



Intermediate Quality Report

**For EU-SILC 2011 operation
Cross sectional data**

Hungary

30 November 2012.

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 2011	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, 2011	26
<i>Table 21:</i> Comparison of income target variables of EU-SILC2008,2009,2010 ,2011 weighted	27
<i>Table 22:</i> Comparison of common cross-sectional indicators of EU-SILC 2008, 2009, 2010,2011	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

2011 was the seventh 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 2011 Hungary

Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2011

			2011	Standard error	Effective sample size		
1 Risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$NAT	749 550	5 028	2 558		
		EUR	2 721	18.25	2 558		
		PPS	4 190	28.10	2 558		
	2 adults 2 dep. children	\$NAT	1 574 055	10 558	3 455		
		EUR	5 714	38.33	3 455		
		PPS	8 799	59.02	3 455		
2 Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender	Total	Total	13.8	0.45	19 440		
		M	14.1	0.51	9 438		
		F	13.6	0.48	9 748		
	0-17	Total	23.0	1.07	3 394		
		0-64	Total	15.6	0.52	16 407	
			M	15.6	0.58	8 290	
	F		15.6	0.57	8 105		
	18-64	Total	13.6	0.46	12 883		
		M	13.4	0.54	6 095		
		F	13.7	0.49	6 949		
	18-24	Total	18.9	1.14	1 928		
		M	16.9	1.45	940		
		F	20.9	1.43	989		
	25-49	Total	13.8	0.55	6 344		
		M	13.5	0.65	3 154		
		F	14.1	0.63	3 231		
	50-64	Total	11.0	0.61	4 324		
		M	11.6	0.80	1 998		
		F	10.5	0.63	2 365		
	65+	Total	4.5	0.46	2 616		
		M	3.5	0.59	931		
		F	5.0	0.54	1 760		
	3 Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity	Total	Total	6.1	0.37	6 224	
			M	6.7	0.48	3 165	
F			5.4	0.44	3 420		
(a) At work		Total	Total	16.4	0.56	7 203	
		M	17.2	0.85	2 668		
		F	15.9	0.61	4 357		
(d) Not at work		Total	Total	46.6	2.00	1 095	
		M	47.9	2.48	521		
		F	45.0	2.64	551		
(e1) Of which: Unemployed		Total	Total	4.2	0.36	3 636	
		M	3.6	0.51	1 298		
		F	4.7	0.43	2 409		
(e2) Of which: Retired		Total	Total	22.0	1.19	1 959	
		M	20.1	1.68	932		
		F	23.1	1.51	1 099		
4 Risk-of-poverty rate by household type		All hh no dep. childr.	Total	8.2	0.44	8 322	
			1 person hh	M	23.6	2.03	581
				F	12.2	0.90	1 757
	1 person hh <65yrs		22.0	1.41	1 321		
	1 person hh 65+		8.7	0.96	903		
	2 adults no dep. childr. (both < 65)		10.5	0.98	2 519		
		(at least one 65+)		3.0	0.65	1 592	
	2 adults no dep. childr. Other hh no dep. childr.		5.1	0.85	2 356		
	All hh with dep. childr.		18.8	0.79	9 592		
	Single parent (at least 1 child)		29.9	2.92	943		
	2 adults 1 dep. child		11.8	1.23	2 355		
	2 adults 2 dep. childr.		14.5	1.52	2 458		
	2 adults 3+ dep. childr.		33.0	2.91	2 644		
	Other hh with dep. childr.		17.8	1.81	1 344		
	Risk-of-poverty rate by accomodation						
5 tenurestatus	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	13.1	0.55	13 529		
		(b) Tenant	Total	25.7	1.08	599	

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2011 Hungary
Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2011 –continued

			2011	Standard error	Effective sample size		
6 Risk-of-poverty rate by work intensity of the household	All hh no dep. childr.	WI = 0	16.3	1.38	1 405		
		0 < WI < 1	9.7	1.08	2 372		
		WI = 1	2.2	0.49	2 532		
	All hh with dep. childr.	WI = 0	61.8	4.33	705		
		0 < WI < 0.5	55.5	4.15	831		
		0.5 <= WI < 1	12.6	1.67	2 592		
		WI = 1	3.4	0.69	5 584		
7 Risk-of-poverty rate before and after transfers by age and gender (a) before all transfers	Total	Total	51.8	0.44	23 040		
		M	49.5	0.56	9 362		
		F	53.9	0.48	11 858		
	0-17	Total	Total	52.5	1.14	3 639	
		18-64	Total	42.7	0.52	14 354	
		M	41.0	0.63	6 389		
		F	44.3	0.56	8 117		
	65+	Total	Total	89.4	0.66	3 233	
			M	91.0	0.91	1 221	
			F	88.5	0.76	2 078	
	(b) including pensions	Total	Total	28.9	0.44	22 624	
			M	29.5	0.56	8 356	
			F	28.4	0.48	12 150	
		0-17	Total	Total	47.5	1.14	3 857
			18-64	Total	28.5	0.52	12 618
			M	28.2	0.63	5 554	
			F	28.8	0.56	7 361	
		65+	Total	Total	9.1	0.66	2 683
			M	6.3	0.91	715	
			F	10.8	0.76	2 074	
13 Relative median risk-of-poverty gap by age and gender		Total	Total	18.3	0.99	15 125	
			M	18.5	1.13	6 801	
		F	18.0	0.99	9 221		
	0-17	Total	Total	18.8	1.38	2 957	
		18-64	Total	18.6	1.04	10 676	
		M	19.3	1.17	5 493		
		F	17.9	1.05	6 091		
	65+	Total	Total	10.8	1.73	2 144	
			M	9.4	2.05	585	
			F	11.9	2.03	1 731	
14 S80/S20 quintile share ratio			3.9	0.05	9 628		
15 Gini coefficient			0.268	0.0027	10 436		

2. Accuracy

2.1. Sample design

2.1.1. Type of sampling

2011 was the seventh year for the Hungarian EU-SILC survey. In 2011 a new rotational group (number10) with 5495 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 8,9 and 10 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 2011 Hungary

Localities were stratified by county and category of size for rotational group 8,9 and 10. 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

13448 households were selected in 2011. 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	13448
Contacted addresses	13151
Can not be located	9
Unable to access	3
Non-residential, unoccupied, not principal residence	285

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 2011 with reference month of March 2011. 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 May.

Table 3. Fieldwork timing and sample development over time- achieved sample

Weeks of interview	Achieved sample size	Distribution of achieved sample
Weeks		
1 March – 6 March	1362	11.7%
7 March – 13 March	2415	20.7%
14 March – 20 March	2287	19.6%
21 March – 27 March	2150	18.4%
28 March – 3 April	1213	10.4%
4 April – 10 April	1093	9.4%
11 April – 17 April	948	8.1%
18 April – 24 April	158	1.4%
25 April – 1 May	45	0.4%
2 May – 8 May	14	0.1%
Total	11685	100.0%

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. The next year in 2011 rotational group 6 with size of 2474 households was dropped and a new rotational group with 5495 households was introduced.

Table 4. Size of rotational groups (selected sample)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
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	2 158
Rotational group8	-	-	-	-	3 837	3 431	3 016
Rotational group9	-	-	-	-	-	3 204	2 779
Rotational group10	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 495
Total sample	13 975	9 767	12 598	11459	12 156	11 500	13 448

2.1.8. Weighting

This chapter describes the computation of weights of EU-SILC sample 2011.

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 methods 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.

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2011 Hungary

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	1 648 547	11 713	11 814	9 066	10 605
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	94671	1 208	1 208	235	977
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	954 946	2 142	2 274	4 907	1 340
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans		0	0	0	0
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	253 155	1 756	1 756	681	1 038
PY100G	Old-age benefit	1 092 977	6 365	6 404	3 875	6 718
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	454 139	388	388	546	247
PY120G	Sickness benefit	105 279	1 132	1 132	338	770
PY130G	Disability benefit	640 050	1 707	1 708	1 545	1 078
PY140G	Education related allowances	175 468	408	408	247	282
HY010	Total household gross income	2 838 808	11 474	11 683	21 593	9 143
HY020	Total disposable household income	2 342 314	11 475	11 684	15 877	8 818
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	2 053 287	11 345	11 553	16 443	8 863
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 606 095	10 122	10 302	18 138	8 689
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	499 136	134	134	76 372	165
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	445 585	3 901	3 901	8 036	2 346
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	140 642	860	860	12 076	381
HY070G	Housing allowances	62 532	932	932	1 778	766
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	224 966	2 125	2 125	6 740	1 691
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	654 357	202	202	95 640	176
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	262 545	2 000	2 000	2 907	1 566
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	69 910	44	44	5 820	35
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	16 919	7 249	7 249	206	4 299
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	147 686	1 817	1 817	5 253	1 551
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	692 255	7 811	7 811	9 023	6 486

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2011 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	1 649 651	3 861 623	3 899 213	6 627
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	95857	381 782	381782	262
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 124 082	832 142	887 696	4 486
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans		0	0	
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	255 702	572 132	572 132	601
PY100G	Old-age benefit	1 092 516	2 229 931	2 242 895	2 500
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	442 630	105 359	105 359	440
PY120G	Sickness benefit	105 422	353 719	353 719	348
PY130G	Disability benefit	635 371	510 165	510 320	1 229
PY140G	Education related allowances	175 779	131 180	131 180	224
<hr/>					
HY010	Total household gross income	2 991 105	3 704 198	3 785 664	17 312
HY020	Total disposable household income	2 451 058	3 704 469	3 785 935	12 591
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	2 166 163	3 669 987	3 751 298	13 046
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 670 185	3 298 532	3 370 218	14 151
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	537 095	47 450	47 450	119 820
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	462 474	1 240 781	1 240 781	5 556
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	131 822	245 425	245 425	9 736
HY070G	Housing allowances	61 828	267 769	267 769	1 655
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	237 623	637 716	637 716	8 394
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	848 406	70 007	70 007	161 485
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	259 759	662 224	662 224	3 201
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	67 540	12 370	12 370	7 431
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	17 559	2 427 588	2 427 588	223
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	149 702	586 992	586 992	5 878
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	740 094	2 585 175	2 585 175	9 065

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	1 270 248	3 213	15 002	2 824
2 household member	1 520 275	7 140	16 455	3 287
3 household member	1 480 724	6 255	19 909	1 589
4 and more household member	1 271 014	12 866	14 839	2 129
<i>Population by age groups</i>				
Under 25	1 237 071	8 540	12 080	6 206
25-34	1 532 628	3 583	19 558	2 766
35-44	1 396 578	4 067	17 635	3 454
45-54	1 425 973	4 335	17 213	3 204
55-64	1 482 012	4 498	17 144	4 241
65+	1 340 666	4 451	13 784	3 564
<i>Population by gender</i>				
Male	1 399 638	13 627	9 262	10 479
Female	1 355 335	15 847	7 728	12 369
<i>Total</i>	1 375 818	29 474	7 185	9 345

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 $\approx 0.7\%$.

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

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, EU-SILC2009 and EU-SILC2010) 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 (Címkártya).
- 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 2011 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 2011 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	13 151	2 109	2 705	2 946	5 391
Achieved sample size	11 685	1 942	2 396	2 593	4 754
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.889	0.921	0.886	0.880	0.882

Table 9. Sample size and rotational groups on personal level

Personal level	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Selected sample size	29 474	4 865	6 055	6 429	12 125
Achieved sample size	24 611	4 132	4 975	5 440	10 064
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.835	0.849	0.822	0.846	0.830

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

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

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

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

$$Rh = \frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]} = \mathbf{0.8885}$$

$$NRh = (1 - (0.9991 * 0.8885)) * 100 = \mathbf{11.23 \%}$$

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2011 Hungary
Household non-response rates (NRh) – for the new replication

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

$$Ra=\frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}}=\frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]}= \mathbf{1.0000}$$

$$Rh=\frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}}=\frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]}= \mathbf{0.8818}$$

$$NRh=(1-(0.9991*0.8885))*100= \mathbf{11.82 \%}$$

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

$$NRp=(1-(Rp))*100 = \mathbf{0.0974}$$

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

$$\frac{\Sigma[RB250=11]}{\Sigma[RB245=1]} = \mathbf{0.9990}$$

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

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

$$NRp=(1-(1.0000*0.8818*0.9990))*100= \mathbf{11.90 \%}$$

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*

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

$$NRp=(1-(1.0000*0.8818*0.9988))*100=\mathbf{11.82 \%}$$

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)	13 151	2 109	2 705	2 946	5 391
Address can not be located (21)	9	1	5	3	0
Address unable to access (22)	3	0	0	3	0
Address does not exist or etc (23)	285	48	69	64	104
Total	13 448	2 158	2 779	3 016	5 495

Table 11. Distribution of DB130

DB130- Household questionnaire result	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Household questionnaire completed (11)	11 697	1 942	2 396	2 593	4 766
Refusal to co-operate (21)	1 044	103	242	250	449
Entire household temporarily away (22)	342	54	59	89	140
Household unable to respond (23)	45	9	7	8	21
Other reason(24)	23	1	1	6	15
Total	13 151	2 109	2 705	2 946	5 391

Table 12. Distribution of DB135

DB135- Household interview acceptance	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Interview accepted for database (1)	11 685	1 942	2 396	2 593	4 754
Interview rejected (2)	12	0	0	0	12
Total	11 697	1 942	2 396	2 593	4 766

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	11474	98.2	11265	98.2	209	1.8		
HY020	Total disposable household income	11475	98.6	11319	98.6	156	1.4		
	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	11345	97.6	11203	97.6	142	1.2		
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	10122	87.1	10005	87.0	117	1.0		
HY023									
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	134	1.1	134	1.1	0	0.0		
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	3901	33.4	3901	33.4	0	0.0		
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	860	7.4	860	7.4	0	0.0		
HY070G	Housing allowances	932	8.0	932	8.0	0	0.0		
	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	2125	18.2	2125	18.2	0	0.0		
HY080G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	202	1.7	202	1.7	0	0.0		
HY090G									
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	2000	17.1	2000	17.1	0	0.0		
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	44	.4	44	0.4	0	0.0		
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	7249	62.0	7249	62.0	0	0.0		
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	1817	15.5	1817	15.5	0	0.0		
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	7811	66.8	7811	66.8	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	11713	47.7	11626	99.3	87	0.7		
PY020G Non-cash employee income	1208	4.9	1208	100.0	0	0.0		
PY050G Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	2142	8.7	2115	98.7	27	1.3		
PY080G Pension from individual private plans	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
PY090G Unemployment benefit	1756	7.1	1756	100.0	0	0.0		
PY100G Old-age benefit	6365	25.9	6326	99.4	39	0.6		
PY110G Survivor's benefit	388	1.6	388	100.0	0	0.0		
PY120G Sickness benefit	1132	4.6	1132	100.0	0	0.0		
PY130G Disability benefit	1707	6.9	1706	99.9	1	0.1		
PY140G Education related allowances	408	1.7	408	100.0	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)	24 611	4 132	4 975	5 440	10 064
From register...no reason (12-33)	24	10	5	9	0
Total	24 635	4 142	4 980	5 449	10 064

Table 16. Distribution of RB260

RB260- Contact address	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
PAPI (1)	20 456	3 461	4 150	4 552	8 293
CAPI, CATI, Other(2,3,4)					
Proxy(5)	4 155	671	825	888	1 771
Total	24 611	4 132	4 975	5 440	10 064

Table 17. Interview duration in minutes

Interview	Mean	By household size	Mean
Household interview	16	HH with 1 member	29
Personal interview	12	HH with 2 members	40
Total (at household level)	42	HH with 3 members	48
		HH with 4 members	54
		HH with 5+ members	58
		Total	42

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 991 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)	4795	1.734	.083
Market price of the dwelling	1478	45.311	.000
Complex indicator of settlement facilities	3603	11.646	.000
Dwelling size	134	-9.113	.000
Settlement type	-3391	-9.240	.000
Degree of urbanisation	-3865	7.297	.000
Cost of housing maintenance	.120	6.471	.000
More than 1 bathrooms	5607	5.557	.000
Number of rooms	1601	-5.933	.000
District heating	-4171	-4.745	.000
Detached house	-3061	-2.781	.000
Wet walls /dump floors	-1891	-9.113	.005

Selection mechanism: stepwise

R square: 0.575

Table 19. Number of imputed records

Household with estimated imputed rent	10311
Households with self assessed value as imputed rent	991
Household with actual market rental	383
Total	11685

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 2011.

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 2011.
- viii. Total duration of data collection of the sample*
The data collection lasted 10 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 109 200 HUF (about 383 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 100 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 (thousand)						
Working	2037.5	1731.5	3769.0	1987.5	1742.1	3729.5
Unemployed	372.0	305.6	677.7	379.9	296.4	676.3
Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience	373.6	374.0	747.6	381.7	389.3	771.0
In retirement or in early retirement or permanently disabled	796.4	1094.7	1891.1	1065.3	1593.6	2658.9
Fulfilling domestic tasks and care responsibilities	14.5	386.4	400.9	10.5	248.8	259.3
Other inactive person	36.6	45.6	82.2	34.6	152.5	187.1
Total	3630.6	3937.8	7568.4	3859.5	4422.6	8282.1
Distribution (%)						
Working	56.1	44.0	49.8	51.5	39.4	45.0
Unemployed	10.2	7.8	9.0	9.8	6.7	8.2
Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience	10.3	9.5	9.9	9.9	8.8	9.3
In retirement or in early retirement or permanently disabled	21.9	27.8	25.0	27.6	36.0	32.1
Fulfilling domestic tasks and care responsibilities	0.4	9.8	5.3	0.3	5.6	3.1
Other inactive person	1.0	1.2	1.1	0.9	3.4	2.3
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://www.ksh.hu/apps/shop.kiadvany?p_kiadvany_id=12659&p_temakor_kod=KSH&p_session_id=983976481951451&p_lang=HU

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2011 Hungary

Table 21. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 (weighted)

weighted		2008		2009		2010		2011	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1489 381	13 517	1621374	7862	1607120	12149	1649651	6 627
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	76 487	225	74810	196	71205	199	95857	262
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	942 774	12 658	1074571	4951	1094533	4742	1124082	4 486
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	444 017	255	569888	396	366526	156	---	---
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	263 042	915	267210	692	271736	823	255702	601
PY100G	Old-age benefit	949 236	21 543	1048213	2482	1042794	5245	1092516	2 500
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	410 948	579	482880	540	457066	628	442630	440
PY120G	Sickness benefit	103 112	519	111630	433	103057	400	105422	348
PY130G	Disability benefit	588 141	2 267	677155	1655	626640	1651	635371	1 229
PY140G	Education related allowances	152 376	233	162289	193	177380	321	175779	224

Table 21. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 (weighted)- continued -

		2008		2009		2010		2011	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error
<i>Income components on household level</i>									
HY010	Total household gross income	2 697 270	41 069	2944966	20246	2912549	21574	2991105	17312
HY020	Total disposable household income	2 101 591	23 423	2275418	12487	2260719	12831	2451058	12 591
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 810 434	16 776	1985007	12943	1975663	13137	2166163	13 046
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 440 865	34 012	1521096	14391	1496257	14132	1670185	14151
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	599 283	122 817	563642	83555	389627	61439	537095	119820
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	388 899	7 460	417322	4556	421251	4340	462474	5556
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	105 051	10 562	126209	10041	124329	7864	131822	9736
HY070G	Housing allowances	50 098	1 980	50041	1677	58109	2818	61828	1655
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	161 739	10 332	189354	7224	215888	8122	237623	8 394
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	1 238 220	308 293	1208454	228152	811389	152898	848406	161485
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	188 086	3 560	217108	3496	209488	3075	259759	3201
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	72 508	14 864	147857	43615	171124	88543	67540	7431
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14 583	223	15335	224	15469	209	17559	223
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	118 197	12 587	134562	6005	144042	5906	149702	5878
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	851 769	17 561	929010	14008	902689	14687	740094	9065

Table 22. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2008, 2009, 2010, 2011

			2008	2009	2010	2011
At-Risk of poverty threshold (illustrative values)						
	1 person hh	\$NAT	663367	715187	713291	749550
		EUR	2639	2844	2544	2721
		PPS	3993	4175	4164	4190
	2 adults 2 dep. children	\$NAT	1393070	1501892	1497911	1574055
		EUR	5542	5972	5343	5714
		PPS	8385	8767	8743	8799
At-Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender						
	Total	Total	12	12	12	14
		M	12	13	13	14
		F	12	12	12	14
	0-17	Total	20	21	20	23
	0-64	Total	14	14	17	16
		M	14	14	16	16
		F	14	14	19	16
	18-64	Total	12	12	13	14
		M	12	12	12	13
		F	12	12	13	14
	18-24	Total	18	18	17	19
		M	16	17	15	17
		F	20	19	20	21
	25-49	Total	12	13	12	14
		M	12	12	13	14
		F	13	14	12	14
	50-64	Total	9	8	9	11
		M	9	9	9	12
		F	8	7	8	11
	65+	Total	4	5	4	5
		M	3	3	3	4
		F	5	5	5	5
At-Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity						
	Total	Total	5	6	5	6
		M	8	7	6	7
		F	4	5	5	5
	(a) At work					
	(d) Not at work	Total	15	14	15	16
		M	15	14	15	17
		F	15	14	14	16
	(e1) Of which: Unemployed	Total	48	47	45	47
		M	49	49	46	48
		F	48	45	44	45
	(e2) Of which: Retired	Total	7	4	4	4
		M	7	3	3	4
		F	7	5	5	5
	(f) Of which: Other inactive	Total	24	19	20	22
		M	20	17	17	20
		F	25	20	20	23

Table 22. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2008,2009,2010,2011-cont.-

			2008	2009	2010	2011	
Risk-of-poverty rate by household type	All hh no dep. childr.		8	7	7	8	
	1 person hh	M	23	20	18	24	
	1 person hh	F	12	11	8	12	
	1 person hh <65yrs		22	19	19	22	
	1 person hh 65+		8	9	10	9	
	(both < 2 adults no dep. childr. 65)		9	8	9	11	
	(at least 2 adults no dep. childr. one 65+)		3	3	2	3	
	Other hh no dep. childr.		5	4	5	5	
	All hh with dep. childr.		16	17	17	19	
	(at least Single parent 1 child)		33	26	28	30	
	2 adults 1 dep. child		11	10	11	12	
	2 adults 2 dep. childr.		16	16	15	15	
	2 adults 3+ dep. childr.		29	31	28	33	
	Other hh with dep. childr.		11	14	16	18	
	At-Risk-of-poverty rate by accommodation tenure status						
6	(a) Owner or rent-free		Total	12	12	13	13
	(b) Tenant		Total	25	25	19	26
7	Risk-of-poverty rate by work intensity of the household						
	All hh no dep. childr.		WI = 0	15	11	13	16
			0 < WI < 1	7	9	9	10
			WI = 1	2	2	1	2
	All hh with dep. childr.		WI = 0	56	60	62	62
			0 < WI < 0.5	34	45	43	56
			0.5 <= WI < 1	13	15	12	13
			WI = 1	4	4	3	3

Table 22. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2008,2009,2010,2011-cont.-

			2008	2009	2010	2011	
Risk-of-poverty							
9	rate	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	52	51	51	52
	before and after transfers		<i>M</i>	47	50	49	50
	by age and gender		<i>F</i>	54	54	54	54
	(a) before all transfers						
		0-17	<i>Total</i>	52	51	52	53
		18-64	<i>Total</i>	44	43	43	43
			<i>M</i>	42	41	41	41
			<i>F</i>	46	45	44	44
		65+	<i>Total</i>	89	88	88	89
			<i>M</i>	91	90	90	91
			<i>F</i>	88	87	87	89
	(b) including pensions						
		<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	30	29	28	29
			<i>M</i>	31	29	29	30
			<i>F</i>	30	28	28	28
		0-17	<i>Total</i>	47	46	47	48
		18-64	<i>Total</i>	30	28	28	29
			<i>M</i>	30	28	28	28
			<i>F</i>	30	28	28	29
		65+	<i>Total</i>	10	9	9	9
			<i>M</i>	7	7	6	6
			<i>F</i>	11	11	7	11
13	Relative median risk-of-poverty gap	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	17	16	17	18
	by age and gender		<i>M</i>	18	16	17	19
			<i>F</i>	17	16	16	18
		0-17	<i>Total</i>	17	17	17	19
		18-64	<i>Total</i>	18	17	17	19
			<i>M</i>	18	17	17	19
			<i>F</i>	18	17	16	18
		65+	<i>Total</i>	10	13	11	11
			<i>M</i>	10	16	11	9
			<i>F</i>	10	12	11	12
14	S80/S20 quintile share ratio			3.6	3.5	3.4	3.9
15	Gini coefficient			0.252	0.247	0.241	0.268