



Intermediate Quality Report

**For EU-SILC 2010 operation
Cross sectional data**

Hungary

October 2010.

Introduction.....	4
1. Common Cross Sectional European Union Indicators	5
2. Accuracy	8
2.1. Sample design	8
2.2. Sampling errors	12
2.3. Non-sampling errors	14
2.4. Mode of data collection	21
2.5. Imputation procedure	21
2.6. Imputed rent	22
2.7. Company car	23
3. Comparability	23
3.1. Basic concepts and definitions.....	23
3.3. Tracking rules	25
4. Coherence	26

Index of tables

<i>Table 1:</i> Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC 2010	6
<i>Table 2:</i> Sample size	9
<i>Table 3:</i> Fieldwork timing and sample development over time	9
<i>Table 4:</i> Size of rotational groups	10
<i>Table 5:</i> Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, effective sample size, unweighted	12
<i>Table 6:</i> Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, effective sample size, weighted	13
<i>Table 7:</i> Mean, number of observation, standard error for disposable income	14
<i>Table 8:</i> Sample size and rotational groups on household level	16
<i>Table 9:</i> Sample size and rotational groups on personal level	16
<i>Table 10:</i> Distribution of DB120	18
<i>Table 11:</i> Distribution of DB130	18
<i>Table 12:</i> Distribution of DB135	18
<i>Table 13:</i> Item non-response on household level by income items	19
<i>Table 14:</i> Item non-response on personal level by personal income items	20
<i>Table 15:</i> Distribution of RB250	21
<i>Table 16:</i> Distribution of RB260	21
<i>Table 17:</i> Interview duration in minutes	21
<i>Table 18:</i> Regression model for imputed rent calculation	22
<i>Table 19:</i> Number of imputed records	23
<i>Table 20:</i> Number of persons aged 16-74 by self-classification and by gender in HU-LFS and HU-EU-SILC, 2010	26
<i>Table 21:</i> Comparison of income target variables of EU-SILC2007,2008,2009 ,2010 weighted	27
<i>Table 22:</i> Comparison of common cross-sectional indicators of EU-SILC 2007, 2008, 2009,2010	29

Introduction

The present intermediate quality report follows the structure outlined in Commission Regulation (EC) No 28/2004. The regulation defines 3 chapters to ensure constant documentation on quality of EU-SILC instrument. The three chapters reports 3 dimensions of quality as accuracy, comparability and coherence. According to article 16 of EC regulation No 1177/2003 of European Parliament of the Council of 16th June 2003 concerning Community Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) this report covers only the cross sectional indicators.

1. Common Cross Sectional European Union Indicators

2010 was the sixth year of EU-SILC survey in Hungary. On the basis of the cross sectional data the calculated Laeken Indicators are presented here.

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2010 Hungary

Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2010

			2010	Standard error	Effective sample size	
1 Risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$\$NAT	713291	4393	1 723	
		EUR	2544	16	1 723	
		PPS	4164	24	1 723	
	2 adults 2 dep. children	\$\$NAT	1497911	9226	2 238	
		EUR	5343	33	2 238	
		PPS	8743	51	2 238	
2 Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender	Total	Total	12.3	,53	15 458	
		M	12.6	,58	6 226	
		F	12.0	,56	9 665	
	0-17	Total	20.3	1,19	3 231	
		0-64	Total	17.0	,61	12 911
			M	15.4	,65	5 526
	F		18.6	,66	7 664	
	18-64	Total	12.7	,52	9 701	
		M	12.4	,56	4 376	
		F	13.1	,56	5 827	
	18-24	Total	17.0	1,19	1 644	
		M	15.4	1,48	781	
		F	20.3	1,61	842	
	25-49	Total	12.3	,64	4 940	
		M	12.6	,71	2 363	
		F	12.0	,72	2 696	
	50-64	Total	8.6	,58	3 574	
		M	9.2	,79	1 557	
		F	8.1	,64	2 057	
	65+	Total	4.1	,48	2 356	
		M	2.8	,59	834	
		F	4.8	,57	1 611	
3 Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity (a) At work (d) Not at work (e1) Of which: Unemployed (e2) Of which: Retired (f) Of which: Other inactive	Total	Total	5.3	,71	4 945	
		M	6.0	,82	2 602	
		F	4.6	,79	2 601	
	Total	Total	14.5	,63	6 018	
		M	15.1	,80	2 028	
		F	14.1	,68	4 504	
	Total	Total	44.8	1,25	739	
		M	45.8	1,82	350	
		F	43.5	1,61	362	
	Total	Total	4.0	,77	3 867	
		M	3.2	1,00	1 221	
		F	4.5	,85	3 042	
	Total	Total	19.5	,96	1 672	
		M	17.3	1,20	699	
		F	20.7	1,13	1 079	
4 Risk-of-poverty rate by household type	All hh no dep. childr.	Total	7.0	,55	4 187	
			18.3	,89	2 283	
		M	7.7	1,92	559	
	1 person hh	F	19.3	,91	1 666	
		1 person hh <65yrs		10.3	1,39	1 170
			1 person hh 65+	8.9	,97	867
	2 adults no dep. childr. (both < 65) (at least one 65+)			2.4	1,02	1 718
				,53		
			5.4		1 554	
	2 adults no dep. childr. Other hh no dep. childr.		16.6	,44	2 291	
		All hh with dep. childr. Single parent (at least 1 child)		28.1	,93	8 948
				10.5	3,22	973
			14.6	1,37	2 096	
	2 adults 1 dep. child		27.8	1,71	2 450	
		2 adults 2 dep. childr.		15.6	3,26	1 365
			2 adults 3+ dep. childr. Other hh with dep. childr.		7.0	1,80
Risk-of-poverty rate by accomodation						
5 tenuresstatus	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	11.9	,62	12 673	
		(b) Tenant	Total	18.1	,90	464

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2010 Hungary
Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2010 –continued

			2010	Standard error	Effective sample size	
6	Risk-of-poverty rate	All hh no dep. childr.	WI = 0	13,3	,99	2 193
	by work intensity of		0 < WI < 1	9,2	,87	1 607
	the household		WI = 1	1,4	1,17	1 212
		All hh with dep. childr.	WI = 0	61,5	1,78	646
			0 < WI < 0.5	42,7	3,02	852
			0.5 <= WI < 1	11,9	1,73	3 203
			WI = 1	3,2	1,96	3 891
7	Risk-of-poverty rate	Total	Total	51,4	,49	17 880
	before and after transfers		M	49,0	,58	8 265
	by age and gender		F	53,6	,53	10 003
	(a) before all transfers	0-17	Total	52,4	1,16	3 376
		18-64	Total	42,6	,56	12 004
			M	41,1	,67	5 378
			F	44,0	,60	7 213
		65+	Total	88,0	,73	2 959
			M	89,5	1,04	1 160
			F	87,1	,83	1 775
	(b) including pensions	Total	Total	28,4	,49	17 058
			M	28,9	,58	7 600
			F	28,0	,53	9 319
		0-17	Total	47,4	1,17	3 537
		18-64	Total	27,7	,54	11 453
			M	27,5	,63	5 037
			F	27,9	,57	6 800
		65+	Total	8,6	,63	2 662
			M	6,0	,83	937
			F	7,4	,76	1 671
13	Relative median	Total	Total	16.5	,90	13 063
	risk-of-poverty gap		M	16.9	1,05	6 545
	by age and gender		F	15.6	,94	8 039
		0-17	Total	16.5	1,32	2 625
		18-64	Total	16.7	,98	8 926
			M	17.3	1,14	5 048
			F	16.3	,99	5 357
		65+	Total	11.0	1,61	2 876
			M	11.0	2,56	737
			F	11.0	1,88	2 024
14	S80/S20 quintile share ratio			3.4	0,05	6 785
15	Gini coefficient			0.241	0,00299	6 713

2. Accuracy

2.1. Sample design

2.1.1. Type of sampling

2010 was the sixth year for the Hungarian EU-SILC survey. In 2010 a new rotational group (number 9) with 3204 dwellings was introduced. The Hungarian EU-SILC survey was a supplementary survey in 2005, it was carried out in the sub sample of the Micro census sample

The rotational group 7 have a stratified two stage sample design in a part of the population (part I., type I.), while a stratified one stage sample design on the other part of the population (part II., type II.). Part II. population consists of mostly the bigger localities, part I. consists of the rest. Group 6 ,8 and 9 have a stratified three stage sample design in a part of the population (part III, type III), while a stratified two stage sample design on the other part of the population (part IV., type IV.). Part IV. population consists of mostly the bigger localities, part III. consists of the rest.

2.1.2. Sampling units

In type I. sample design PSU-s are localities, SSU-s are dwellings. In type II. PSU-s are dwellings. In type III. sample design PSU-s are localities, SSU-s are enumeration districts, USU-s are households. In type IV. PSU-s are enumeration districts, SSU-s are households.

2.1.3. Stratification criteria

Localities of Hungary were stratified by size.

The micro census mother sample's stratification has an effect on the stratification of SILC sample. The micro census sample was designed to provide reliable estimates of the main demographic indicators for the 176 General Electoral Districts (GEDs) of the country. The GEDs were roughly of the same size, the average being 24000 in terms of dwellings. Each GED has a 2 % sample of its own, resulting in a self-weighting 2 % overall sample of the country. Some GEDs are towns or segments of major cities, other GEDs consist of a number of smaller localities. Localities within GEDs were stratified by size (number of dwellings). In strata with more than one locality, only one locality (PSU) was selected for micro census.

Micro census has 806 localities in the sample, but EU-SILC could not allow more than 370, which resulted in collapsing some micro census strata together and consider them as EU-SILC strata. Collapsing micro census strata was carried out within county: micro census strata similar in size of localities were collapsed. Within these collapsed strata some localities were selected for EU-SILC .

Strata with one locality constitute the part of the population where we have one stage sample design (type II.), strata with more than one locality constitute the other part, where two stage sample design was applied (type I.).

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2010 Hungary

Localities were stratified by county and category of size for rotational group 6, 8 and 9. Bigger localities (of part IV.) are self-representing localities. Within selected localities the households were stratified by the characteristic of the head of household.

2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria

11500 households were selected in 2010. Based on the minimum effective sample size we took expected non-response rate at the first wave and attrition over time into account. We calculate higher non-response rate in urban area, and somewhat lower non-response rate in the rural area.

Table 2. Sample size

	Number
Selected addresses	11500
Contacted addresses	11196
Can not be located	6
Unable to access	4
Non-residential, unoccupied, not principal residence	294

2.1.5. Sample selection schemas

Localities were selected with pps, where size is measured by the number of dwellings. Dwellings in a selected locality were selected systematically. For type III. and IV. localities and enumeration districts were selected with pps, where size is measured by the number of dwellings. Households were selected in a simple random way.

2.1.6. Sample distribution over time

The field work was carried out in March , April and May 2010 with reference month of March 2010. The field work period covered three months because of field work allocation and workload related reasons. Those follow-up households moved to new location were interviewed in June.

Table 3. Fieldwork timing and sample development over time

Weeks of interview	Achieved sample size	Distribution of achieved sample
1 March – 7 March	520	5.30%
8 March – 14 March	1653	16.85%
15 March – 21 March	2023	20.62%
22 March – 28 March	1780	18.14%
29 March – 4 April	803	8.18%
5 April – 11 April	737	7.51%
12 April – 18 April	914	9.31%
19 April – 25 April	816	8.32%
26 April – 2 May	443	4.51%
3 May – 9 May	86	0.88%
10 May – 16 May	12	0.12%
17 May – 23 May	2	0.02%
24 May – 30 May	1	0.01%
31 May – 6 June	0	0.00%
7 June – 13 June	1	0.01%
14 June – 20 June	14	0.14%
21 June – 27 June	6	0.06%
Total	9813	100.00%

2.1.7. Renewal of the sample, rotational groups

2005 was the first year of EU-SILC in Hungary. The 13 975 selected households were divided into 4 rotational groups, sized 2702, 3344, 3731 and 4198, where we took the expected attrition into account. In 2006 the first rotational group (of size 2702) was dropped out and 4130 new households were introduced. In 2007 rotational group 2 (of size 1697) was dropped and 6315 new households were introduced as rotational group 6. In 2008 rotational group 3 (of size 1708) was dropped and 4122 new households were introduced as rotational group 7. Rotational group4 was dropped and rotational group8 with size 3837 was introduced in 2009. In 2010 rotational group5 with size of 2312 households was dropped and a new rotational group9 was introduced with 3204 households to the panel.

Table 4. Size of rotational groups (selected sample)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Rotational group1	2 702	-	-	-	-	-
Rotational group2	3 344	1 697	-	-	-	-
Rotational group3	3 731	1 863	1 708	-	-	-
Rotational group4	4 198	2 077	1 920	1 805	-	-
Rotational group5	-	4 130	2 655	2 345	2 312	-
Rotational group6	-	-	6 315	3 187	3 099	2 474
Rotational group7	-	-	-	4 122	2 908	2 391
Rotational group8	-	-	-	-	3 837	3 431
Rotational group9	-	-	-	-	-	3 204
Total sample	13 975	9 767	12 598	11459	12 156	11 500

2.1.8. Weighting

This chapter describes the computation of weights of EU-SILC sample 2010.

2.1.8.1. Design factors

For group 7 it was calculated by strata; in stratum j the design weight, the reciprocal of inclusion probability $w_j = L_j / l_j$, where L_j is the total number of units in stratum j , and l_j is the number of selected units. $w_j \in [740, 1135]$ for group 7. For rotational group 6, 8 and 9 the same calculation was made with the exception, that weighting classes were defined by regions, category of size of localities and characteristic of head of households (household strata), and that L_j is the estimated number of units in class j . This estimation comes from the frame (master sample) information of HBS which is of size 200000 in terms of household.

2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments

Non-response weights were introduced to reduce bias caused by unit non-response on household level. Non-response adjustment was applied by the same classes as design factors were calculated by. Primary weight in class j , $w'_j = L_j / l'_j$, where l'_j is the number of observed units.

2.1.8.3. Adjustment to external data

The aim of this adjustment was to improve the accuracy of data using socio-economical information available from the constantly updated Census 2001 and other surveys. Iterative raking scale method were applied. For the integrative calibration the following controls were used:

- Population totals for sex * age * region groups defined by ages 0-14, 15-29, 30-59, 60 or more;
- Population totals for sex * age * type of locality groups defined by ages 0-14, 15-29, 30-59, 60 or more;
- Population totals for activity status * type of locality groups
- Population totals of the actives for education level * type of locality groups
- Total number of households for household* type of locality groups.

Calibration was carried out with a self made SAS program.

2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weights

After calibrating the new and former rotational groups separately, those adjusted weights were reduced proportional to the group size. Finally, one more calibration was applied for the overall sample with a small number of iterations. Final cross-sectional weights for the whole sample are in the interval [100,1100].

2.1.9. Substitution

There was no substitution in the survey.

2.2. Sampling errors

Table 5. Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, Standard errors – unweighted

Income component		Mean	Nr of observation		Standard error	Effective sample size
			Before imputation	After imputation		
<i>Gross income components on personal level</i>						
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1620742	9547	9780	11450	7556
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	72310	1196	1196	184	1006
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	888647	1841	1967	5416	1350
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	413748	26	26	216	14
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	271062	1356	1356	751	847
PY100G	Old-age benefit	1044282	5717	5784	4978	4132
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	479606	330	330	637	213
PY120G	Sickness benefit	106410	1218	1218	385	951
PY130G	Disability benefit	625166	1414	1459	1602	990
PY140G	Education related allowances	179169	344	344	313	207
HY010	Total household gross income	2784574	9461	9809	25240	7072
HY020	Total disposable household income	2178381	9459	9810	15784	6822
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1890911	9402	9712	16137	6660
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1431478	8228	8499	18124	6966
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	420725	155	155	71819	100
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	415561	3316	3316	7191	2057
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	128319	809	809	8240	429
HY070G	Housing allowances	56030	940	940	2440	636
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	211301	1731	1731	6929	1814
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	730895	85	85	127445	73
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	210177	1757	1757	2845	1428
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	202424	10	10	103109	7
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14978	4991	4991	195	3507
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	138243	1680	1680	5190	1824
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	870707	6474	6474	14764	4510

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2010 Hungary

Table 6. Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, Standard errors – weighted

Income component		Mean	Nr of observation		Standard error
			Before imputation	After imputation	
<i>Gross income components on personal level</i>					
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1607120	3806358	3908815	12149
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	71205	473784	473784	199
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1094533	825714	905432	4742
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	366526	9615	9615	156
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	271736	537085	537085	823
PY100G	Old-age benefit	1042794	2253291	2281838	5245
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	457066	107304	107304	628
PY120G	Sickness benefit	103057	494105	494105	400
PY130G	Disability benefit	626640	487792	506955	1651
PY140G	Education related allowances	177380	123774	123774	321
HY010	Total household gross income	2912549	3624672	3790472	21574
HY020	Total disposable household income	2260719	3624376	3790855	12831
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1975663	3609861	3760486	13137
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1496257	3206204	3342288	14132
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	389627	62279	62279	61439
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	421251	1301288	1301288	4340
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	124329	293855	293855	7864
HY070G	Housing allowances	58109	333840	333840	2818
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	215888	631304	631304	8122
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	811389	37991	37991	152898
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	209488	691255	691255	3075
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	171124	4025	4025	88543
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	15469	2019312	2019312	209
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	144042	640142	640142	5906
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	902689	2599383	2599383	14687

Table 7. Mean, number of observation, Standard error for Disposable Income - unweighted

Disposable income	Mean	Number of observation	Standard error	Effective sample size
<i>Equivalised disposable income By household size</i>				
1 household member	1191408	2723	24215	1628
2 household member	1396616	5844	13658	2512
3 household member	1356277	5484	17660	1380
4 and more household member	1200097	10700	14278	1420
<i>Population by age groups</i>				
Under 25	1157275	7174	10906	4127
25-34	1386916	3067	15711	2538
35-44	1276378	3336	19856	2402
45-54	1319797	3610	18714	2490
55-64	1393006	3730	14969	3157
65+	1280789	3834	11018	3086
<i>Population by gender</i>				
Male	1296577	11358	9344	7489
Female	1266211	13393	7368	8306
<i>Total</i>	1280146	24751	8164	6690

2.3. Non-sampling errors

Survey results are subject to various sources of error. Total error in a survey estimate is the difference between the estimate derived from the sample data collected and the true value for the population.

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

The target population of EU-SILC is the Hungarian population living in private household in the territory of Hungary. Persons living in collective households and in institutions are excluded. The sampling frame is an updated dataset of addresses used in the 2001 population and housing census, thus the under-coverage is due to the new buildings completed after the last updating.

The under-coverage in percentages amounts to about ≈ 0.7 %.

2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

Measurement errors can be defined as a bias between the recorded value on the basis of the respondent answer and the real, true, but unknown value of the given variable. The sources of the difference can be:

- i. questionnaire problem
- ii. data collection problem
- iii. respondent misinterpreting the question

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2010 Hungary

These unavoidable problems were kept in mind during the preparations of the data collection and following steps were done to reduce them.

Based on the experiences of the previous waves (EU-SILC2005, EU-SILC2006, EU-SILC2007, EU-SILC2008, and EU-SILC2009) the following steps were done:

- The questionnaire was formed according to Eurostat recommendations.
- To avoid non-response of respondents because of personal data-protections reasons we have kept the separated data sheet for the names and birth date of the respondents. It was called address sheet (Címkaart).
- A detailed manual was compiled for interviewers to deepen their knowledge about the structure of the questionnaire and the management of the interview.

Field work organization, Interviewers training

The organization of the fieldwork related to social surveys was restructured in the Hungarian Central Statistical Office. Regional Offices of HCSO were in charge of respondent contact and data collection and capture while any other responsibility related to EU-SILC including questionnaire design, data checking, imputation, analysis and study of the results belonged to Living Standard and Labour – and Education Statistics Department in the Central Office located in Budapest. The organization of the field-work of the survey year 2010 was based on the experiences of the previous years.

Training was organized for the colleagues working in the Regional offices by the experts of the Central office. Detailed interviewers manual and presentations were prepared on the questions of all the questionnaires (household, personal, and data-sheet questionnaire), possible problems and respondent approach as well. The training for interviewers was organized by the 7 Regional offices using the supporting document and presentations supplied for the central training. Uniformed training schedule and script were used for the regional trainings.

An IT interface group was generated dedicated to EU-SILC survey and its fieldwork. It was used as a problem solving hot-line. All the colleagues working with the survey on any level has a right to put any question related to fieldwork or IT problem on it and the experts of the Central office replied to the question within 1 working day at least. Either the questions or the answers become publicly available for all the users of the group.

Fieldwork, controlling

During the fieldwork Regional offices monitored the ratio of the address contacted and the response rate in case of each interviewer. Regional supervisors controlled the timing of the interviewing and work quality of the interviewers. There were extra checks on data of the visited households. After the fieldwork the supervisors called 5% of the households by phone asked about the interviewer (whether the interviewer visited the households, was he/she polite, etc.).

We used personal paper and pencil assisted (PAPI) interviews during the data collection.

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

Blaise was used as data entry program. The data entry program was tested by colleagues of Regional offices and Central office experts. After the testing the data entry program was corrected.

Approximately 50 colleagues made the data entry. The program contained checks to ensure the basic data consistency.

Data controlling, editing

After entry the data were controlled in various ways. The main elements of the controlling were the following:

- Identification numbers controlling
- Outlier controlling
- Data consistency checking (for instance, basic demographic data – highest education level attained; basic demographic data – economic status; economic status under the income reference period – the income components)
- Controlling of the amount of social transfers

2.3.3. Non-response errors

The sample of EU-SILC 2010 wave designed according to the expected panel mortality and response rate in 4 rotational groups.

Table 8. Sample size and rotational groups on household level

Household level	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Selected sample size	11196	2404	2327	3334	3131
Achieved sample size	9813	2123	2069	2863	2758
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.876	0.883	0.889	0.859	0.881

Table 9. Sample size and rotational groups on personal level

Personal level	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Selected sample size	24751	5374	5217	7163	6997
Achieved sample size	20653	4465	4421	6015	5752
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.834	0.831	0.847	0.840	0.822

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

Household non-response rates (NRh)- for the total sample

$$NRh = (1 - (Ra * Rh)) * 100$$

$$Ra = \frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]} = \mathbf{0.9991}$$

$$Rh = \frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]} = \mathbf{0.8765}$$

$$NRh = (1 - (0.9935 * 0.8097)) * 100 = \mathbf{12.43 \%}$$

Household non-response rates (NRh) – for the new replication

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2010 Hungary

$$NRh=(1-(Ra*Rh))*100$$

$$Ra=\frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}}=\frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]}= \mathbf{0.9997}$$

$$Rh=\frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}}=\frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]}= \mathbf{0.8809}$$

$$NRh=(1-(0.9986*0.8129))*100= \mathbf{11.94 \%}$$

Individual non-response rate (NRp)- for the total sample

$$NRp=(1-(Rp))*100 = \mathbf{0.0484}$$

$$Rp=\frac{\text{Number of personal interviews completed}}{\text{Number of eligible individuals in the households whose interviews were completed and accepted for the data base}}=$$

$$\frac{\Sigma[RB250=11]}{\Sigma[RB245=1]} = \mathbf{0.9995}$$

*Overall individual non-response rate (*NRp)- for the total sample*

$$NRp=(1-(Ra*Rh*Rp))*100$$

$$NRp=(1-(0.9988*0.8467*0.9992))*100= \mathbf{11.98 \%}$$

Individual non-response rate (NRp)- for the new replication

$$NRp=(1-(Rp))*100$$

$$Rp=\frac{\text{Number of personal interviews completed}}{\text{Number of eligible individuals in the households whose interviews were completed and accepted for the data base}}=$$

$$\frac{\Sigma[RB250=11]}{\Sigma[RB245=1]} = \mathbf{0.9988}$$

*Overall individual non-response rate (*NRp)- for the new replication*

$$NRp=(1-(Ra*Rh*Rp))*100$$

$$NRp=(1-(0.9997*0.8809*0.9988))*100=\mathbf{12.05 \%}$$

2.3.3.3. *Distribution of households by “record of contact address”(DB120), by “household questionnaire result” (DB130) and by “household interview acceptance” (DB135), for each rotational group and for the total*

Table 10. Distribution of DB120

DB120- Contact address	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Address contacted (11)	11196	2404	2327	3334	3131
Address can not be located (21)	6	2	2	2	0
Address unable to access (22)	4	0	0	3	1
Address does not exist or etc (23)	294	68	62	92	72
Total	11500	2474	2391	3431	3204

Table 11. Distribution of DB130

DB130- Household questionnaire result	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Household questionnaire completed (11)	9813	2123	2069	2863	2758
Refusal to co-operate (21)	932	190	153	342	247
Entire household temporarily away (22)	364	64	85	112	103
Household unable to respond (23)	54	15	16	16	7
Other reason(24)	33	12	4	1	16
Total	11196	2404	2327	3334	3131

Table 12. Distribution of DB135

DB135- Household interview acceptance	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Interview accepted for database (1)	9813	2123	2069	2863	2758
Interview rejected (2)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9813	2123	2069	2863	2758

2.3.3.5. *Item non-response*

The item non-response is covered by the following tables about completeness of information regarding each income item on household level and personal level as well.

Table 13 .Item non-response on household level by income items

Income items		Household having received an amount		Full information		Partial information		Missing	
		count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%
HY010	Total household gross income	9461	96.4	9113	96.3	348	3.7	0	0
HY020	Total disposable household income	9459	97.1	9183	97.1	276	2.9	0	0
	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	9402	96.7	9183	96.6	219	2.3	0	0
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	8228	84.8	8063	84.5	165	1.7	0	0
HY023									
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	155	1.6	155	1.6	0	.0	0	0
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	3316	33.8	3316	33.8	0	.0	0	0
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	809	8.2	809	8.2	0	.0	0	0
HY070G	Housing allowances	940	9.6	940	9.6	0	.0	0	0
	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	1731	17.6	1731	17.6	0	.0	0	0
HY080G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	85	.9	85	.9	0	.0	0	0
HY090G									
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	1757	17.9	1757	17.9	0	.0	0	0
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	10	.1	10	.1	0	.0	0	0
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	4991	50.9	4991	50.9	0	.0	0	0
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	1680	17.1	1680	17.1	0	.0	0	0
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	6474	66.0	6474	66.0	0	.0	0	0

Table 14. Item non-response on personal level by personal income items

Personal income items		Persons having received an amount		Full information		Partial information		Missing	
		count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	9547	46.4	9376	45.9	171	.8	0	0
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	1196	5.8	1196	5.8	0	.0	0	0
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1841	8.9	1790	8.7	51	.2	0	0
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	26	.1	26	0.1	0	.0	0	0
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	1356	6.6	1356	6.6	0	.0	0	0
PY100G	Old-age benefit	5717	27.7	5650	27.4	67	.3	0	0
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	330	1.6	330	1.6	0	.0	0	0
PY120G	Sickness benefit	1218	5.9	1218	5.9	0	.0	0	0
PY130G	Disability benefit	1414	6.8	1369	6.6	45	.2	0	0
PY140G	Education related allowances	344	1.7	344	1.7	0	.0	0	0

2.4. Mode of data collection

Distribution of persons aged 16 or over by "data status" (RB250) and by "type of interview" (RB260)

Table 15. Distribution of RB250

RB250- Data status	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Information completed only from interview(11)	20643	4463	4421	6014	5745
From register...no reason (12-33)	10	2	0	1	7
Total	20653	4465	4421	6015	5752

Table 16. Distribution of RB260

RB260- Contact address	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
PAPI (1)	16549	3620	3573	4790	4566
CAPI, CATI, Other(2,3,4)	0	0	0	0	0
Proxy(5)	4094	843	848	1224	1179
Total	20643	4463	4421	6014	5745

Table 17. Interview duration in minutes

Interview	Mean	By household size	Mean
Household interview	26	HH with 1 member	38
Personal interview	15	HH with 2 members	51
Total (at household level)	57	HH with 3 members	63
		HH with 4 members	75
		HH with 5+ members	93
		Total	57

2.5. Imputation procedure

According to the principles of the detailed methodology of EU-SILC (Doc. 065/04) we applied imputation for the case of item non-response. The aim was to insert a value where the original data is missing due to item non-response. The inserted value was estimated on the basis of following procedures:

- i. deterministic method
- ii. stochastic method

Deterministic method was covering the cases, when the missing value can be determined by several available background information at the given record. Practically it was used for social incomes and benefits. Most of the benefit income items had got fixed amount according to the corresponding governmental measures and regulations. When the respondents were not able to give us the exact value of childcare benefit (*Családi pótlék*), we imputed the value of childcare benefit according to the information about the number, age and activity status of the children at the household. Similar imputation was done, when the respondent did not report the value of his unemployment benefit. In this case we imputed the value the official unemployment benefit minimum to this variable.

Stochastic method was covering the cases of item non-response for work related income items. The estimations were based on linear or logarithmic regression models built up for the income items. We tested several models and chose the ones with the highest R^2 . If we could not assign a regression model to describe the missing information, the mean value of the group was used.

2.6. Imputed rent

The purchase of the dwelling is regarded primary as capital formation (investment) and not consumer expenditure. However the ownership of a dwelling is considered to produce a service – a shelter -, which is actually consumed over time by the household. As consequence, it is required to estimate the price of the shelter, by imputation of rental, since no monetary transaction involved. This imputed rental is a part of household consumption expenditure. The inclusion of imputed rent in gross disposable income as well give better basis for comparison of standards of living between households with different housing behaviour patterns and with EU member states.

According to regulation imputed rent should be estimated only for those dwellings used as a main residence and for all households do not reporting full rent either because they are owner occupiers or paying lower price than the market rent. Market rent is the rent due to the right to use an unfurnished dwelling on the private market, excluding charges for heating, water, electricity, etc.

Hungary has got a special housing market situation in the aspect of imputed rental calculation. The share of market rental sector is 3 %. Owner occupiers constitute 97 % of the total housing market. Personal attitudes and social circumstances make stronger the role of private property in the housing market. Geographical and physical attributes and mainly the location of the dwelling within the country determines mostly the value of a dwelling, and possibility to let it on the rental market. Comparison of standard of living on the basis of EU-SILC survey between different social groups is not affected by the minor groups of market renters. The calculation of imputed rent is reasoned by international comparison of data within EU.

Regression method was used to calculate the value of imputed rent on household level. We asked the value of subjective rent on household level. The following question was asked in the questionnaire: “How much you should pay as a rent for a dwelling similar to your current one either in size, number of rooms and conditions in your close neighborhood?” The value of the subjective rent was used as a dependent variable in the regression calculation. Wide set of explaining variable and linear regression models were tested as well. The one with the highest R^2 was chosen. There were 666 households where the established function did not fit and those records received the self-assessed value as an estimated imputed rent.

Table 18. Regression model for imputed rent calculation

Coefficients	Unstandardized B	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2983	1.269	0.204
Market price of the dwelling	1688	51.252	0.000
Settlement type	-4583	-15.581	0.000
Cost of housing maintenance	.172	11.752	0.000
Dwelling size	74	7.961	0.000
Complex indicator of settlement facilities	3196	11.366	0.000
Number of rooms	1385	5.717	0.000
More than 1 bathrooms	3549	4.464	0.000
District heating	-3629	-5.782	0.000
Detached house	-3024	-5.082	0.000
Technical condition of the dwelling	1512	3655	0.000
Public sewerage	-1072	-2.261	0.024

Selection mechanism: stepwise

R square: 0.601

Table 19. Number of imputed records

Household with estimated imputed rent	10190
Households with self assessed value as imputed rent	666
Household with actual market rental	289
Total	11145

2.7. Company car

A question was used to determine the value of private use of company car in on the questionnaire. It was answered by the respondents reporting use of company cars. The respondent had to estimate this value and this estimation was used in the database.

3. Comparability

This chapter will report the differences between Eurostat definitions and definitions Hungary applied in EU-SILC 2010.

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions

- i. *Reference population*
No difference to common definition
- ii. *Private household definition*
No difference to common definition
- iii. *Household membership*
No difference to common definition
- iv. *Income reference period*
Fixed twelve month period was used, which was the previous calendar year 2009.
- v. *Period for taxes on income and social insurance*
No difference to common definition
- vi. *Reference period for taxes on wealth*
The reference period for taxes on wealth was the same as income tax period. We included the tax on motorcars and property tax. Tax was imposed on motorcars on the basis of it's' weight and it was compulsory for the owner. Property tax could be imposed by the local municipality. It was not used in every settlement, and had several options for reductions for the property owners.
- vii. *The lag between the income reference period and the current variables*
The lag between the income reference period and the current variables is 3 months since the reference time of interviewing was 1 March 2010.
- viii. *Total duration of data collection of the sample*
The data collection lasted 15 weeks.
- ix. *Basic information on activity during the income reference period*
Activity information was asked for each month of the income reference period in the questionnaire.

3.2. Components of income

3.2.1. Differences between the national definitions and standard EU-SILC definitions and assessment of consequences of the differences

- i. *Total household gross income*
No difference to common definitions.
- ii. *Total disposable household income*
No difference to the common methodology.
- iii. *Total disposable household income, before social transfers other than old-age benefit and survivors' benefit*
No difference to the common methodology.
- iv. *Total disposable household income, before social transfers including old-age and survivors' benefit*
No difference to the common methodology.
- v. *Imputed rent*
Any difference to common methodology was described at 2.6.
- vi. *Income from rental of property or land*
No difference to the common methodology.
- vii. *Family/children related allowances*
The sophisticated child related allowance system of Hungary was covered here. For the age of 6 months of the baby, the mother can stay at home with the baby on a *Child birth leave* receiving the amount of a normal sickpay, about 80 % of her former salary. For the age of 2 years of the child the mother or the father of the child can stay home receiving *Child care allowance (Gyed)*, which is equal to 70 % of her/his former salary, but not higher than 100 100 HUF (about 364 Euro/month). Until the age of 3 of the child the parent can stay home receiving *Child care aid (Gyes)*, which equals to the minimum old age pension 28 500 HUF (about 104 Euro/month). This allowance can be passed to the any of grandparents who is responsible for the daily care of the child if the parent goes back to work again. If the family has got 3 or more children and the mother does not work full time (max. 20 hours a week) or does not work at all she can receive *Child care benefit (Gyet)*, which equals to the minimum old-age pension until the youngest child does not fulfill the age of 8.
- viii. *Social exclusion payment not elsewhere classified*
No difference to common methodology

3.2.2. The source or procedure used for collecting income variables

All the income variables were collected from the respondents. The income target variables were grouped into more detailed sub-components according to Hungarian tax and benefit system.

3.2.3. The form in which income variables at component level have been obtained

Gross income data were collected for the income items but in case of certain benefits according to tax law which were not considered to be belonging to the taxable income net value were asked, like old-age pension or family allowance.

3.2.4. The method used for obtaining the income target variables in the required form

The income items were divided into sub-components according to the Hungarian tax regulations and benefit practice in the questionnaire. The personal and household incomes were separated. Gross income items were asked for work related incomes and other incomes belonging to the personal tax system and net income items were asked for benefits and other allowances. The following steps were taken to obtain income target variables in the required form.

- i. The subcomponents were summed up to obtain the income items on personal income level.
- ii. While Hungary has a personal income tax system, the household type incomes had to be connected to household members. It was done on the basis of the income type, eg. Agricultural income was connected to the household member(s) reporting agricultural activity. Obviously just adult members were involved.
- iii. The value of taxable income was calculated for each household member.
- iv. The total household gross income was calculated for the household including all income types on basis of the process listed at i. and ii.
- v. On the basis of value of taxable income for each household member, the value of personal income tax and social insurance fee was calculated. The deductions were summed up for total of the household.
- vi. The total disposable income on household level was calculated as difference between the total household gross income and the total tax deductions.

3.3. Tracking rules

No difference to common methodology.

4. Coherence

Coherence refers to comparison of target variables and common cross-sectional indicators with external sources.

Labour Force Survey (LFS)

LFS is main reference source for labour force data. Labor force data on the activity status of the population was used for the calibration and output comparison as well.

Table 20. Number of persons aged 16-74 by self-classification and by gender in HU-LFS and in HU-EU-SILC, 2010

Age-group	HU-LFS			HU-SILC		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
Persons						
Working	1999766	1729962	3729727	1996145	1736228	3732373
Unemployed	376578	299498	676075	341855	252860	594715
Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience	376285	376541	752826	370211	376159	746370
In retirement or in early retirement or permanently disabled	823053	1128745	1951799	884262	1199403	2083665
Fulfilling domestic tasks and care responsibilities	17005	367839	384843	7676	161005	168681
Other inactive person	35744	43737	79482	58002	280408	338410
Total	3628431	3946322	7574752	3658151	4006063	7664214
Distribution (%)						
Working	55.1	43.8	49.2	54.6	43.3	48.7
Unemployed	10.4	7.6	8.9	9.3	6.3	7.8
Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience	10.4	9.5	9.9	10.1	9.4	9.7
In retirement or in early retirement or permanently disabled	22.7	28.6	25.8	24.2	29.9	27.2
Fulfilling domestic tasks and care responsibilities	0.5	9.3	5.1	0.2	4.0	2.2
Other inactive person	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.6	7.0	4.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

In a strict sense EU-SILC datasets are not considered as external sources, but it provides the opportunity to compare the cross-sectional results of 4 waves. However some changes were introduced in the formulation of questions but the data were produced under the same frame and definitions and procedures. All the target variables are available for the comparison.

The income items reflect the changes of the economic situation of Hungarian households well. In a country of a rapid social and economic transition it is quite plausible to see a certain restructuring among the income items even on a very short period of one year. There is an increase on the employment cash income and self-employment related income while the non-cash income has been narrowed by the income tax regulations. At certain items – like pension from individual private plans or income of household members under 16 – the number of observations was small.

Last but not least the final output of EU-SILC is the annual calculation of the common cross sectional indicators (Laeken indicators). The common cross sectional indicators receives great attention from the public and official users as well. HCSO publish a study on this topic every year describing the results in Hungarian. The latest study can be found here.

<http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/laekindikator/laekindikator09.pdf>

Table 21. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 (weighted)

weighted		2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1 378 174	21 143	1 410 237	15 474	1 489 381	13 517	1 621 374	7862	1 607 120	12 149
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	70 510	4 241	98 653	15 256	76 487	225	74 810	196	71 205	199
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 861 218	99 261	893 234	58 792	942 774	12 658	1 074 571	4951	1 094 533	4 742
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	171 382	32 102	388 738	139 349	444 017	255	569 888	396	366 526	156
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	185 629	13 192	247 210	18 395	263 042	915	267 210	692	271 736	823
PY100G	Old-age benefit	796 206	7 538	861 340	5 508	949 236	21 543	1 048 213	2482	1 042 794	5 245
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	316 294	18 156	439 261	29 782	410 948	579	482 880	540	457 066	628
PY120G	Sickness benefit	81 945	5 346	104 599	7 263	103 112	519	111 630	433	103 057	400
PY130G	Disability benefit	526 610	9 731	521 900	10 406	588 141	2 267	677 155	1 655	626 640	1 651
PY140G	Education related allowances	88 714	6 017	112 671	8 121	152 376	233	162 289	193	177 380	321

Table 21. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 (weighted)- continued -

		2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error
<i>Income components on household level</i>											
HY010	Total household gross income	2 447 399	34 664	2 510 148	26 020	2 697 270	41 069	2944966	20246	2912549	21574
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 968 043	27 270	1 998 043	17 298	2 101 591	23 423	2275418	12487	2260719	12831
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 784 588	28 050	1 737 966	17 327	1 810 434	16 776	1985007	12943	1975663	13137
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 595 723	33 000	1 430 903	20 136	1 440 865	34 012	1521096	14391	1496257	14132
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	278 499	69 557	599 990	113 058	599 283	122 817	563642	83555	389627	61439
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	268 548	5 755	371 931	7 173	388 899	7 460	417322	4556	421251	4340
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	42 755	8 259	49 203	3 903	105 051	10 562	126209	10041	124329	7864
HY070G	Housing allowances	49 010	2 854	49 971	2 393	50 098	1 980	50041	1677	58109	2818
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	311 243	34 887	111141	5 479	161 739	10 332	189354	7224	215888	8122
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	338 028	66 443	783 803	123 903	1 238 220	308 293	1208454	228152	811389	152898
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	249 095	12 549	222 814	7 997	188 086	3 560	217108	3496	209488	3075
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	45 581	26 574	184 734	85 902	72 508	14 864	147857	43615	171124	88543
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	15 778	359	14 552	183	14 583	223	15335	224	15469	209
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	277 097	21 319	79 198	3 731	118 197	12 587	134562	6005	144042	5906
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	649 140	18 330	720 485	13738	851 769	17 561	929010	14008	902689	14687

Table 22. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2007, 2008, 2009, 2010

			2007	2008	2009	2010
At-Risk of poverty threshold (illustrative values)						
1 person hh	\$NAT		623502	663367	715187	713291
	EUR		2359	2639	2844	2544
	PPS		3975	3993	4175	4164
2 adults 2 dep. children	\$NAT		1309354	1393070	1501892	1497911
	EUR		4955	5542	5972	5343
	PPS		8348	8385	8767	8743
At-Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender						
Total	Total		13	12	12	12
	M		13	12	13	13
	F		13	12	12	12
0-17	Total		19	20	21	20
0-64	Total		14	14	14	17
	M		14	14	14	16
	F		14	14	14	19
18-64	Total		12	12	12	13
	M		12	12	12	12
	F		12	12	12	13
18-24	Total		18	18	18	17
	M		17	16	17	15
	F		19	20	19	20
25-49	Total		13	12	13	12
	M		12	12	12	13
	F		13	13	14	12
50-64	Total		9	9	8	9
	M		10	9	9	9
	F		6	8	7	8
65+	Total		6	4	5	4
	M		3	3	3	3
	F		8	5	5	5
At-Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity						
Total	Total		6	5	6	5
	M		8	7	6	6
	F		5	4	5	5
(a) At work						
(d) Not at work	Total		15	15	14	15
	M		16	15	14	15
	F		15	15	14	14
(e1) Of which: Unemployed	Total		47	48	47	45
	M		53	49	49	46
	F		41	48	45	44
(e2) Of which: Retired	Total		8	7	4	4
	M		8	7	3	3
	F		9	7	5	5
(f) Of which: Other inactive	Total		22	24	19	20
	M		19	20	17	17
	F		24	25	20	20

Table 22. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2007,2008,2009,2010-cont. -

			2007	2008	2009	2010
Risk-of-poverty rate by household type	<i>All hh no dep. childr.</i>		8	8	7	7
	1 person hh	M	20	23	20	18
	1 person hh	F	14	12	11	8
	1 person hh <65yrs		21	22	19	19
	1 person hh 65+		11	8	9	10
	(both < 65)					
	2 adults no dep. childr.		9	9	8	9
	(at least one 65+)					
	2 adults no dep. childr.		4	3	3	2
	Other hh no dep. childr.		4	5	4	5
	All hh with dep. childr.		16	16	17	17
	(at least 1 child)					
	Single parent		29	33	26	28
	2 adults 1 dep. child		12	11	10	11
	2 adults 2 dep. childr.		15	16	16	15
	2 adults 3+ dep. childr.		27	29	31	28
	Other hh with dep. childr.		11	11	14	16
At-Risk-of-poverty rate by accommodation tenure status						
6						
	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	12	12	12	13
	(b) Tenant	Total	22	25	25	19
7	Risk-of-poverty rate by work intensity of the household					
	<i>All hh no dep. childr.</i>	<i>WI = 0</i>	16	15	11	13
		<i>0 < WI < 1</i>	8	7	9	9
		<i>WI = 1</i>	3	2	2	1
	<i>All hh with dep. childr.</i>	<i>WI = 0</i>	62	56	60	62
		<i>0 < WI < 0.5</i>	42	34	45	43
		<i>0.5 <= WI < 1</i>	13	13	15	12
		<i>WI = 1</i>	6	4	4	3

Table 22. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2007,2008,2009,2010-cont.-

			2007	2008	2009	2010		
9	Risk-of-poverty							
	rate	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	49	52	51	51	
	before and after transfers		<i>M</i>	47	50	49	49	
	by age and gender		<i>F</i>	51	54	54	54	
	(a) before all transfers						52	
		<i>0-17</i>	<i>Total</i>	49	52	51		
		<i>18-64</i>	<i>Total</i>	49	44	43	43	
			<i>M</i>	47	42	41	41	
			<i>F</i>	52	46	45	44	
		<i>65+</i>	<i>Total</i>	88	89	88	88	
			<i>M</i>	89	91	90	90	
			<i>F</i>	87	88	87	87	
	(b) including pensions							
		<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	29	30	29	28	
			<i>M</i>	30	31	29	29	
			<i>F</i>	29	30	28	28	
		<i>0-17</i>	<i>Total</i>	45	47	46	47	
		<i>18-64</i>	<i>Total</i>	29	30	28	28	
			<i>M</i>	29	30	28	28	
			<i>F</i>	29	30	28	28	
		<i>65+</i>	<i>Total</i>	11	10	9	9	
			<i>M</i>	7	7	7	6	
			<i>F</i>	13	11	11	7	
	13	Relative median risk-of-poverty gap	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	20	17	16	17
		by age and gender		<i>M</i>	21	18	16	17
				<i>F</i>	19	17	16	16
		<i>0-17</i>	<i>Total</i>	20	17	17	17	
		<i>18-64</i>	<i>Total</i>	21	18	17	17	
			<i>M</i>	21	18	17	17	
			<i>F</i>	22	18	17	16	
		<i>65+</i>	<i>Total</i>	14	10	13	11	
			<i>M</i>	10	10	16	11	
			<i>F</i>	15	10	12	11	
14		S80/S20 quintile share ratio		3.7	3.6	3.5	3.4	
15	Gini coefficient		0.257	0.252	0.247	0.241		