



EU-SILC 2011 Operation

Intermediate quality report

Czech Republic



July 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Common cross-sectional European Union indicators	4
1.1 Common cross-sectional European Union indicators based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC	4
1.2 Other Indicators	16
2. Accuracy	18
2.1 Sampling design	18
2.1.1 Type of sampling	18
2.1.2 Sampling units	18
2.1.3 Stratification criteria	19
2.1.4 Sample size and allocation criteria	19
2.1.5 Sample selection schemes.....	19
2.1.6 Sample distribution over time	19
2.1.7 Renewal of the sample: Rotational groups	19
2.1.8 Weightings	19
2.1.9 Substitutions	20
2.2 Sampling errors and effective sample size.....	20
2.3 Non-sampling errors	21
2.3.1 Sampling frame and coverage errors.....	21
2.3.2 Measurement and processing errors.....	21
2.3.3 Non-response errors.....	24
2.4 Mode of data collection.....	32
2.5 Interview duration	33
3. Comparability.....	34
3.1 Basic concepts and definitions	34
3.2 Components of income.....	34
3.2.1 Differences between the national definitions and standard EU-SILC definitions.....	34
3.2.2 The source or procedure used for collection of income variables.....	34
3.2.3 The form in which income variables at component level have been obtained.....	34
3.2.4 The method used for obtaining the income target variables in required form.....	35
4. Coherence	37
4.1 Comparison of income target variables and number of persons with external sources	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table 1 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by gender and selected age groups.....	4
Table 2 At-risk-of-poverty threshold, illustrative values	4
Table 3 Relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, by age and gender	5
Table 4 Proportion of population lacking at least three/four items in the “economic strain and durables” dimension of the material deprivation items	6
Table 5 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by age and gender	7
Table 6 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by household type	7
Table 7 People living in households with very low work intensity, by age and gender.....	8
Table 8 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by most frequent activity status and by gender.....	8
Table 9 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by accommodation tenure status, gender and selected age groups	9
Table 10 Dispersion around the at-risk-of-poverty threshold, by gender and selected age group ...	10
Table 11 Intensity of material deprivation (mean number of deprived items), by gender.....	11
Table 12 Housing cost overburden rate, by age	11
Table 13 Housing cost overburden rate, by age and gender.....	11
Table 14 Housing cost overburden rate, by tenure status	11
Table 15 Housing cost overburden rate, by degree of urbanisation	11
Table 16 Housing cost overburden rate, by household type	13
Table 17 Overcrowding rate - total population, by age	13
Table 18 Overcrowding rate - total population, by age and gender.....	13
Table 19 Overcrowding rate - total population, by tenure status	13
Table 20 Overcrowding rate - total population, by degree of urbanisation	13
Table 21 Overcrowding rate - total population, by household type.....	2
Table 22 At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time (2005), by age and gender ...	15
Table 23 At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers, by gender and selected age groups (except pensions)	15
Table 24 In-work at-risk-of-poverty rates	15
Table 25 Housing deprivation by item, by age.....	16
Table 26 Housing deprivation by item, by age and gender	16
Table 27 Median of the housing cost burden distribution, by age and gender	16
Table 28 Number of observations, value, standard errors for income components and Kish factor	20
Table 29 Response by interviewers’ characteristics (%)	23
Table 30 Sample size – households	24
Table 31 Regional disparities in response	25
Table 32 1 st wave: Distribution of households by ‘record of contact at address’	27
Table 33 1 st wave: Distribution of address contacted by ‘household questionnaire result’	27
Table 34 2 nd wave: Distribution of households by ‘record of contact at address’	28
Table 35 2 nd wave: Distribution of address contacted by ‘household questionnaire result’	28
Table 36 3 rd wave: Distribution of households by ‘record of contact at address’	28
Table 37 3 rd wave: Distribution of address contacted by ‘household questionnaire result’	29
Table 38 4 th wave: Distribution of households by ‘record of contact at address’	29
Table 39 4 th wave: Distribution of address contacted by ‘household questionnaire result’	29
Table 40 Total sample: Distribution of households by ‘record of contact at address’	30
Table 41 Total sample: Distribution of address contacted by ‘household questionnaire result’	30
Table 42 Overview of the non-response for the income variables: % households having received an amount, % of households with missing values and % of households with partial information .	31
Table 43 Distribution of household members by type of interview (RB260)	33
Table 44 Average interview durations in minutes (2006 to 2011).....	33
Table 45 Average interview durations in minutes by type of interview	33
Table 46 Overview of the collection of income data (net/gross values)	35
Table 47 Social income – comparison with administrative sources (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs) – in million CZK	37
Table 48 Income – comparison with national accounts – in million CZK.....	37

1. Common cross-sectional European Union indicators

1.1 Common cross-sectional European Union indicators based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC

Primary Laeken indicators of social cohesion

At-risk-of-poverty rate, by gender and selected age groups

The percentage of persons in the total population and in the relevant age and gender breakdowns, over the total population or over the relevant age or gender subset, with an equivalised disposable income below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold.

Table 1 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by gender and selected age groups

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	9.8
	men	8.9
	women	10.6
0_17 years	total	15.2
18_64 years	total	9.1
	men	8.3
	women	9.8
65+ years	total	6.6
	men	2.0
	women	10.1

At-risk-of-poverty threshold, illustrative values

The at-risk-of-poverty threshold is set at 60% of the national median equivalised disposable income. The value of the at-risk-of-poverty threshold shall be expressed in PPS (purchasing power standards), Euro and national currency (CZK) for two illustrative household types (single person and household with 2 adults with 2 children under 14 years).

Table 2 At-risk-of-poverty threshold, illustrative values

Household type	Currency	Rounded value
Single person	EUR	4 471
	NAT	113 040
	PPS	5 944
Two adults with two children under 14 years	EUR	9 389
	NAT	237 384
	PPS	12 482

Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap

This indicator is the difference for each age group and gender between the at-risk-of-poverty threshold for the total population and the median equivalised disposable income of persons (in the relevant breakdown) below the same at-risk-of-poverty threshold, expressed as a percentage of the at-risk-of-poverty threshold.

Table 3 Relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, by age and gender

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	17.2
	men	19.1
	women	16.5
0_17 years	total	17.7
18_64 years	total	19.4
	men	19.9
	women	19.0
65+ years	total	8.1
	men	11.9
	women	7.7

Material deprivation rate

This indicator is defined as the percentage of population with an enforced lack of at least three/four out of nine material deprivation items in the 'economic strain and durables' dimension.

The nine items considered are

- 1) arrears on mortgage or rent payments, utility bills, hire purchase instalments or other loan payments,
- 2) capacity to afford paying for one week's annual holiday away from home,
- 3) capacity to afford a meal with meat, chicken, fish (or vegetarian equivalent) every second day,
- 4) capacity to face unexpected financial expenses 9 100 CZK,
- 5) household cannot afford a telephone/mobile phone,
- 6) household cannot afford a colour TV,
- 7) household cannot afford a washing machine,
- 8) household cannot afford a car,
- 9) ability of the household to pay for keeping its home adequately warm.

Table 4 Proportion of population lacking at least three/four items in the “economic strain and durables” dimension of the material deprivation items

Age	Gender	At-risk-of-poverty	Tree items Rounded value	Four items Rounded value
Total	total	total	16.1	6.1
		yes	47.6	24.2
		no	12.7	4.2
	men	total	14.7	5.6
		yes	46.8	24.6
		no	11.6	3.8
	women	total	17.4	6.7
		yes	48.3	23.8
		no	13.7	4.6
0_17 years	total	total	19.3	8.0
		yes	52.2	27.1
		no	13.4	4.5
18_64 years	total	total	15.4	5.8
		yes	46.3	23.4
		no	12.3	4.1
	men	total	14.4	5.4
		yes	43.9	24.0
		no	11.7	3.7
	women	total	16.4	6.2
		yes	48.3	22.8
		no	12.9	4.4
65+ years	total	total	15.4	5.4
		yes	42.9	21.2
		no	13.5	4.3
	men	total	10.7	3.3
		yes	32.4	22.6
		no	10.2	2.9
	women	total	19.0	7.0
		yes	44.4	21.0
		no	16.1	5.4

At-risk-of-poverty rate, by age and gender

The percentage of persons in the total population and in the relevant age and gender breakdowns, over the total population or over the relevant age or gender subset, with an equivalised disposable income below the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold'.

Table 5 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by age and gender

Age	Sex	Rounded value
Total	total	9.8
	men	8.9
	women	10.6
0_17 years	total	15.2
18_24 years	total	12.7
	men	13.3
	women	12.0
25_49 years	total	9.1
	men	7.5
	women	10.8
50_64 years	total	7.4
	men	7.5
	women	7.3
65+ years	total	6.6
	men	2.0
	women	10.1

At-risk-of-poverty rate, by household type

The 'at-risk-of-poverty rate (after social transfers) broken down by household type is calculated as the percentage of persons in each breakdown with an equivalised disposable income below the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold'.

Table 6 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by household type

Household type		Rounded value
Total		9.8
Households without dependent children		
Total		7.1
One adult	younger than 64 years	19.0
	older than 65 years	17.2
Single	female	21.2
	male	13.7
Two adults	at least one aged 65 years and over	2.7
	younger than 65 years	7.3
Three or more adults		3.1
Households with dependent children		
Total		12.4
Single parent with dependent children		35.6
Two adults with	one dependent child	6.8
	two dependent children	9.3
	three or more dependent children	23.9
Three or more adults with dependent children		9.5

People living in households with very low work intensity by age and gender (population aged 0 to 59 years)

People living in households with very low work intensity are people aged 0-59 living in households where the adults work less than 20% of their total work potential during the past year.

Table 7 People living in households with very low work intensity, by age and gender

Age	Sex	Rounded value
18_64 years	total	6.4
	men	5.2
	women	7.7
0_17 years	total	6.9
0_60 years	total	6.6
	men	5.8
	women	7.4

At-risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity status and, by gender

The 'at-risk-of-poverty rate' (after social transfers) broken down by most frequent activity status during the income reference period as well as gender is calculated as the percentage of persons in each breakdown (over the total population in the same breakdown) with an equivalised disposable income below the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold'.

Table 8 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by most frequent activity status and by gender

Activity	Sex	Rounded value
Employment	total	4.0
	men	4.1
	women	4.0
Non employment	total	13.8
	men	12.5
	women	14.7
Unemployment	total	46.4
	men	45.3
	women	47.4
Retired	total	6.7
	men	2.4
	women	9.3
Other inactive	total	14.0
	men	15.3
	women	13.3

At-risk-of-poverty rate by accommodation tenure status and by gender and selected age groups

The 'at-risk-of-poverty rate (after social transfers) broken down by accommodation tenure status and by gender and selected age groups is calculated as the percentage of persons in each modified accommodation tenure status and in the relevant age and gender breakdown (over the total population in the same accommodation tenure status and in the same age and gender breakdown) with an equivalised disposable income below the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold'.

Table 9 At-risk-of-poverty rate, by accommodation tenure status, gender and selected age groups

Age	Tenure status	Sex	Rounded value
Total	owner or rent free	total	8.0
		men	7.2
		women	8.8
	rent	total	18.3
		men	17.3
		women	19.3
0_17 years	owner or rent free	total	11.6
	rent	total	29.6
18_64 years	owner or rent free	total	7.6
		men	7.1
		women	8.0
	rent	total	16.2
		men	14.3
		women	18.0
65+ years	owner or rent free	total	6.1
		men	1.9
		women	9.3
	rent	total	10.3
		men	2.8
		women	14.8

Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold

This indicator is defined as the percentage of persons, over the total population, with an equivalised disposable income below 40 %, 50 % and 70 % of the national disposable income.

Table 10 Dispersion around the at-risk-of-poverty threshold, by gender and selected age group

% of the national median income	Age	Sex	Rounded value
40%	Total	total	2.8
		men	2.7
		women	2.9
	0_17 years	total	4.6
	18_64 year	total	2.9
		men	2.7
		women	3.1
	65+ year	total	0.3
		men	0.1
		women	0.5
50%	Total	total	5.1
		men	4.9
		women	5.3
	0_17 year	total	8.3
	18_64 year	total	5.1
		men	4.8
		women	5.3
	65+ year	total	1.7
		men	0.6
		women	2.5
70%	Total	total	16.6
		men	14.6
		women	18.5
	0_17 year	total	23.1
	18_64 year	total	14.7
		men	13.5
		women	15.9
	65+ year	total	17.1
		men	7.1
		women	24.6

Intensity of material deprivation by gender and at-risk-of-poverty status

This indicator is defined as the mean number of items lacked by persons considered as deprived in the 'economic strain and durables' dimension.

Table 11 Intensity of material deprivation (mean number of deprived items), by gender

Age	Gender	At-risk-of-poverty	Rounded value 3 items	Rounded value 4 items
Total	total	total	3.6	4.5
		yes	3.9	4.8
		no	3.5	4.4
	men	total	3.6	4.6
		yes	4.0	4.9
		no	3.4	4.4
	women	total	3.6	4.5
		yes	3.9	4.8
		no	3.5	4.4

Housing cost overburden rate

This indicator is defined as the percentage of the population living in a household where the total housing costs (net of housing allowances) represent more than 40% of the total disposable household income (net of housing allowances).

Table 12 Housing cost overburden rate, by age

Age	At-risk-of-poverty	Rounded value
Total	total	9.5
	yes	42.3
	no	5.9
0_17 years	total	8.8
	yes	35.8
	no	3.9
18_64 years	total	8.8
	yes	44.9
	no	5.2
65+ years	total	13.2
	yes	44.4
	no	11.0

Table 13 Housing cost overburden rate, by age and gender

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	9.5
	men	7.9
	women	11.1
0_17 years	total	8.8
18_64 years	total	8.8
	men	7.6
	women	10.0
65+ years	total	13.2
	men	8.4
	women	16.7

Table 14 Housing cost overburden rate, by tenure status

Tenure status	Rounded value
Outright owner	5.3
Owner with mortgage	6.4
Tenant – market price	18.7
Tenant – reduced price or free	25.0

Table 15 Housing cost overburden rate, by degree of urbanisation

Degree of urbanisation	Rounded value
Densely populated area	12.9
Intermediate area	7.5
Thinly populated area	7.7

Table 16 Housing cost overburden rate, by household type

Household type			Rounded value
No dependent children	Total		11.4
	1 person household	total	29.8
		man	22.0
		women	35.0
		0_64 years	29.6
		65+ years	30.1
	2 person household	both age 0_64 years	10.7
		at least one age 65+	7.5
With dependent children	2 or more adults		7.0
	Total		7.6
	Single parent		28.5
	2 adults	1 dependent child	5.8
		2 dependent child	5.8
		3 or more dependent children	4.4
	2 or more adults		5.8

Overcrowding rate

The indicator is defined as the percentage of the population living in an overcrowded household. A person is considered as living in an overcrowded household if the household does not have at its disposal a minimum of rooms equal to: 1 room for the household; 1 room for each couple; 1 room for each single person aged 18+; 1 room for two single people of the same sex between 12 and 17 years of age; 1 room for each single person of different sex between 12 and 17 years of age; 1 room for two people under 12 years of age.

Table 17 Overcrowding rate - total population, by age

Age	At-risk-of-poverty	Rounded value
Total	total	21.1
	yes	41.0
	no	18.9
0_17 years	total	32.6
	yes	54.3
	no	28.7
18_64 years	total	20.9
	yes	37.6
	no	19.3
65+ years	total	8.2
	yes	25.8
	no	6.9

Table 18 Overcrowding rate - total population, by age and gender

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	21.1
	men	20.9
	women	21.2
0_17 years	total	32.6
18_64 years	total	20.9
	men	20.5
	women	21.4
65+ years	total	8.2
	men	5.7
	women	10.0

Table 19 Overcrowding rate - total population, by tenure status

Tenure status	Rounded value
Outright owner	14.7
Owner with mortgage	16.9
Tenant – market price	35.6
Tenant – reduced price or free	42.2

Table 20 Overcrowding rate - total population, by degree of urbanisation

Degree of urbanisation	Rounded value
Densely populated area	25.7
Intermediate area	19.5
Thinly populated area	17.9

Table 21 Overcrowding rate - total population, by household type

Household type			Rounded value
No dependent children	Total		11.0
	1 person household	total	13.7
		man	16.4
		women	12.0
		0_64 years	15.7
		65+ years	11.4
	2 person household	both age 0_64 years	7.1
		at least one age 65+	5.2
	2 or more adults		10.4
With dependent children	Total		30.8
	Single parent		47.1
	2 adults	1 dependent child	21.7
		2 dependent child	22.8
		3 or more dependent children	51.6
	2 or more adults		29.3

Context indicators**Inequality of income distribution S80/S20 income quintile share ratio**

S80/S20 income quintile share ratio: Ratio of total income received by the 20% of the country's population with the highest income (top quintile) to that received by the 20% of the country's population with the lowest income (lowest quintile).

Rounded value	3.5
---------------	-----

Inequality of income distribution: Gini coefficient

The relationship of cumulative shares of the population arranged according to the level of income, to the cumulative share of the total income received by them.

Rounded value	25.2
---------------	------

At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time (2005), by gender and selected age groups

For a given year 'T', this indicator is defined as the percentage of the population whose equivalised total disposable income in that given year is below the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold' calculated in the standard way for the reference year or base year, currently 2005, and then adjusted for inflation.

The population consists of all the persons that have been living in private households for the current year T for the calculation of this indicator. For the calculation of the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold' in the base year (2005) the population consists of the persons that lived in private households during the base year.

Table 22 At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time (2005), by age and gender

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	5.0
	men	4.9
	women	5.2
0_17 years	total	8.1
18_64 years	total	5.0
	men	4.7
	women	5.2
65+ years	total	1.7
	men	0.6
	women	2.5

At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers, by gender and selected age groups

The 'at-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers' shows the percentage of persons (over the total population) having an equivalised disposable income before social transfers excluding old-age benefits below the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold'.

Table 23 At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers, by gender and selected age groups (except pensions)

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	18.0
	men	17.0
	women	18.9
0_17 years	total	27.0
18_64 years	total	17.4
	men	16.5
	women	18.3
65+ years	total	9.9
	men	4.3
	women	14.0

In-work at-risk-of-poverty rate

The 'at-risk-of-poverty rate' broken down by most frequent activity status during the income reference period and gender is calculated as the percentage of persons in each breakdown (over the population in the same breakdown) with an equivalised disposable income below the 'at-risk-of-poverty threshold' for the whole population.

Table 24 In-work at-risk-of-poverty rates

Activity		Rounded value
In-work	Full-time	3.8
	Part-time	8.9

Housing deprivation rate by item

The indicator is defined as the percentage of the population deprived of each available housing deprivation items (leaking roof, bath/shower, toilet, darkness, bath/shower and toilet).

Table 25 Housing deprivation by item, by age

Age	At-risk-of-poverty	Rounded value
Total	total	4.8
	yes	12.5
	no	4.0
0_17 years	total	8.3
	yes	19.4
	no	6.4
18_64 years	total	4.6
	yes	10.7
	no	4.0
65+ years	total	1.6
	yes	4.5
	no	1.4

Table 26 Housing deprivation by item, by age and gender

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	4.8
	men	4.8
	women	4.9
0_17 years	total	8.3
18_64 years	total	4.6
	men	4.3
	women	4.9
65+ years	total	1.6
	men	0.9
	women	2.1

People at-risk-of-poverty or social exclusion (Europe 2020 strategy)

Population at risk of poverty or social exclusion, by age and gender

This indicator corresponds to the sum of persons who are: at risk of poverty or severely materially deprived or living in households with very low work intensity. Persons are only counted once even if they are present in several sub-indicators. At risk-of-poverty are persons with an equivalised disposable income below the risk-of-poverty threshold, which is set at 60 % of the national median equivalised disposable income (after social transfers). Material deprivation covers indicators relating to economic strain and durables. People living in households with very low work intensity are those aged 0-59 living in households where the adults (aged 18-59) work less than 20% of their total work potential during the past year.

Table 27 Median of the housing cost burden distribution, by age and gender

Age	Gender	Rounded value
Total	total	15.3
	men	13.7
	women	16.9
0_17 years	total	20.0
18_64 years	total	15.1
	men	13.4
	women	16.8
65+ years	total	10.7
	men	4.9
	women	14.9

1.2 Other Indicators

Equivalised disposable income

The average of the equivalised disposable income of each person.

Mean equalised disposable income (HY020 equalised)	213 403.3
--	-----------

The gender pay gap

The gender pay gap is not calculated from EU-SILC.

2. Accuracy

2.1 Sampling design

2.1.1 Type of sampling

The survey was carried out on the whole territory of the Czech Republic. The sample size of newly selected dwelling (first wave in 2011) was 4 000 dwellings. Dwellings were selected using stratified two-stage sampling design. At the first sampling stage small geographical areas (CEUs – Census Enumeration Units) were selected by probability sampling. In the second stage selection a sample of 10 dwellings was drawn from each CEU.

2.1.2 Sampling units

Census Enumeration Districts (CEUs) constitute the first-stage sampling units. CEUs are small geographical areas covering the whole territory of the country. They are used as enumeration districts during the census, but their use is more general. Continuously updated geographical register is maintained by the CZSO, where these units form the basic geographical layer, on which subsequent aggregations are based. This register is the base for an integrated hierarchical geographical information system and is the base for databases of regional indicators and statistical data.

For each CEU, a list of all buildings is maintained in the register. This list is updated from administrative data of the construction authorities (new buildings', flats' or commercial premises' acceptance protocols, demolitions' protocols). For each building, the number of dwelling units is recorded.

CEUs vary considerably in size measured in number of dwelling units in them. Before drawing of the first stage sample, the sampling frame of CEUs had to be adjusted in two ways:

- As noted above, CEUs have wider use than sampling of dwellings and there are CEUs not containing any buildings dwellings (like industrial areas, railway stations and the like). These CEUs, where the number of dwellings is zero, are dropped from the sampling frame.
- In order to enable incorporation of small census enumeration units into the sampling process (to reach the required full geographical coverage of the national territory), small CEUs (with less than 20 inhabited dwellings) were merged with adjacent CEUs and this larger merged CEU entered the first stage of sampling. Therefore, in some cases, the 10 dwellings sampled in the second stage belong to two, in exceptional cases even more, real administrative CEUs. The survey design variable DB060 (PSU) is later coded according to this adjusted structure of the sampling frame, to keep the dwellings together as they were actually sampled.

In the second stage, 10 dwellings were sampled in each sampled CEU. CZSO's regional fieldwork units (each covering one of the 14 NUTS3 administrative regions) received the list of selected dwellings (address + identification number of the flat in buildings with more than one flat). Before the actual fieldwork, the regional fieldwork units' staff carried out identification of the selected dwellings and filled in the contact names on the list of selected dwellings for interviewers.

The ultimate sampling unit was the dwelling, i.e. all persons with usual residence in that dwelling (their only place of residence or their main place of residence, according to the EU-SILC definition) were included in the survey. This includes also foreign nationals and subtenants living in the selected dwelling.

The household definition is based on the sharing of expenditures concept, in line with the definition of Paragraph 115 of the national Civil Code – based on the declaration of the persons in sampled dwelling unit that they permanently live together and finance together expenditures to cover their needs.

2.1.3 Stratification criteria

The sampling of CEUs is stratified by region (NUTS4) and municipality size with following four categories:

- below 2 000 inhabitants
- 2 000 – 9 999 inhabitants
- 10 000 – 49 999 inhabitants
- 50 000 and more inhabitants

2.1.4 Sample size and allocation criteria

The total sample size was 10 847 dwellings (10 936 households) from which 4 300 addresses were newly selected and 6 847 dwellings (6 916 households) were revisited from previous waves. The new sample was allocated to the strata using proportional algorithm (proportionally to the number of dwellings in the sampling frame).

2.1.5 Sample selection schemes

In the first stage, CEUs were sampled with probability proportional to size (number of dwellings). Simple random sampling without replacement is used for sampling of constant number of 10 dwellings in each sampled CEU.

2.1.6 Sample distribution over time

Due to the limited duration of the fieldwork period, the survey was organized as a one-shot survey. Sample was not distributed into separate waves over the duration of the fieldwork.

2.1.7 Renewal of the sample: Rotational groups

The survey will in the long term use the integrated four-year rotational panel design. Since the 2005 operation was the first year of the survey, there was only one sample replication and no rotation was applied. In years 2006 to 2011 was added a new replications. In 2009 first rotational panel was ended and the household from the 2005 operation was dropped from the sample. In 2011 the household from the 2007 operation was dropped from the sample. Each next year, one sub-sample rotates out and a new one is drawn and substituted for.

The sample rotation will be at the level of CEUs as primary sampling units (whole CEUs will be added to/dropped from the sample).

2.1.8 Weightings

2.1.8.1 Design factor

The sample was designed as a self-weighting sample. Design factor for all sampled dwellings is equal to 1.

2.1.8.2 Non-response adjustments

The original sample was designed as a self-weighting probability sample. However, non-ignorable level of non-response biased the structure of the sample of achieved interviews. For example, compared to the available demographic statistics and external data, the achieved average household size was significantly smaller. There was under-representation of the self-employed, of the unemployed as well as of persons living in larger cities. On the other hand, there was over-representation of persons in the retirement age and of persons living in family houses.

Due to the limited information on non-respondents of the first wave restricted only to the geographical information obtainable from the sampling frame, the possibilities for modelling using propensity to response models were quite limited. There was an option by second wave households to utilize information, which was obtained from previous SILC wave, and to adjust their previous year weights for attrition. In that case it would be difference between first and next wave weighting procedures. Experimental computations show that this method would entail excessive weights variability increase. Therefore, united calibration for all the waves was used as the method for correcting non-response.

The achieved sample was re-weighted using the integrated calibration technique (producing the same weights on household and personal level). This technique ensures that the weighted sample structure corresponds to a set of known external population characteristics. The calculations were implemented using the CALMAR software in SAS.

2.1.8.3 Adjustments to external data

The following calibration variables were used:

- Number of inhabited dwellings in each NUTS3 region, subdivided into family houses (detached and semi-detached houses) and flats, based on the 2001 Census continuously updated from administrative sources of construction authorities
- Population characteristics:
 - o Population totals in each NUTS3 region (from demographic statistics)
 - o Economic activity characteristics in each NUTS3 region:
 - Number of pensioners (excl. pensions for orphans), based on the administrative data from social security administration
 - Number of unemployed (registered unemployed from administrative source of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, corrected for unregistered unemployment using the Labour Force Survey data)
 - Number of self-employed (estimate based on the Labour Force Survey)
 - Number of children aged 0-15 (from demographic statistics)
 - o Demographic characteristics at the national level (based on the demographic statistics):
 - Age groups (0-15, 16-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75+)
 - Gender at the national level
 - Municipality size at the national level (below 2 000 inhabitants, 2 000 - 9 999, 10 000 - 49 999, 50 000+ inhabitants)

Since the target population of the survey were persons living in private households, the demographic statistics aggregate data were adjusted by subtracting institutionalised population (from social security administrative data) and persons in prisons.

2.1.8.4 Final cross-sectional weights

Final household cross-sectional weight was result of Calmar calibration.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
Weights DB090	8 866	157	1 412	471.5	207.3

The number of cross-sectional weights (number of DB090 > 0 is 8 866) is the same as the number of successfully interviewed households (DB130 = 11 is 8 866).

2.1.9 Substitutions

Substitutions were not used.

2.2 Sampling errors and effective sample size

The estimated standard errors and Kish factors for the main indicators are provided below:

Table 28 Number of observations, value, standard errors for income components and Kish factor*

Indicator	N	Value	Std. error	Kish
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers:				
Male	9 832	0.08920	0.00287	
Female	10 797	0.10647	0.00297	
Hh with dependant children	9 686	0.12359	0.00334	
Hh without dependant children	10 943	0.07147	0.00246	
Inequality of income distribution:				
S80/S20 income quintile share ratio	20 629	3.53836	0.00967	
Gini coefficient	20 629	0.25237	0.00408	

*It will be calculated and delivered later.

The estimated standard errors take into account the complex sampling scheme used in the survey (stratification, two-stage design). Results were obtained using the Jackknife Repeated Replication. The computations were done in SAS programs for variance estimation of the measures required for Intermediate Quality Report developed Università degli Studi di Siena. All indicators were calculated at individual level.

2.3 Non-sampling errors

2.3.1 Sampling frame and coverage errors

Sampling frame covers existing buildings with the information on number of dwelling units in each building (see part on sampling units for description of the register of CEUs).

Out of the 4 000 newly sampled dwelling unit records (in the first wave), 300 were found to be ineligible for the survey (7.5 %). Fieldwork staff undertaking pre-fieldwork identification of sampled dwelling units and interviewers must declare clear confirmation of the fact, that the dwelling unit was not located.

2.3.2 Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1 Measurement errors

Development of the questionnaires

Data collection had the form of an interview and interviewers filled in the answers into paper questionnaires (PAPI data collection) or into electronic questionnaires (CAPI data collection)

Data from paper questionnaires were then captured using OCR technology (optical reading of documents). The first SILC questionnaires were developed in 2004. The inputs for designing the questionnaires were the questionnaires from Microcensus surveys (national income survey), the harmonised description of EU-SILC target variables (technical document SILC 065) and the blueprint questionnaire in English used for previous SILC pilots in old Member States. Basic questionnaire structure follows the practice already well established in the Microcensus, with three main forms: dwelling unit questionnaire with household membership roster, household questionnaire and personal questionnaire. The questionnaires were first tested in pilot survey of 600 randomly sampled households (Spring 2004). The pilot project involved 14 future regional coordinators of the survey and small group of experienced interviewers (2-3 per region). After this fieldwork test, questionnaire was updated and partly re-designed, with active involvement of the regional staff and the participating interviewers. Together with the questionnaires, detailed interviewers guidelines were developed with binding instructions to all questions.

The survey was conducted using electronic questionnaires with the assistance of programmatic system BLAISE. It is developed Statistics Netherlands and it is standard for questionnaire survey. Since 2008 will be a gradual transition to CAPI data collection. The electronic questionnaires were first tested in pilot survey of 412 randomly sampled households (November 2007). There were used electronic questionnaire EU-SILC. The content of the pilot survey were demographic and social characteristics, inter-household transfers, consumption from household own production, spending on dwelling, personal income, labour status and employment and health. After this fieldwork test, questionnaire was updated and partly re-designed, with active involvement of the regional staff and the participating interviewers. Together with the questionnaires, detailed interviewers guidelines were developed with binding instructions to all questions.

The content of the survey was divided into four questionnaires with different units of reference:

Questionnaire A (dwelling unit questionnaire): contained the roster with the list of all persons with usual residence in the selected dwelling, their basic demographic characteristics, information on sharing of expenses to determine household units and relationship of each person to the main user of the dwelling and to the head of the household.

Questionnaire B (household questionnaire): filled in for each household, contained information on housing, consumer durables, financial situation of the household, consumption of the household's own production (i.e. small scale farming and similar activities), inter-household transfers paid and received, family social benefits, rental income, paid regular taxes on wealth (buildings and land) and childcare.

Questionnaire C (personal questionnaire): filled in by each household member aged 16+ as of 31 December 2010 (i.e. persons born in 1994 and earlier). This questionnaire contained information on labour status and employment, personal income (from employment, private enterprise and social security schemes), participation in private pension plans, health and selected biographical information.

Questionnaire CM (personal questionnaire): filled in by each household member born in 1951-1985. Module questions relate to the basic information about parents of the respondent and conditions of his/her household when he/she was 14 years old.

Reference periods

- Age: December 31, 2010.
- Other demographic variables - marital status, education, housing, financial situation: the date of the interview.
- Work activity of those who changed their job or economic status was collected for each month of 2010. If the work activity stayed the same all the year round, one (yearly) value was entered. Work activity figures are gathered by self-definition of the respondent (respondents themselves choose among different types of activity the one that fits them the most). Its value depends primarily on the respondent's main occupation and on the time spent in it. Subsequently, other data related to the respondent's work activity (status in employment, profession) was collected. At the same time, in every month or as a year value, parallel activities were surveyed (second job, study) together with the data on receipt of pensions and social benefits.
- Economic activity was not collected but derived from the monthly/yearly data (if monthly data was the basis, the activity with the highest incidence was coded as the yearly value). For those who completed their education in 2010 the latter half of the year was considered.
- Current employment variables (current employment status, occupation): the date of the interview.
- Income data (both monetary and in kind): calendar year 2010.
- Subjective questions focused on housing and financial problems: the date of the interview.
- Health problems: last six or twelve months.
- Housing, consumer durables, financial and social situation of household: the date of the interview, unless the question specifically refers to some other period.
- Module questions: when the respondent was 14.

Interviewers

The survey participated 671 interviewers on the whole. The survey by force of paper questionnaire (PAPI) was performed by 359 interviewers (approximately almost 14 households per interviewers). The survey by the aid of electronic questionnaires (CAPI) was performed by 312 interviewers; most of them were staff of CZSO (approximately almost 19 households per interviewer). The following table shows the successfulness of the interviewers by their basic characteristics (if there are more than one household in the dwelling, at least one interviewed household is considered as successfully surveyed).

Table 29 Response by interviewers' characteristics (%)

Interviewers' characteristics	Total	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4
Age:					
Age ≤ 40	82.41	63.36	91.28	93.69	94.27
Age 41-60	83.13	63.43	90.38	92.42	97.00
Age > 60	84.99	70.50	94.60	92.58	94.51
Sex:					
Male	86.10	70.23	93.31	94.75	99.01
Female	82.57	63.60	91.12	92.03	95.73
Education:					
Primary	84.82	70.27	96.00	91.67	100.00
Lower secondary	85.10	66.92	94.89	93.39	95.19
Upper secondary	82.84	64.49	90.90	92.48	96.52
Tertiary education	84.59	66.30	91.56	93.92	94.24
Economic activity:					
Employed	83.10	63.49	91.02	92.61	96.15
Student	85.29	71.01	89.25	95.83	100.00
Retired	84.91	70.51	93.87	92.38	95.38
Unemployed	80.28	55.00	91.43		92.86
Other	73.90	54.62	93.88	95.24	96.43
Experience with surveys:					
SILC 2009 - yes	84.74	65.35	91.12	92.94	96.27
- no	78.65	64.54	93.28	90.84	94.91
SILC 2010 - yes	83.99	64.67	91.76	92.84	96.09
- no	77.94	67.09	91.22	93.68	96.25
Other - yes	84.84	66.60	91.87	93.32	96.05
Different interviewer in 2010	92.23		91.69	92.31	93.92
Same interviewer as in 2010	93.38		91.70	92.79	96.35
Total	83.36	65.08	91.70	92.73	96.10

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

Data processing

In case of PAPI data were captured using OCR technology (scanning). After the data collection in the field, the regional fieldwork staff gathers the questionnaire material. While accepting the material from each interviewers, the initial check is performed – the way, how the questionnaires are filled, completeness of the questionnaires, basic consistence checks. Then, control sum of numerical values on each page is calculated and filled by the regional coding staff. Larger tables, with more numerical data, have their own control sums. At the same time, the coding staff coded some variables – occupation (ISCO), sector of employment (NACE) and country codes for country of birth and citizenship variables.

After this preparatory phase, questionnaires are scanned into raw data files. CZSO has three specialised scanning units with technical equipment and expertises in this data capture technology. This technology is also used extensively in business and agricultural surveys. Control sums are automatically checked during scanning. Whenever the sum of captured values does not match the control sum or when some number is not properly recognised, that position of the questionnaire appears as image on the screen of the operator for verification. Images of the scanned questionnaires are also stored with the captured data with unique filenames allowing linking of each data record with the image of the questionnaire, from which the data were captured.

In case of CAPI data were collected into electronic questionnaire with the aid of programming system BLAISE in application eDomset. After the data collection in the field, the regional fieldwork staff takes data file form the questionnaire material. While accepting the data file gathers the questionnaire material from each interviewers, the initial check is performed - the way, how the

questionnaires are filled, completeness of the questionnaires, basic consistence checks. After this preparatory phase, data from questionnaires are co-ordinate to general database CZSO.

The raw data files are then subject to initial centrally performed checks – checking the integrity of identification numbers, consistency with the sample, completeness of the questionnaire sets for all dwellings. Regional staff is responsible for further checking of the data for their respective region, using a special software application containing a set of logical controls, captured data and linked images of the questionnaires. Three kinds of errors are distinguished: critical errors (must be corrected, limited to a small set of key consistency issues), errors to verify (must be commented, involving contacting the interviewer in charge of that household, if additional information is necessary) and informative flags (extraordinary or unusual situations, which should be looked at).

2.3.3 Non-response errors

2.3.3.1 Achieved sample size

4 000 new dwellings entered the survey (1st wave) and 6 847 dwellings were revisited – 6 694 at the last year's address and 153 were tracked to their new home. The fieldwork revealed that among the total of 10 847 dwellings in the sample there were 526 dwellings (4.8 %) unoccupied, unlocated or ineligible because the households had moved. Since there was no substitution for these ineligible units, the survey was conducted in 10 321 dwellings and 10 401 households. There were 80 additional interviewed households in these dwellings, since in 70 dwellings there are more households in one dwelling unit (household definition is based on sharing of expenses).

The overview of the survey response can be summarised by following table:

Table 30 Sample size – households

	Households			Response (%)		
	Total	1st wave	2nd-4th wave	Total	1st wave	2nd-4th wave
Response, total	8 866	2 421	6 445	85.2	65.1	96.5
Non-response, total	1 535	1 299	236	14.8	34.9	3.5
- Refusals (unwillingness to give information)	1 187	1 008	179	77.3	77.6	75.8
- Household not contacted. temporarily absent	238	195	43	15.5	15.0	18.2
- Household unable to respond (health limitation)	58	48	10	3.8	3.7	4.2
- Other reasons (linguistic etc.)	52	48	4	3.4	3.7	1.7

Refusals also include situations when the household did not refuse the survey as such, but did not accept to provide the information on income to the extent, which would qualify the household as successfully interviewed. The definition of successfully interviewed household allowed missing income data for only one person and the person must not be the head of the household. Non-contacts, temporarily absent category cover situations, when the interviewer did not establish contact with the selected household, despite the prescribed minimum number of three attempts of personal contact.

Table 31 Regional disparities in response

Region (NUTS3)	Total			1 st wave			2 nd and 3 rd wave		
	HHs in survey	Response		HHs in survey	Response		HHs in survey	Response	
		count	%		count	%		count	%
Praha	1 122	871	77.6	489	268	54.8	633	603	95.3
Stredocesky	1 185	1 003	84.6	426	273	64.1	759	730	96.2
Jihocesky	695	630	90.6	221	163	73.8	474	467	98.5
Plzensky	548	476	86.9	209	143	68.4	339	333	98.2
Karlovarsky	266	214	80.5	100	53	53.0	166	161	97.0
Ustecky	857	720	84.0	303	191	63.0	554	529	95.5
Liberecky	415	348	83.9	164	109	66.5	251	239	95.2
Kralovehradecky	558	460	82.4	196	120	61.2	362	340	93.9
Pardubicky	502	419	83.5	178	107	60.1	324	312	96.3
Vysocina	532	486	91.4	164	125	76.2	368	361	98.1
Jihomoravsky	1 119	955	85.3	414	279	67.4	705	676	95.9
Olomoucky	623	536	86.0	219	150	68.5	404	386	95.5
Zlinsky	611	536	87.7	191	128	67.0	420	408	97.1
Moravskoslezsky	1 368	1 212	88.6	446	312	70.0	922	900	97.6
CZ total	10 401	8 866	85.2	3 720	2 421	65.1	6 681	6 445	96.5

The lowest achieved response rate was in the City of Prague region (Praha), about 78 percent. This result has its objective reasons, as in any other large city, the social environment and dwelling structure in this metropolitan region is the least favourable for conducting household surveys. On the other hand, there are exceptionally high response rate, above 90 percent, at Vysocina and Jihocesky region. For the remaining regions, the differences between response rates are not large (interval from 80 percent to 88 percent).

Participation in the sample survey is voluntary; unlike the population census, households were not obliged to provide any information. A selected household has to be informed about the content of the survey and about the fact that their participation in the survey is voluntary. Whether to respond or not is left to the household's own deliberation. The main reasons for refusal are privacy reasons (objections against giving personal information and fear of abuse of the personal data), unwillingness to report income, fear of contact with interviewers as strangers. There is a considerable group of persons, who as a matter of principle strictly refuse to give any information about them and their households.

SILC data files non-response characteristics, with the SILC harmonised response rates:

Achieved sample size: 8 866

Number of households for which an interview is accepted for the database: 8 866

Number of persons of 16 years or older, who are members of the households and for whom the interview is accepted for the database: 17 612

2.3.3.2 Unit non-response

Address contact rate (Ra): the ratio of the number of address successfully contacted, to the number of valid addresses selected.

Household response rate (Rh): the ratio of the number of household interviews completed (and accepted in the database), to the number of eligible household at the contacted addresses.

Individual response rate (Rp): the ratio of the number of personal interviews completed (and accepted in the database), to the number of eligible individuals in completed households.

New replication

- **Household non-response rates (NRh)**

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

Where

$$Ra = \frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}} = \frac{\sum [DB120 = 11]}{\sum [DB120 = all] - \sum [DB120 = 23]} = \frac{3720}{4020 - 0} = 0.92537$$

$$Rh = \frac{\text{Number of household interviews completed and accepted for the database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}} = \frac{\sum [DB135 = 1]}{\sum [DB130 = all]} = \frac{2421}{3720} = 0.65081$$

$$NRh = (1 - (0.92537 * 0.65081)) * 100 = 39.776$$

The household non-response rate is 39.78 %.

- **Individual non-response rates (NRp)**

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

Where

$$Rp = \frac{\text{Number of personal interview completed}}{\text{Number of eligible individuals}} = \frac{4722}{4722} = 1.00$$

$$NRp = (1 - 1) * 100 = 0 \%$$

So, the individual non-response rate is 0 %.

- **Overall individual non-response rates (*NRp)**

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

$$*NRp = (1 - (0.92537 * 0.65081 * 1)) * 100 = 39.776$$

So, the overall individual non-response rate is 39.78 %.

Total sample

- **Household non-response rates (NRh)**

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

$$Ra = 10\,401 / (10\,936 - 235) = 0.97197$$

$$Rh = 8\,866 / 10\,401 = 0.85242^1$$

¹ There were more than one household units in some interviewed dwellings (70 cases, with 80 additional households, out of which 74 were successfully interviewed). These 74 households are included in the database. Their inclusion in the non-response calculation slightly bias upwards the non-response calculated at the household level – assuming that at least in some of the

$$NRh = (1 - (0.97197 * 0.85242)) * 100 = 17.147$$

The household non-response rate is 17.15 %.

- **Individual non-response rates (NRp)**

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

$$Rp = 17\,612 / 17\,612 = 1.00$$

$$NRp = (1 - 1) * 100 = 0 \%$$

The individual non-response rate is 0 %.

- **Overall individual non-response rates (*NRp)**

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

$$*NRp = (1 - (0.97197 * 0.85242 * 1)) * 100 = 17.147$$

The overall individual non-response rate is 17.15 %.

2.3.3.3 Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address' (DB120), by 'household questionnaire result' (DB130) and by 'household interview acceptance' (DB135)

First wave

Table 32 1st wave: Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address'

	Count	%
Total (DB120 = 11 to 23)	4 020	100.00
Address contacted (DB120 = 11)	3 720	92.54
Address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	300	7.46
Total address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	300	100.00
Address cannot be located (DB120 = 21)	300	100.00
Address unable to access (DB120 = 22)	0	0.00
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)	0	0.00

Table 33 1st wave: Distribution of address contacted by 'household questionnaire result'

	Count	%
Total	3 720	100.00
Household questionnaire completed (DB130 = 11)	2 421	65.08
Interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	1 299	34.92
Total interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	1 299	100.00
Refusal to co-operate (DB130 = 21)	1 008	77.60
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork – i.e. non-contacts (DB130 = 22)	195	15.01
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc.) (DB130 = 23)	48	3.70
Other reasons (DB130 = 24)	48	3.70
Household questionnaire completed (DB135 = 1 + 2)	2 421	100.00
Interview accepted for data base (DB135 = 1)	2 421	100.00
Interview rejected (DB135 = 2)	0	0.00

non-responding dwellings can also include more than one household unit, the denominator should be higher than 10 401. This difference is unknown, but is likely to be quite small.

Second wave

Table 34 2nd wave: Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address'

	Count	%
Total (DB120 = 11 to 23)	2 606	100.00
Address contacted (DB120 = 11)	2 606	96.55
Address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	93	3.45
Total address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	93	100.00
Address cannot be located (DB120 = 21)	0	0.00
Address unable to access (DB120 = 22)	0	0.00
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)	93	100.00

Table 35 2nd wave: Distribution of address contacted by 'household questionnaire result'

	Count	%
Total	2 606	100.00
Household questionnaire completed (DB130 = 11)	2 475	94.97
Interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	131	5.03
Total interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	131	100.00
Refusal to co-operate (DB130 = 21)	101	77.09
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork – i.e. non-contacts (DB130 = 22)	24	18.32
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc.) (DB130 = 23)	4	3.05
Other reasons (DB130 = 24)	2	1.53
Household questionnaire completed (DB135 = 1+ 2)	2 475	100.00
Interview accepted for database (DB135 = 1)	2 475	100.00
Interview rejected (DB135 = 2)	0	0.00

Third wave

Table 36 3rd wave: Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address'

	Count	%
Total (DB120 = 11 to 23)	2 447	100.00
Address contacted (DB120 = 11)	2 352	96.12
Address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	95	3.88
Total address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	95	100.00
Address cannot be located (DB120 = 21)	0	0.00
Address unable to access (DB120 = 22)	0	0.00
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)	95	100.00

Table 37 3rd wave: Distribution of address contacted by 'household questionnaire result'

	Count	%
Total	2 352	100.00
Household questionnaire completed (DB130 = 11)	2 269	96.47
Interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	83	3.53
Total interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	83	100.00
Refusal to co-operate (DB130 = 21)	64	77.11
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork – i.e. non-contacts (DB130 = 22)	14	16.87
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc.) (DB130 = 23)	3	3.61
Other reasons (DB130 = 24)	2	2.41
Household questionnaire completed (DB135 = 1+ 2)	2 269	100.00
Interview accepted for data base (DB135 = 1)	2 269	100.00
Interview rejected (DB135 = 2)	0	0.00

Fourth wave**Table 38** 4th wave: Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address'

	Count	%
Total (DB120 = 11 to 23)	1 770	100.00
Address contacted (DB120 = 11)	1723	97.34
Address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	72	2.96
Total address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	72	100.00
Address cannot be located (DB120 = 21)	1	1.39
Address unable to access (DB120 = 22)	0	0.00
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)	71	98.61

Table 39 4th wave: Distribution of address contacted by 'household questionnaire result'

	Count	%
Total	2360	100.00
Household questionnaire completed (DB130 = 11)	2336	98.98
Interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	24	1.02
Total interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	24	100.00
Refusal to co-operate (DB130 = 21)	20	83.33
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork – i.e. non-contacts (DB130 = 22)	3	12.50
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc.) (DB130 = 23)	1	4.17
Other reasons (DB130 = 24)	0	0.00
Household questionnaire completed (DB135 = 1+ 2)	2336	100.00
Interview accepted for database (DB135 = 1)	2336	100.00
Interview rejected (DB135 = 2)	0	0.00

Total sample

Table 40 Total sample: Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address'

	Count	%
Total (DB120 = 11 to 23)	11274	100.00
Address contacted (DB120 = 11)	10720	95.09
Address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	554	4.91
Total address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	554	100.00
Address cannot be located (DB120 = 21)	319	57.58
Address unable to access (DB120 = 22)	0	0.00
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)	235	42.42

Table 41 Total sample: Distribution of address contacted by 'household questionnaire result'

	Count	%
Total	10720	100.00
Household questionnaire completed (DB130 = 11)	9098	84.87
Interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	1622	15.13
Total interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	1622	100.00
Refusal to co-operate (DB130 = 21)	1274	78.54
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork – i.e. non-contacts (DB130 = 22)	248	15.28
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc.) (DB130 = 23)	86	5.30
Other reasons (DB130 = 24)	14	0.86
Household questionnaire completed (DB135 = 1 + 2)	9098	100.00
Interview accepted for data base (DB135 = 1)	9098	100.00
Interview rejected (DB135 = 2)	0	0.00

2.3.3.4 Distribution of substituted units

Substitutions were not used.

2.3.3.5 Item non-response

In following table there are an overview of the item non-response for all income variables is presented. The percentage households having received an amount, the percentage of households with missing values and the percentage of households with partial information is calculated.

These percentages are calculated as follows:

% of households having received an amount: number of households (or persons) who have received something (yes to a filter) / total

% of households with missing values: number of households (or persons) who said that they have received something but did not give any amount (no partial information) / number of households (or persons) who have received something (yes to a filter)

% of households with partial information: number of households (or persons) who said that they have received something but gave partial information (amounts were not given for all components) / number of households (or persons) who have received something (yes to a filter)

Table 42 Overview of the non-response for the income variables: % households having received an amount, % of households with missing values and % of households with partial information

Item non-response	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values (before imputation)	% of households with partial information (before imputation)
(overview for different income components) ²			
Total gross household income (HY010)	100.00	0.00	0.12
Total disposable household income (HY020)	100.00	0.00	0.12
Total disposable household income before social transfers except old-age and survivor's benefits (HY022)	99.15	0.00	0.13
Total disposable household income including social transfers except old-age and survivor's benefits (HY023)	91.08	0.00	0.14
Net income components at household level			
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040N)	5.40	0.42	0.00
Family related allowances (HY050N)	12.90	0.00	0.00
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060N)	1.40	0.00	0.00
Housing allowance (HY070N)	2.47	0.00	0.00
Regular inter-household cash transfer received (HY080N)	9.59	0.00	0.00
Alimonies received (compulsory + voluntary) (HY081N)	5.52	0.00	0.00
Income received by people aged < 16 (HY110N)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120N)	70.88	0.00	0.00
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid (HY130N)	9.17	0.00	0.00
Alimonies paid (compulsory + voluntary) (HY131N)	2.88	0.00	0.00
Tax on income and social contributions (HY140N)	65.50	0.00	0.00
Value of goods produced by own-consumption (HY170N)	55.19	0.00	0.00
Gross income components at household level			
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040G)	5.40	0.42	0.00
Family related allowances (HY050G)	12.90	0.00	0.00
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060G)	1.40	0.00	0.00
Housing allowance (HY070G)	2.47	0.00	0.00
Regular inter-household cash transfer received (HY080G)	9.59	0.00	0.00
Alimonies received (compulsory + voluntary) (HY081G)	5.52	0.00	0.00
Interests, dividends, etc. (HY090G)	15.17	0.00	0.00
Interest repayments on mortgage (HY100G)	12.44	0.09	0.00
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120G)	70.88	0.00	0.00
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid (HY130G)	9.17	0.00	0.00
Alimonies paid (compulsory + voluntary) (HY131G)	2.88	0.00	0.00
Tax on income and social contributions (HY140G)	65.50	0.00	0.00
Value of goods produced by own-consumption (HY170G)	55.19	0.00	0.00

² For the more detailed definitions of the SILC income variables, please refer to the SILC UDB Documentation

	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	% of persons with missing values (before imputation)	% of persons with partial information (before imputation)
Net income components at personal level			
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010N)	46.75	0.11	0.00
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035N)	44.44	0.05	0.00
Pension from individual private plans (PY080N)	0.65	0.00	0.00
Unemployment benefits (PY090N)	3.21	0.71	0.00
Old age benefits (PY100N)	32.41	0.02	0.00
Survivor' benefits (PY110N)	9.93	0.00	0.00
Sickness benefits (PY120N)	5.56	0.00	0.00
Disability benefits (PY130N)	6.98	0.00	0.00
Education-related allowances (PY140N)	0.80	0.00	0.00
Gross income components at personal level			
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010G)	46.75	0.11	0.00
Non cash employee income (PY020G)	29.22	0.12	0.00
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035G)	44.44	0.05	0.00
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment (PY050G)	8.55	0.13	0.00
Pension from individual private plans (PY080G)	0.65	0.00	0.00
Unemployment benefits (PY090G)	3.21	0.71	0.00
Old age benefits (PY100G)	32.46	0.02	0.00
Survivor' benefits (PY110G)	9.93	0.00	0.00
Sickness benefits (PY120G)	5.56	0.00	0.00
Disability benefits (PY130G)	6.98	0.00	0.00
Education-related allowances (PY140G)	0.80	0.00	0.00

2.4 Mode of data collection

Distribution of household members by data status (RB250)

Registers are not used at all. Due to strict definition of response, there are any “not completed interviews” at individual level or “not contacted individuals” (all such cases were filled as proxy or were self-administered by respondents).

Distribution of household members by type of interview (RB260)

The data collection methods were PAPI (Paper Assistance Personal Interview) around 44 percent, and CAPI (Computer Assistance Personal Interview) around 31 percent. Most of the questionnaires were filled during fact-to-face interview with the interviewer (76 percent). PAPI contain also interview that was carried out by PAPI and then feed into electronic questionnaire. Some personal questionnaires were filled as proxy interviews (24 percent) – information about household member was not present at the time of the interview was provided by another household member. In some case, where this was agreed with the household, interviewer left the personal questionnaire for some household member and collected it later (self-administered questionnaire).

Table 43 Distribution of household members by type of interview (RB260)

Method	Total		First wave	
	Count	%	Count	%
Face to face interview - PAPI	7 816	44.38	2 580	54.64
Face to face interview - CAPI	5 488	31.16	1 180	24.97
CATI, Telephone interview	not used	-	not used	-
Self-administered by respondent	5	0.03	1	0.02
Proxy interview	4 303	24.43	961	20.35
Total	17 612	100.00	4 722	100.00

Method	Second wave		Third wave		Fourth wave	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Face to face interview - PAPI	2 596	52.11	2 190	48.61	477	13.81
Face to face interview - CAPI	1 231	24.97	1 231	27.39	1 843	53.34
CATI, Telephone interviews	not used	-	not used	-	not used	-
Self-administered by respondent	2	0.04	2	0.04	not used	-
Proxy interview	1 128	20.35	1 135	32.85	1 135	32.85
Total	4 930	100.00	4 505	100.00	3 455	100.00

2.5 Interview duration

The average interview duration in successfully interviewed households (the whole interview time: household + all personal questionnaires combined) was 29.8 minutes. The average interview duration we can divide between paper questionnaire interview (PAPI) and computer questionnaire interview (CAPI).

The following tables presents the mean interview duration in minutes calculated as the sum of the duration of all household interviews (HB100) plus the sum of the duration of all personal interviews (PB120), divided by the number of household members aged 16 and over whose household questionnaire is completed and accepted for the database (PB030)³

Table 44 Average interview durations in minutes (2006 to 2011)

2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
42.5	41.3	36.6	30.3	31.3	29.8

Table 45 Average interview durations in minutes by type of interview

Method	Total duration	Duration of personal questionnaire
Face to face interview - PAPI	38.7	20.9
Face to face interview – CAPI	24.5	13.1
Self-administered by respondent	26.0	15.0
Proxy interview	20.3	12.2
Total	29.8	16.4

³ If the household interview duration (HB100) or one personal interview duration (PB120) is missing for one member of the household, then the household is excluded from the calculation.

3. Comparability

3.1 Basic concepts and definitions

- The reference period: no differences between the national and standard EU-SILC concept
- The private household definition: no differences (there can be more households in one dwelling eligible for the survey)
- The household membership: no differences
- The income reference period used: calendar year 2010
- The period for taxes and social contributions: taxes and social insurance contribution refer to the income received during the income reference period
- The reference period for taxes on wealth: income reference period
- The lag between the income reference period and current variables: three to four months (the survey took place from the end of February to May 2011)
- The total duration of the data collection of the sample: 9 weeks (PAPI), 11 weeks (CAPI)
- Basic information on activity status during the income reference period: no differences

3.2 Components of income

3.2.1 Differences between the national definitions and standard EU-SILC definitions

The concepts and definitions used in the survey are those set in the EU-SILC documentation (definitions of target variables, as they are set in the EU-SILC regulations and technical document "Description of Target Variables – Doc. SILC 065). There is only one deliberate deviation from the used concepts:

3.2.2 The source or procedure used for collection of income variables

All the income variables are obtained by interview. The EU-SILC income target variables were divided to more subcomponents. The subcomponents were defined according to the Czech benefit system. These subcomponents were surveyed.

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

Both alternatives (gross amounts, net amount – net of taxes and social insurance contributions) were available to respondents for income from employment and self-employment income. In addition, information on claimed tax deductions was collected from respondents. Algorithms based on detailed application of the national tax rules were then used to calculate the complementary net/gross amount. Social benefits are generally tax-exempt – therefore there is no difference between gross and net values – they can be collected as one value and assigned to both gross and net.

Table 46 Overview of the collection of income data (net/gross values)

Income component	% collected net of taxes and social contributions	% collected gross ⁴
Net income component at personal level		
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010N)	58.91	41.09
Non-cash employee income (PY020N)	-	-
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035N)	100.00	0.00
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment (PY050N)	-	-
Pension from individual private plans (PY080N)	100.00	0.00
Unemployment benefits (PY090N)	100.00	0.00
Old-age benefits (PY100N)	100.00	0.00
Survivor' benefits (PY110N)	100.00	0.00
Sickness benefits (PY120N)	100.00	0.00
Disability benefits (PY130N)	100.00	0.00
Education-related allowances (PY140N)	100.00	0.00
Gross income components at personal level		
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010G)	58.91	41.09
Non-cash employee income (PY020G)	0.00	100.00
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035G)	100.00	0.00
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment (PY050G)	31.74	68.26
Pension from individual private plans (PY080G)	100.00	0.00
Unemployment benefits (PY090G)	0.00	100.00
Old-age benefits (PY100G)	0.00	100.00
Survivor' benefits (PY110G)	0.00	100.00
Sickness benefits (PY120G)	0.00	100.00
Disability benefits (PY130G)	0.00	100.00
Education-related allowances (PY140G)	0.00	100.00

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

Situation of missing income data for one of the household members was rare (11 cases). For these persons, the income was imputed by the simple hot-deck method (using randomly chosen person with similar characteristics from another household).

Another source of bias, which needs to be taken into account, stems from the interviewing. Data on income obtained during interviews with household members have the tendency to underestimate certain sources of income or data on some components is missing (item non-response).

Underestimation of income is a natural consequence of the fact, that respondents either tends to give lower than actual values or simply did not recall certain irregular or small incomes. It is, more or less, a non-sampling error, affected substantially by the incomes themselves and by their source. The possibilities to eliminate this underestimation of the survey data are limited. In the presented survey, only such adjustments were done, where there was sufficiently reliable external statistical source or which can be based on the legislation.

Data on gross income from employment were compared with corresponding data from wage statistics broken into sectors of activity (NACE). Different from the last year's survey and in

⁴ Gross amount does not include social insurance contributions for the self-employed – where these are treated in our national system as part of the tax-deductible costs and not as part of the gross self-employment income.

accordance with experience from other income surveys, income from work was underestimated (roughly by 5.4 %). Primarily, this underestimation concerned those incomes that were recorded as yearly lump sums. Such incomes were moderately boosted so that the average monthly gross pay by sectors approached the data from wage statistics. There was no need for corrections with income from private enterprise.

In case of social benefits for which there is a legal entitlement (parental leave benefit, child birth benefit, death grant provided to families of the deceased, to some extent also maternity leave benefit), a check on their receiving by the eligible households was applied and amounts provided were corrected according to the amounts fixed by the legislation. Old age benefits (pension from the social security system) were not corrected, since their underestimation is quite low.

Amounts declared by the unemployed as unemployment benefits were overestimated. Unemployed respondents tend to report their income from social benefits as unemployment benefits and do not distinguish them from the minimum income support benefits (claimed on the basis of the legal minimum subsistence amounts). In cases where the duration of unemployment and the reported amounts did not match the rules of the unemployment benefits provision, the reported amounts were re-classified as minimum income support benefits.

It was not possible to correct the underestimation of the sickness benefits (where respondents tend to forget spells of short-term illness over the 12 months income reference period), means-tested social benefits whose claims depend on the previous income (prior to the income reference periods), capital income and non-monetary income generated by own-consumption.

The value of goods produced by own-consumption was an estimate of the household based on the amount of consumed food and other goods, own production and goods from own business during the year 2010 (for example food and animals from own small-scale non-commercial farming activity, value of meals from own restaurant, bread from own bakery and the like).

4. Coherence

4.1 Comparison of income target variables and number of persons with external sources

The numbers of recipients of most of the incomes were used as calibration variables. The total gross income can be divided into four components: income of employees, income of self-employed, social income and other income. Any other sufficiently reliable source of household income is not available. The only part of income that can be reliably compared with the external source (administrative source) is the social income.

Table 47 Social income – comparison with administrative sources (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs) – in million CZK

	EU-SILC 2010	Administrative source	Ratio*
Total social income	396 089	415 490	95.3
Sickness benefits (PY120G)	16 362	22 789	71.8
Pensions (all)	335 390	337 800	99.3
Unemployment benefits (PY090G)	9 356	13 400	69.8
Child benefits	3 916	3 862	101.4
Parental allowances	26 346	27 722	95.0
Housing allowances (HY070G)	2 832	3 521	80.4

* (EU-SILC/Administrative source)*100

The other income components except to social income can be only compared to national accounts for household sector. Comparison of the aggregated income from this survey with the household sector aggregates of the national accounts (even after their modification taking into account the items, which are not covered by household income surveys) is relatively difficult. Concerning its aggregated value the income obtained by direct questioning in the households will always be lower. The more important fact for evaluation of their credibility is that the trend in development of household income is in line with the trends in the national accounts. From this viewpoint, the presented results of SILC 2010 are in full agreement with data from the previous year and with related statistics from developed nations of the European Union.

Table 48 Income – comparison with national accounts – in million CZK

	EU-SILC 2010	National Accounts*	Ratio**
Income of employees	1 039 595	1 195 121	87.0
Income of self-employed	242 113	308 928	78.4
Total gross income	1 747 048	2 074 402***	90.8
Total net income	1 508 806	1 973 889***	82.7

* Preliminary results

** (EU-SILC/National Accounts)*100

*** Excluding imputed rent