



Intermediate Quality Report

**For EU-SILC 2007 operation
Cross sectional data**

Hungary

March 2009.

Introduction.....	4
1. Common Cross Sectional European Union Indicators	5
2. Accuracy	10
2.1. Sample design	10
2.2. Sampling errors	13
2.3. Non-sampling errors	15
2.4. Mode of data collection	22
2.5. Imputation procedure	22
2.6. Imputed rent	23
2.7. Company car	24
3. Comparability	24
3.1. Basic concepts and definitions.....	24
3.2. Components of income	25
3.3. Tracking rules	26
4. Coherence	26

Index of tables

Table 1: Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC 2007	6
Table 2: Sample size	11
Table 3: Sample distribution over time	11
Table 4: Renewal of the sample, rotational groups	11
Table 5: Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, unweighted	13
Table 6: Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, weighted	14
Table 7: Mean, number of observation, standard error for disposable income	15
Table 8: Sample size and rotational groups on household level	17
Table 9: Sample size and rotational groups on personal level	17
Table 10: Distribution of DB120	18
Table 11: Distribution of DB130	18
Table 12: Distribution of DB135	18
Table 13: Item non-response on household level by income items	19
Table 14: Item non-response on personal level by personal income items	20
Table 15: Distribution of RB250	21
Table 16: Distribution of RB260	21
Table 17: Interview duration in minutes	21
Table 18: Regression model for imputed rent calculation	22
Table 19: Number of imputed records	23
Table 20: Comparison of key personal and household income items of EU-SILC and HBS	25
Table 21: Number of persons working full time and part-time by EU-SILC and LFS26	26
Table 22: Comparison of income target variables of EU-SILC2005, 2006 and 2007, weighted	27
Table 23: Comparison of common cross-sectional indicators of EU-SILC2005,2006 and 2007	28

Introduction

The present intermediate quality report follows the structure outlined in Commission Regulation 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

2007 was the third year of EU-SILC survey in Hungary as a part of a longitudinal sample. On the basis of the cross sectional data the calculated Laeken Indicators are presented here.

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary

Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2007

			Standard error	Effective sample size				
1	Mean equivalised disposable income	NAT	1 156 439					
2	Risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$NAT	623 502	4,440	2372		
			EUR	2 359	17	2384		
			PPS	3 975	28	2379		
		2 adults 2 dep. children	\$NAT	1 309 354	9,324	4114		
			EUR	4 955	35	4092		
			PPS	8 348	60	4101		
3	Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender	Total	Total	12,6	0,558	13376		
			M	12,7	0,591	8224		
			F	12,5	0,565	6999		
		0-17	Total	19,1	1,357	2618		
		0-64	Total	13,7	0,743	9501		
			M	13,9	0,730	5743		
			F	13,5	0,735	5711		
		18+	Total	11,2	0,528	7826		
			M	11,0	0,627	4974		
			F	11,3	0,527	4561		
		18-64	Total	12,2	0,572	9108		
			M	12,2	0,652	4822		
			F	12,2	0,639	4639		
		18-24	Total	17,9	1,064	2559		
			M	17,0	1,485	1371		
			F	18,8	1,454	1310		
		25-49	Total	12,5	0,685	5672		
			M	11,9	0,756	2974		
			F	13,1	0,730	3003		
		50-64	Total	8,6	0,802	2335		
			M	9,7	0,968	1449		
			F	7,7	0,904	1680		
		65+	Total	6,3	0,849	1250		
			M	3,3	0,983	504		
			F	8,0	1,007	1139		
		4	Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity (a) At work (d) Not at work (e1) Of which: Unemployed (e2) Of which: Retired (f) Of which: Other inactive	Total	Total	6,0	0,357	7218
					M	6,8	0,470	4138
	F			5,0	0,458	3523		
Total	Total			15,4	0,575	10640		
	M			15,6	0,892	4232		
	F			15,3	0,629	6385		
Total	Total			47,2	3,213	790		
	M			52,6	4,016	412		
	F			41,3	4,693	324		
Total	Total			8,3	0,476	6793		
	M			7,9	0,698	2473		
	F			8,6	0,476	4205		
Total	Total			22,3	1,046	2954		
	M			19,2	1,806	982		
	F			24,0	1,293	2081		
5	Risk-of-poverty rate by household type			All hh no dep. childr.		7,9	0,543	5633
				1 person hh	Total	15,8	1,039	1396
				1 person hh	M	20,2	2,138	431
		1 person hh	F	13,9	1,174	950		
		1 person hh <65yrs		20,6	1,655	677		
		1 person hh 65+		11,3	1,283	647		
		2 adults no dep. childr. (both < 65) (at least one 65+)		8,8	1,219	1400		
		2 adults no dep. childr. Other hh no dep. childr.		4,3	0,861	1571		
		All hh with dep. childr.		4,0	1,126	1068		
		Single parent (at least 1 child)		16,3	0,892	7388		
		2 adults 1 dep. child		29,0	3,580	619		
		2 adults 2 dep. childr.		11,6	1,553	1532		
		2 adults 3+ dep. childr.		14,7	1,808	1768		
		2 adults 3+ dep. childr. Other hh with dep. childr.		27,4	3,130	1216		
				11,1	1,546	2393		
		6	Risk-of-poverty rate by accomodation tenurestatus	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	11,9	0,539	14904
				(b) Tenant	Total	21,8	3,440	1267

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary
Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2007 –continued

				Standard error	Effective sample size		
7 Risk-of-poverty rate by work intensity of the household	All hh no dep. childr.	WI = 0	16,4	1.467	877		
		0 < WI < 1	7,6	0.943	3335		
		WI = 1	2,7	0.452	2373		
	All hh with dep. childr.	WI = 0	62,0	5.447	838		
		0 < WI < 0.5	42,1	4.430	1351		
		0.5 <= WI < 1	12,9	1.322	5350		
WI = 1		6,2	1.057	4416			
9 Risk-of-poverty rate before and after transfers by age and gender (a) before all transfers	Total	Total	49,4	0.596	21518		
		M	47,3	0.719	9368		
		F	51,3	0.608	12531		
	0-17	Total	Total	49,2	1.301	3904	
		18+	Total	49,4	0.565	18142	
			M	46,7	0.702	7865	
	F		51,8	0.568	10541		
	18-64	Total	Total	41,1	0.704	12845	
		M	39,7	0.836	5885		
		F	42,3	0.709	7578		
	65+	Total	Total	88,0	0.795	3691	
		M	89,3	1.074	1248		
		F	87,3	0.929	2214		
	(b) including pensions	Total	Total	29,3	0.543	16590	
			M	29,9	0.668	7752	
			F	28,7	0.572	10432	
		0-17	Total	Total	45,0	1.288	3799
			18+	Total	25,8	0.479	12273
				M	26,1	0.622	5694
		F		25,5	0.478	8444	
		18-64	Total	Total	29,0	0.544	10651
			M	29,3	0.700	4785	
			F	28,8	0.564	6686	
		65+	Total	Total	11,0	0.698	3746
M			7,0	0.843	1328		
F			13,3	0.941	2493		
13 Relative median risk-of-poverty gap by age and gender		Total	Total	20,1	1.095	3246	
			M	21,2	1.265	1542	
			F	19,4	1.175	1734	
		0-17	Total	Total	19,8	1.529	834
			18+	Total	20,4	1.067	2387
	M			20,8	1.123	1079	
	F	19,9		1.204	1298		
	18-64	Total	Total	21,4	1.128	2072	
		M	21,2	1.160	997		
		F	21,8	1.277	1084		
	65+	Total	Total	13,9	1.627	265	
		M	10,4	4.384	64		
		F	14,5	1.602	200		
	14 S80/S20 quintile share ratio			3,7	0.070	8737	
	15 Gini coefficient			0,260	0.406	9531	

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary
Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2007 – continued-

				Standard error	Effective sample size	
16 Distribution of population by age and gender	(a) total population	Total	Total	100.0	0.000	
			0-17	18.1	0.154	3189
			18-24	11.6	0.234	2179
			25-49	34.7	0.305	7666
			50-64	20.9	0.352	5571
			65+	14.6	0.228	3380
			18+	81.9	0.154	15593
			18-64	67.3	0.268	12529
			0-64	85.4	0.228	16756
			Total	100.0		
			0-17	19.6	0.231	1568
			18-24	12.7	0.358	1279
			25-49	36.3	0.444	3636
		50-64	20.1	0.481	2137	
		65+	11.3	0.313	1216	
		18+	80.4	0.231	6888	
		18-64	69.1	0.399	5509	
		0-64	88.7	0.313	8115	
		Total	100.0			
		0-17	16.7	0.191	1999	
		18-24	10.7	0.334	1123	
		25-49	33.3	0.420	3533	
		50-64	21.6	0.441	2870	
		65+	17.6	0.289	2066	
		18+	83.3	0.191	10778	
		18-64	65.7	0.341	7041	
		0-64	82.4	0.289	8272	
	(b) poor population	Total	Total	Total	100.0	0.000
				0-17	26.6	1.143
			18-24	17.3	0.919	420
			25-49	34.1	1.144	934
			50-64	15.2	1.109	420
			65+	6.7	1.115	121
			18+	73.4	1.143	1813
			18-64	66.7	1.212	1369
			0-64	93.3	1.115	1248
			Total	100.0	0.000	
			0-17	30.1	1.610	407
			18-24	17.9	1.438	227
			25-49	33.1	1.533	476
		50-64	15.6	1.505	209	
		65+	3.2	0.936	23	
		18+	69.9	1.610	982	
		18-64	66.7	1.670	810	
		0-64	96.8	0.936	515	
		Total	100.0	0.000		
		0-17	23.3	1.452	322	
		18-24	16.8	1.150	289	
		25-49	35.1	1.864	397	
		50-64	14.8	1.392	214	
		65+	10.1	1.613	123	
		18+	76.7	1.452	1058	
		18-64	66.6	1.769	703	
		0-64	89.9	1.613	837	

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary
Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2007 – continued-

			Standard error	Effective sample size		
17 Distribution of population by most frequent activity Status and gender - (a) total population	Total	18+	100.0			
		At work	48.5	0.256	7743	
	Male	Not at work	51.5	0.256	9576	
		of which: unemployed	4.3	0.203	716	
		of which: retired	33.0	0.117	6041	
		of which: other inactive	14.2	0.198	2755	
		18+	100.0			
		At work	56.4	0.512	4388	
	Female	Not at work	43.6	0.512	3879	
		of which: unemployed	4.8	0.347	391	
		of which: retired	28.1	0.296	378	
		of which: other inactive	10.6	0.366	269	
		18+	100.0			
		At work	41.7	0.405	3597	
	(b) poor population	Total	Not at work	58.3	0.405	5918
			of which: unemployed	3.9	0.303	358
		Male	of which: retired	37.2	0.250	3014
of which: other inactive			17.3	0.366	1852	
18+			100.0			
At work			27.3	1.417	526	
Not at work			72.7	1.417	1733	
of which: unemployed			19.0	1.457	390	
Female		of which: retired	25.2	1.386	638	
		of which: other inactive	28.5	1.126	714	
		18+	100.0			
		At work	35.3	2.336	339	
		Not at work	64.7	2.336	696	
		of which: unemployed	23.9	2.367	206	
Total		of which: retired	21.0	1.839	226	
		of which: other inactive	19.9	1.837	221	
		18+	100.0			
	At work	20.5	1.871	177		
	Not at work	79.5	1.871	959		
	of which: unemployed	14.9	1.848	145		
Male	of which: retired	28.7	1.561	371		
	of which: other inactive	36.0	1.988	505		

2. Accuracy

2.1. Sample design

2.1.1. Type of sampling

2007 was the third year for the Hungarian EU-SILC survey. In 2007 a new rotational group with 6315 dwellings was introduced, the sample design of which coincides with the previous year sample design. The Hungarian EU-SILC survey was a supplementary survey in 2005, the new rotational group in 2006 was standalone and newly introduced rotational group in 2007 was similar.

It has 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.

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.

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 295, 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.).

2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria

6315 dwellings were selected in 2007. 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.

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary

Table 2. Sample size

	Number
Selected addresses	12598
Contacted addresses	12365
Can not be located	8
Unable to access	0
Non-residential, unoccupied, not principal residence	225

2.1.5. Sample selection shames

Localities were selected with pps, where size is measured by the number of dwellings. Dwellings in a selected locality 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 2007 with reference month of March 2007. The field work period covered nearly two months because of field work allocation and workload related reasons.

Table 3. Fieldwork timing and sample development over time

Weeks of interview	Achieved sample size	Distribution of achieved sample
1 March - 5 March	237	2.7%
6 March - 12 March	576	6.6%
13 March - 19 March	818	9.4%
20 March - 26 March	1046	12.0%
27 March - 2 April	653	7.5%
3 April - 9 April	693	7.9%
10 April - 16 April	1994	22.8%
17 April - 23 April	1602	18.3%
24 April - 30 April	922	10.6%
1 May - 7 May	164	1.9%
8 May - 14 May	26	0.3%
15 May - 21 May	4	0.0%
22 May - 28 May	2	0.0%
Total	8737	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 dwellings 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 4103 new dwellings were introduced. In 2007 rotational group 2 (of size 1697) was dropped and 6315 new dwellings were introduced as rotational group 6.

Table 4. Size of rotational groups (selected sample)

	2005	2006	2007
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
Rotational group5	-	4 130	2 655
Rotational group6	-	-	6 315
Total sample	13 975	9 767	12 598

2.1.8. Weighting

This chapter describes the computation of weights of EU-SILC sample 2007.

2.1.8.1. Design factors

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 dwellings in stratum j , and l_j is the number of selected dwellings. $w_j \in [44,4600]$.

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 strata. Primary weight in stratum j , $w'_j = L_j / l'_j$, where l'_j is the number of observed dwellings.

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 the constantly updated Census 2001. Iterative raking scale method were applied. For the integrative calibration the following controls were used:

- Population totals of sex*age groups defined by ages 0-15, 16-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60 or more;
- Population totals of regions (NUTS2 level);
- Number of households with members 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or more;
- Population totals by activity status;
- Population totals by qualification;
- Population totals of actives by qualification;
- Population totals by types of localities.

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 [110,1100].

2.1.9. Substitution

There was no substitution in the survey.

2.2. Sampling errors

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

Income component		Mean	Nr of observation		Standard error	Effective sample size
			Before imputation	After imputation		
<i>Gross income components on personal level</i>						
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1 422 612	8 509	8 710	16 588	5 477
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	98 872	653	653	11 879	477
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	758 234	1 845	1 878	59 264	906
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	44 763	1 044	1 044	4 201	433
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	337 056	26	26	92 907	54
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	231 524	1 017	1 017	14 099	768
PY100G	Old-age benefit	854 959	5 223	5 314	5 383	3 368
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	442 483	255	255	25 015	181
PY120G	Sickness benefit	106 029	1 110	1 110	7 820	622
PY130G	Disability benefit	514 203	1 701	1 716	9 154	808
PY140G	Education related allowances	114 176	270	270	7 523	397
<i>Gross income components on household level</i>						
HY010	Total household gross income	2 428 067	8 728	8 728	26 020	6 031
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 947 716	8 732	8 732	17 298	6 055
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 696 453	8 630	8 630	17 327	5 666
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 357 851	7 347	7 347	20 136	4 736
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	545 977	161	161	113 058	114
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	377 952	2 774	2 779	7 173	1 420
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	52 470	350	350	3 903	443
HY070G	Housing allowances	49 771	656	656	2 393	630
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	107 890	1 356	1 356	5 479	403
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	679 975	97	97	123 903	105
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	217 510	963	963	7 997	356
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	184 292	9	9	85 902	6
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14 151	4 948	4 948	183	2 321
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	76 361	1 084	1 084	3 731	655
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	712 349	5 660	5 660	13 738	3 843

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 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	1 410 237	3 922 348	4 027 363	15 474
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	98 653	301 555	301 555	15 256
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	893 234	870 871	889 642	58 792
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	49 644	411281	411 281	4 830
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	388 738	11 722	11 722	139 349
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	247 210	468 175	468 175	18 395
PY100G	Old-age benefit	861 340	2 061 457	2 101 332	5 508
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	439 261	105 950	105 950	29 782
PY120G	Sickness benefit	104 599	524 745	524 745	7 263
PY130G	Disability benefit	521 900	734 473	740 794	10 406
PY140G	Education related allowances	112 671	109 494	109 494	8 121
HY010	Total household gross income	2 510 148	3 808 237	3 808 237	26 020
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 998 043	3 809 204	3 809 204	17 298
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 737 966	3 763 777	3 763 777	17 327
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 430 903	3270971	3 270 971	20 136
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	599 990	67 485	67 485	113 058
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	371 931	1 286 830	1 289 422	7 173
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	49 203	149 079	149 079	3 903
HY070G	Housing allowances	49 971	265 638	265 638	2 393
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	111 141	578 490	578 490	5 479
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	783 803	46 176	46 176	123 903
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	222 814	469 898	469 898	7 997
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	184 734	3 790	3 790	85 902
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14 552	2 220 489	2 220 489	183
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	79 198	465 773	465 773	3 731
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	720 485	2 608 081	2 608 081	13 738

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

Disposable income	Mean	Number of observation	Standard error	Effective sample size
<i>Equivalised disposable income By household size</i>				
1 household member	998 719	2 283	17 170	1 459
2 household member	1 230 349	5 308	18 789	3 241
3 household member	1 238 474	4 872	22 059	4 001
4 and more household member	1 096 358	9 834	14 661	6 183
<i>Per capita disposable income</i>				
<i>Population by age groups</i>				
Under 25	602 105	6 346	6 726	4 224
25-34	817 507	3 094	16 892	2 284
35-44	696 222	2 839	11 311	1 984
45-54	816 439	3 290	12 944	2 272
55-64	930 052	2 990	16 034	1 872
65+	859 721	3 738	8 202	2 495
<i>Population by gender</i>				
Male	754 889	10 274	6 319	8 140
Female	769 504	12 023	5 781	7 081
<i>Total</i>	<i>762 770</i>	<i>22 297</i>	<i>5 350</i>	<i>15 767</i>

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) the following steps were done:

- The questionnaire was formed according to Eurostat requirements.

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary

- 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

Due to the restructuring of the organization of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO) 7 regional office was formed in 2006. Regional Office of North Great Plain centered in Debrecen became responsible for organization and fieldwork related to social surveys including EU-SILC. The reorganization was taken place in the Central office in Budapest as well. Reorganization affected the former Social Statistics Department responsible for EU-SILC 2005 and 2006. The management and responsibility of the survey was transferred to Living Standard and Labour Force Statistics Department. 2007 was the first survey year among this newly formed organization structure.

The training for interviewers was organized by Debrecen regional Office with support of Living Standard and Labour Force Statistics Department.

A uniformed training schedule and script were used for training. The training contained four parts:

- General information
- Specific difficulties of the questionnaires (theoretical part)
- Problems with the two questionnaires which were asked before the fieldwork (test interviewing)
- Procedure of controlling.

Fieldwork, controlling

During the fieldwork Debrecen Regional Office monitored the ratio of the address contacted and the response rate in case of each interviewer.

Supervisors at Debrecen Office 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 Debrecen Regional Office and head office experts. After the testing the data entry program was corrected.

Approximately 50 colleagues made the data entry. A hot-line was established for any kind of problem during the recording. All the calls were answered by experts and IT specialist in the head office.

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:

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary

- 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 2007 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	12 598	1 708	1 920	2 655	6 315
Achieved sample size	8 737	1 548	1 755	2 286	3 148
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.69	0.91	0.91	0.86	0.50

Table 9. Sample size and rotational groups on personal level

Personal level	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Selected sample size	22 297	4 026	4 531	5 755	7 985
Achieved sample size	18 490	3 331	3 775	4 855	6 529
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.84	0.82

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

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

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

$$Ra=\frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}}=\frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]} = \mathbf{0.9994}$$

$$Rh=\frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}}=\frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]} = \mathbf{0.7066}$$

$$NRh=(1-(0.9994*0.7066))*100=\mathbf{29.38 \%}$$

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

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

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

$$Rh=\frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}}=\frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]} = \mathbf{0.5154}$$

$$NRh=(1-(0.9997*0.5154))*100=\mathbf{48.48 \%}$$

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary
Individual non-response rate (NRp)- for the total sample

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

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

$$\frac{\Sigma[RB250=11]}{\Sigma[RB245=1]} = \mathbf{1.00}$$

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

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

$$NRp=(1-(0.994*0.7066*1.00))*100=\mathbf{29.38 \%}$$

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

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

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

$$\frac{\Sigma[RB250=11]}{\Sigma[RB245=1]} = \mathbf{1.00}$$

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

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

$$NRp=(1-(0.9997*0.5154*1.00))*100=\mathbf{48.48 \%}$$

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)	12 365	1 705	1 914	2 638	6 108
Address can not be located (21)	8	0	1	5	2
Address unable to access (22)	0	0	0	0	0
Address does not exist or etc (23)	225	3	5	12	205
Not contacted address (24)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12 598	1 708	1 920	2 655	6 315

Table 11. Distribution of DB130

DB130- Household questionnaire result	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Household questionnaire completed (11)	8 737	1 548	1 755	2 286	3 148
Refusal to co-operate (21)	2 123	89	82	209	1 743
Entire household temporarily away (22)	822	24	17	39	742
Household unable to respond (23)	226	2	9	21	194
Other reason(24)	457	42	51	83	281
Total	12 365	1 705	1 914	2 638	6 108

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2007 Hungary
Table 12. Distribution of DB135

DB135- Household interview acceptance	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Interview accepted for database (1)	8 737	1 548	1 755	2 286	3 148
Interview rejected (2)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8 737	1 548	1 755	2 286	3 148

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	8 728	99.9	8 728	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY020	Total disposable household income	8 732	99.9	8 732	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	8 630	98.8	8 630	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	7 347	84.1	7 347	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY023									
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	161	1.8	161	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	2 779	31.8	2 774	99.8	5	0.2	0	0.0
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	350	4.0	350	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY070G	Housing allowances	656	7.5	656	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	1 356	15.5	1 356	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY080G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	97	1.1	97	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY090G									
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	963	11.0	963	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	9	0.1	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	4 948	56.6	4 948	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	1 084	12.4	1 084	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	5 660	64.8	5 660	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

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

Personal income items		Persons having received an amount		Full information		Partial information		Missing	
		count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	8 710	47.1	8 509	97.7	201	2.4	0	0.0
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	653	3.5	653	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 878	10.2	1 845	98.2	33	1.8	0	0.0
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	1 044	5.6	1 044	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	26	0.1	26	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	1 017	5.5	1 017	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY100G	Old-age benefit	5 314	28.7	5 223	98.3	91	1.7	0	0.0
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	255	1.4	255	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY120G	Sickness benefit	1 110	6.0	1 110	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY130G	Disability benefit	1 716	9.3	1 701	99.1	15	0.9	0	0.0
PY140G	Education related allowances	270	1.5	270	100.0	0	0.0	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)	18 490	3 331	3 775	4 855	6 529
From register...no reason (12-33)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18 490	3 331	3 775	4 855	6 529

Table 16. Distribution of RB260

RB260- Contact address	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
PAPI (1)	14 768	2 732	3 077	3 940	5 019
CAPI, CATI, Other(2,3,4)	0	0	0	0	0
Proxy(5)	3 722	599	698	915	1 510
Total	18 490	3 331	3 775	4 855	6 529

Table 17. Interview duration in minutes

Interview	Mean	By household size	Mean
Household interview	25	HH with 1 member	46
Personal interview	21	HH with 2 members	65
Total (at household level)	68	HH with 3 members	77
		HH with 4 members	85
		HH with 5+ members	98
		Total	68

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 60 households where the established function did not fit and those records did not receive an estimated imputed rent.

Table 18. Regression model

Coefficients	Unstandardized B	Standardized t	Std. Error
(Constant)	38.02203364	21.62945843	0.000000
Region	-3.731532905	-31.96245305	0.000000
Number of rooms	3.639812026	11.50614607	0.000000
Type of settlement	-9.791658895	-33.51649027	0.000000
Size of dwelling (in m2)	0.228528937	18.95341256	0.000000
2 bathrooms	10.4554476	10.58019818	0.000000
Cost of housing maintenance	0.1418418	10.53963897	0.000000
Public sewerage	4.758449106	7.953670328	0.000000
District heating	-4.965667004	-6.288300306	0.000000
Problems in dwelling environment	-1.0817903	-4.632390953	0.000004
Gas, water, electricity, sewerage	2.627095926	5.485986741	0.000000
Availability of health services in the neighbourhood	1.850796497	5.42871969	0.000000
Toilet in the dwelling	2.576583967	3.715035299	0.000205
Detached house	2.637984581	3.324270857	0.000890
Dwelling warm in winter, cold in summer	1.746272899	2.655701919	0.007929

Table 19. Number of imputed records

Household with estimated imputed rent	8 359
Households with missing values in explaining variables	41
Household not received estimated imputed rent	60
Household with actual market rental	277
Total	8 737

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 2007.

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 2006.
- 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 2007.
- viii. Total duration of data collection of the sample*
The data collection lasted 13 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 2.3.
- 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 75 % of her/his former salary, but not higher than 80 000 HUF (about 320 Euro/months). 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 (about 110 Euro). 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.

Household Budget Survey (HBS)

HBS collects information on Hungarian private households' expenditures and incomes as well. Key income items on personal level and the most important income items on household level were compared with EU-SILC 2007 data. The comparison was done using national currency (HUF).

Table 20. Comparison of key personal and household income items of EU-SILC and HBS

	Income items	EU-SILC	HBS
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1 410 237	1 260 312
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	247 210	225 148
PY100G	Old-age benefit	861 340	842 537
HY010	Total household gross income	2 510 148	2 598 584
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 998 043	1 972 485
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 737 966	1 785 676
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	371 931	362 267
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	111 141	117 923

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 21. Number of persons working full time and part-time employment (thousand)

	Working full time			Working part-time			Total
	man	woman	sum	man	woman	sum	
EU-SILC	2 014.6	1 682.0	3 696.6	70.1	127.2	197.4	3 894.0
LFS (I. quarter year)	2 071.1	1 679.2	3 750.3	54.4	100.8	155.2	3 905.5

EU-SILC

In a strict sense EU-SILC datasets are not considered as external sources, but it provides the opportunity to compare the results of 3 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 was published in September 2008.

<http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/laekindikator/laekindikator07.pdf>

Table 22. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2005, 2006 and 2007 (weighted)

weighted		2005		2006		2007	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1 190 048	18 898	1 378 174	21 143	1 410 237	15 474
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	273 773	29 171	70 510	4 241	98 653	15 256
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1107 428	63 864	1 861 218	99 261	893 234	58 792
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	84 413	6 198	0	0	49 644	4 830
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	223 454	39 140	171 382	32 102	388 738	139 349
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	235 522	14 374	185 629	13 192	247 210	18 395
PY100G	Old-age benefit	725 935	5 227	796 206	7 538	861 340	5 508
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	216 385	14 113	316 294	18 156	439 261	29 782
PY120G	Sickness benefit	123 267	7 165	81 945	5 346	104 599	7 263
PY130G	Disability benefit	398 041	7 427	526 610	9 731	521 900	10 406
PY140G	Education related allowances	81 073	6 367	88 714	6 017	112 671	8 121
<i>Income components on household level</i>							
HY010	Total household gross income	2 104 914	29 723	2 447 399	34 664	2 510 148	26 020
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 639 022	17 273	1 968 043	27 270	1 998 043	17 298
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 125 088	17 548	1 784 588	28 050	1 737 966	17 327
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 217 498	21 308	1 595 723	33 000	1 430 903	20 136
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	347 719	48 525	278 499	69 557	599 990	113 058
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	270 218	5 301	268 548	5 755	371 931	7 173
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	111 222	7 076	42 755	8 259	49 203	3 903
HY070G	Housing allowances	44 623	3 606	49 010	2 854	49 971	2 393
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	156 467	9 811	311 243	34 887	111141	5 479
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	219 051	90 562	338 028	66 443	783 803	123 903
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	219 525	10 937	249 095	12 549	222 814	7 997
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	102 499	22 761	45 581	26 574	184 734	85 902
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14 301	318	15 778	359	14 552	183
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	113 933	7 053	277 097	21 319	79 198	3 731
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	660 784	19 900	649 140	18 330	720 485	13738

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,2006 and 2007

			2005	Age group change	2006	2007	
1 Mean equivalised disposable income							
2	Risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$NAT	519,937		572,577	623,502
			EUR	2,080		2,308	2,359
			PPS	3,430		3,778	3,975
		2 adults 2 dep. children	\$NAT	1,091,867		1,202,412	1,309,354
			EUR	4,367		4,847	4,955
			PPS	7,204		7,933	8,348
3 Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender							
	Total	Total	13.4	Total	15.9	12.6	
		M	13.8		16.3	12.7	
		F	13.0		15.5	12.5	
		0-15	Total	19.5	0-17	24.4	19.1
		0-64	Total	14.6	0-64	17.1	13.7
			M	15.1		17.6	13.9
			F	14.2		16.6	13.5
		16+	Total	12.1	18+	13.6	11.2
			M	12.5		13.7	11.0
			F	11.8		13.4	11.3
		16-64	Total	13.4	18-64	14.5	12.2
			M	13.9		14.9	12.2
			F	12.9		14.2	12.2
		16-24	Total	16.7	18-24	18.3	17.9
			M	16.9		17.9	17.0
			F	16.5		18.7	18.8
		25-49	Total	14.1	25-49	15.8	12.5
			M	14.6		15.9	11.9
			F	13.6		15.7	13.1
		50-64	Total	10.1	50-64	11.2	8.6
			M	10.6		12.1	9.7
			F	9.8		10.4	6.3
		65+	Total	6.5	65+	9.4	6.3
			M	4.2		6.9	3.3
F	7.9			10.8	8.0		
4 Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity							
	Total	Total	9.8		6.9	6.0	
		M	10.6		8.1	6.8	
		F	8.9		5.4	5.0	
(a) At work	Total	Total	14.9		19.6	15.4	
		M	15.2		20.7	15.6	
		F	14.7		18.9	15.3	
(d) Not at work	Total	Total	49.2		52.9	47.2	
		M	53.5		54.9	52.6	
		F	45.2		50.6	41.3	
(e1) Of which: Unemployed	Total	Total	9.9		11.7	8.3	
		M	9.2		11.9	7.9	
		F	10.4		11.7	8.6	
(e2) Of which: Retired	Total	Total	17.4		25.8	22.3	
		M	15.4		23.4	19.2	
		F	19.0		26.9	24.0	
(f) Of which: Other inactive	Total	Total	9.8		6.9	6.0	
		M	10.6		8.1	6.8	
		F	8.9		5.4	5.0	

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,2006 and 2007-continued

			2005	Age group change	2006	2007
5	Risk-of-poverty rate by household type	All hh no dep. childr.	9.6		10.1	7.9
		1 person hh	Total	18.5	17.6	15.8
		1 person hh	M	24.1	24.7	20.2
		1 person hh	F	15.5	14.5	13.9
		1 person hh <65yrs		25.7	22.0	20.6
		1 person hh 65+		10.5	13.5	11.3
		2 adults no dep. childr. (both < 65)		9.3	10.5	8.8
		2 adults no dep. childr. (at least one 65+)		4.4	8.1	4.3
		Other hh no dep. childr.		5.7	5.9	4.0
		All hh with dep. childr.		16.8	20.5	16.3
		Single parent (at least 1 child)		27.1	38.9	29.0
		2 adults 1 dep. child		15.1	13.6	11.6
		2 adults 2 dep. childr.		15.0	18.0	14.7
		2 adults 3+ dep. childr.		23.9	33.2	27.4
		Other hh with dep. childr.		12.9	14.7	11.1
6	Risk-of-poverty rate by accommodation tenure status					
	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	13.0		15.3	11.9
	(b) Tenant	Total	18.8		24.9	21.8
7	Risk-of-poverty rate by work intensity of the household	All hh no dep. childr.	WI = 0	18.2	21.7	16.4
			0 < WI < 1	9.5	9.0	7.6
			WI = 1	7.0	2.3	2.7
		All hh with dep. childr.	WI = 0	56.3	72.5	62.0
			0 < WI < 0.5	43.7	51.9	42.1
			0.5 <= WI < 1	22.7	15.9	12.9
			WI = 1	10.2	5.8	6.2

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,2006 and 2007-continued

		2005		Age group change	2006	2007	
9 Risk-of-poverty rate before and after transfers by age and gender (a) before all transfers	Total	Total	49.8	Total	48.6	49.4	
		M	47.7		46.7	47.3	
		F	51.6		50.4	51.3	
	0-15	Total	48.0	0-17	47.6	49.2	
	16+	Total	50.2	18+	48.9	49.4	
		M	47.6		46.5	46.7	
		F	52.4		51.0	51.8	
	16-64	Total	41.2	18-64	40.0	41.1	
		M	40.3		39.2	39.7	
		F	42.0		40.7	42.3	
	65+	Total	89.7	65+	87.4	88.0	
		M	89.8		88.7	89.3	
		F	89.6		86.6	87.3	
	(b) including pensions	Total	Total	29.3	Total	29.6	29.3
		M	30.1		30.2	29.9	
		F	28.7		29.0	28.7	
	0-15	Total	44.8	0-17	44.0	45.0	
	16+	Total	26.2	18+	25.7	25.8	
		M	26.7		26.2	26.1	
		F	25.7		25.4	25.5	
16-64	Total	29.5	18-64	28.5	29.0		
	M	30.1		29.0	29.3		
	F	29.0		28.1	28.8		
65+	Total	11.4	65+	13.7	11.0		
	M	7.0		9.7	7.0		
	F	14.0		15.9	13.3		
13 Relative median risk-of-poverty gap by age and gender	Total	Total	18.8	Total	24.0	20.1	
		M	19.3		25.2	21.2	
		F	17.9		23.3	19.4	
	0-15	Total	18.8	0-17	25.2	19.8	
	16+	Total	18.7	18+	23.7	20.4	
		M	19.9		25.1	20.8	
		F	17.6		22.6	19.9	
	16-64	Total	19.9	18-64	24.9	21.4	
		M	21.1		25.4	21.2	
		F	19.2		24.1	21.8	
	65+	Total	9.3	65+	17.0	13.9	
		M	8.5		20.5	10.4	
	F	10.8		15.6	14.5		
14 S80/S20 quintile share ratio			4.0		5.5	3.7	
15 Gini coefficient			0.275		0.333	0.260	

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,2006 and 2007-continued

		2005		Age group change	2006		2007		
16 Distribution of popul. by age and gender (a) total population	Total	Total	100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
		0-15	17.1	0-17	18.0	18.1	18.1	18.1	
		16-24	11.6	18-24	11.9	11.6	11.6	11.6	
		25-49	36.3	25-49	35.4	34.7	34.7	34.7	
		50-64	19.7	50-64	19.8	20.9	20.9	20.9	
		65+	15.3	65+	15.0	14.6	14.6	14.6	
		16+	82.9	18+	82.0	81.9	81.9	81.9	
		16-64	67.6	18-64	67.1	67.3	67.3	67.3	
		0-64	84.7	0-64	85.1	85.4	85.4	85.4	
		Total	100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
		Male	0-15	18.5	0-17	19.4	19.6	19.6	19.6
			16-24	12.5	18-24	13.2	12.7	12.7	12.7
			25-49	38.2	25-49	36.8	36.3	36.3	36.3
			50-64	18.9	50-64	19.3	20.1	20.1	20.1
	65+		12.0	65+	11.4	11.3	11.3	11.3	
	16+		81.5	18+	80.6	80.4	80.4	80.4	
	16-64		69.5	18-64	69.2	69.1	69.1	69.1	
	0-64		88.0	0-64	88.6	88.7	88.7	88.7	
	Total		100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Female		0-15	15.9	0-17	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7
			16-24	10.9	18-24	65.1	10.7	10.7	10.7
			25-49	34.6	25-49	34.1	33.3	33.3	33.3
			50-64	20.4	50-64	20.3	21.6	21.6	21.6
			65+	18.3	65+	18.1	17.6	17.6	17.6
16+		84.1	18+	83.3	83.3	83.3	83.3		
16-64		12.9	18-64	65.1	65.7	65.7	65.7		
0-64		14.2	0-64	81.9	82.4	82.4	82.4		
Total		100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		
(b) poor population		Total	Total	100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
			0-15	24.9	0-17	28.5	26.6	26.6	26.6
			16-24	14.5	18-24	13.7	17.3	17.3	17.3
			25-49	38.3	25-49	35.1	34.1	34.1	34.1
			50-64	14.9	50-64	13.9	15.2	15.2	15.2
	65+		7.5	65+	8.8	6.7	6.7	6.7	
	16+		75.1	18+	71.5	73.4	73.4	73.4	
	16-64		67.7	18-64	62.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	
	0-64		92.6	0-64	91.2	93.3	93.3	93.3	
	Total		100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	Male		0-15	26.1	0-17	30.7	30.1	30.1	30.1
			16-24	15.3	18-24	14.4	17.9	17.9	17.9
			25-49	40.5	25-49	35.8	33.1	33.1	33.1
			50-64	14.5	50-64	14.3	15.6	15.6	15.6
		65+	3.7	65+	4.8	3.2	3.2	3.2	
		16+	74.0	18+	69.3	69.9	69.9	69.9	
		16-64	13.9	18-64	64.5	66.7	66.7	66.7	
		0-64	15.1	0-64	95.2	96.8	96.8	96.8	
		Total	100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
		Female	0-15	23.7	0-17	26.3	23.3	23.3	23.3
			16-24	13.8	18-24	13.0	16.8	16.8	16.8
			25-49	36.1	25-49	34.4	35.1	35.1	35.1
			50-64	15.3	50-64	13.6	14.8	14.8	14.8
			65+	11.1	65+	12.6	10.1	10.1	10.1
16+	76.3		18+	73.7	76.7	76.7	76.7		
16-64	65.2		18-64	61.0	66.6	66.6	66.6		

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,2006 and 2007-continued

			2005	Age group change	2006	2007		
<i>Distribution of population by most frequent activity</i>								
17	<i>Status and gender – (a) total population</i>	<i>Total</i>	16+	100.0	18+	100.0	100.0	
			<i>At work</i>	55.1		46.6	48.5	
			<i>Not at work</i>	44.9		53.4	51.5	
			<i>of which:</i>					
			<i>unemployed</i>	4.1		5.6	4.3	
			<i>of which: retired</i>	32.2		32.6	33.0	
			<i>of which: other</i>					
			<i>inactive</i>	8.6		15.2	14.2	
			<i>Male</i>	16+	100.0	18+	100.0	100.0
				<i>At work</i>	60.4		54.0	56.4
				<i>Not at work</i>	39.6		46.0	43.6
				<i>of which:</i>				
				<i>unemployed</i>	4.2		6.6	4.8
				<i>of which: retired</i>	27.0		27.7	28.1
				<i>of which: other</i>				
				<i>inactive</i>	8.4		11.8	10.6
			<i>Female</i>	16+	100.0	18+	100.0	100.0
		<i>At work</i>	50.5		40.2	41.7		
		<i>Not at work</i>	49.6		59.8	58.3		
		<i>of which:</i>						
		<i>unemployed</i>	4.0		4.7	3.9		
		<i>of which: retired</i>	36.7		37.0	37.2		
		<i>of which: other</i>						
		<i>inactive</i>	8.8		18.2	17.3		
<hr/>								
<i>(b) poor population</i>								
		<i>Total</i>	16+	100.0	18+	100.0	100.0	
			<i>At work</i>	44.5		23.2	27.3	
			<i>Not at work</i>	55.5		76.7	72.7	
			<i>of which:</i>					
			<i>unemployed</i>	16.7		21.5	19.0	
			<i>of which: retired</i>	26.5		27.8	25.2	
			<i>of which: other</i>					
			<i>inactive</i>	12.4		27.4	28.5	
			<i>Male</i>	16+	100.0	18+	100.0	100.0
				<i>At work</i>	51.5		31.3	35.3
				<i>Not at work</i>	48.5		68.7	64.7
				<i>of which:</i>				
				<i>unemployed</i>	18.1		26.0	23.9
				<i>of which: retired</i>	20.1		23.5	21.0
				<i>of which: other</i>				
				<i>inactive</i>	10.4		19.2	19.9
			<i>Female</i>	16+	100.0	18+	100.0	100.0
		<i>At work</i>	38.0		16.0	20.5		
		<i>Not at work</i>	62.0		84.0	79.5		
		<i>of which:</i>						
		<i>unemployed</i>	15.4		17.6	14.9		
		<i>of which: retired</i>	32.3		31.6	28.7		
		<i>of which: other</i>						
		<i>inactive</i>	14.2		34.8	36.0		