



Intermediate Quality Report

**For EU-SILC 2008 operation
Cross sectional data**

Hungary

December 2009.

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

Index of tables

<i>Table 1:</i> Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC 2008	6
<i>Table 2:</i> Sample size	9
<i>Table 3:</i> Fieldwork timing and sample development over time	9
<i>Table 4:</i> Size of rotational groups	10
<i>Table 5:</i> Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, effective sample size, unweighted	12
<i>Table 6:</i> Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, effective sample size, weighted	13
<i>Table 7:</i> Mean, number of observation, standard error for disposable income	14
<i>Table 8:</i> Sample size and rotational groups on household level	16
<i>Table 9:</i> Sample size and rotational groups on personal level	16
<i>Table 10:</i> Distribution of DB120	17
<i>Table 11:</i> Distribution of DB130	18
<i>Table 12:</i> Distribution of DB135	18
<i>Table 13:</i> Item non-response on household level by income items	19
<i>Table 14:</i> Item non-response on personal level by personal income items	20
<i>Table 15:</i> Distribution of RB250	21
<i>Table 16:</i> Distribution of RB260	21
<i>Table 17:</i> Interview duration in minutes	21
<i>Table 18:</i> Regression model for imputed rent calculation	22
<i>Table 19:</i> Number of imputed records	23
<i>Table 20:</i> Comparison of key personal and household income items of EU-SILC and HBS	25
<i>Table 21:</i> Number of persons aged 16-74 by self-classification and by gender in HU-LFS and HU-EU-SILC, 2008	26
<i>Table 22:</i> Comparison of income target variables of EU-SILC2005, 2006,2007 and 2008 weighted	27
<i>Table 23:</i> Comparison of common cross-sectional indicators of EU-SILC2005,2006, 2007 and 2008	29

Introduction

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

1. Common Cross Sectional European Union Indicators

2008 was the fourth 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.

Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2008

				Standard error	Effective sample size
1 Risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$\$NAT	663367	5 545,06	1 577
		EUR	2639	20,98	1 577
		PPS	3993	37,05	1 501
	2 adults 2 dep. children	\$\$NAT	1393070	11 644,63	2 166
		EUR	5542	44,07	2 166
		PPS	8385	77,80	2 062
2 Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender	Total	Total	12	0,64	15 411
		M	12	0,61	8 610
		F	12	0,58	9 699
	0-17	Total	20	1,36	3 197
		Total	14	0,63	14 774
		M	14	0,68	7 472
	0-64	F	14	0,68	7 573
		Total	12	0,56	11 423
		M	12	0,62	5 735
	18-64	F	12	0,62	5 856
		Total	18	1,34	1 606
		M	16	1,53	862
	18-24	F	20	1,79	784
		Total	12	0,66	5 915
		M	12	0,78	2 801
	25-49	F	13	0,72	3 122
		Total	9	0,69	3 955
		M	9	0,96	1 891
	50-64	F	8	0,74	2 308
		Total	4	0,57	3 051
		M	3	0,80	1 128
	65+	F	5	0,65	2 050
3 Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity	Total	Total	5	0,40	6 190
		M	6	0,55	3 363
		F	4	0,46	3 126
	(a) At work	Total	15	0,98	5 514
		M	15	1,16	2 449
		F	15	1,00	3 549
	(d) Not at work	Total	48	3,16	596
		M	49	3,75	335
		F	48	4,11	281
	(e1) Of which: Unemployed	Total	7	0,61	4 708
		M	7	0,84	2 054
		F	7	0,67	2 934
	(e2) Of which: Retired	Total	24	1,33	1 890
		M	20	1,90	597
		F	25	1,47	1 341
	(f) Of which: Other inactive	Total	8	0,61	2 271
		M	23	2,26	571
		F	12	1,05	1 512
4 Risk-of-poverty rate by household type	All hh no dep. childr.	Total	8	0,61	2 271
		M	23	2,26	571
		F	12	1,05	1 512
	1 person hh	Total	22	1,67	986
		M	8	1,04	8 758
		F	9	1,25	2 038
	1 person hh <65yrs	(both < 65)	3	0,77	1 878
		(at least one 65+)	5	1,18	1 299
		Total	16	0,90	9 632
	1 person hh 65+	Single parent	33	3,36	909
		(at least 1 child)	11	1,37	2 105
		Total	16	1,72	2 680
	2 adults no dep. childr.	Total	29	3,45	1 368
		M	11	1,74	2 894
		F	11	1,74	2 894
	2 adults 1 dep. childr.	Total	11	1,74	2 894
		M	11	1,74	2 894
		F	11	1,74	2 894
5 Risk-of-poverty rate by accomodation tenurestatus	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	12	0,57	16 810
		M	12	0,57	16 810
		F	12	0,57	16 810
(b) Tenant	Total	Total	25	2,96	1 036
		M	25	2,96	1 036
		F	25	2,96	1 036

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2008 Hungary
Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2007 –continued

				Standard error	Effective sample size	
6	Risk-of-poverty rate	All hh no dep. childr.	WI = 0	15	1,80	2 025
	by work intensity of		0 < WI < 1	7	1,13	2 266
	the household		WI = 1	2	0,40	1 969
		All hh with dep. childr.	WI = 0	56	4,15	998
			0 < WI < 0.5	34	4,71	915
			0.5 <= WI < 1	13	1,33	3 857
			WI = 1	4	0,72	4 262
7	Risk-of-poverty rate	Total	Total	52	1,48	6 974
	before and after transfers		M	50	1,34	4 395
	by age and gender		F	54	1,65	3 649
	(a) before all transfers	0-17	Total	52	1,65	2 944
		18+	Total	44	1,53	5 055
			M	42	1,43	3 098
			F	46	1,64	2 789
		65+	Total	89	0,82	2 878
			M	91	1,07	1 147
			F	88	0,95	1 824
	(b) including pensions	Total	Total	30	0,70	15 056
			M	31	0,74	7 869
			F	30	0,79	7 885
		0-17	Total	47	1,55	3 055
		18-64	Total	30	0,63	11 575
			M	30	0,74	5 646
			F	30	0,69	5 974
		65+	Total	10	0,79	3 107
			M	7	1,10	1 077
			F	11	0,89	2 133
13	Relative median	Total	Total	17	1,36	16 216
	risk-of-poverty gap		M	18	1,56	7 141
	by age and gender		F	17	1,35	9 326
		0-17	Total	17	2,35	2 815
		18-64	Total	18	1,33	10 881
			M	18	1,49	5 128
			F	18	1,35	6 104
		65+	Total	10	1,57	2 743
			M	10	2,76	1 110
			F	10	1,66	1 573
14	S80/S20 quintile share ratio			3,6	0,08	7 029
15	Gini coefficient			0,25	0,43	7 310

2. Accuracy

2.1. Sample design

2.1.1. Type of sampling

2008 was the fourth year for the Hungarian EU-SILC survey. In 2008 a new rotational group (number 7) with 4103 dwellings was introduced, the sample design of which coincides with the sample design of the first year's Hungarian EU-SILC design (in 2005). The Hungarian EU-SILC survey was a supplementary survey in 2005, it was carried out in the sub sample of the Micro census sample

The new rotational group 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. The design is the same as of rotational group 4 and 5. Group 6 has a stratified three stage sample design in a part of the population (part III, type III), while a stratified two stage sample design on the other part of the population (part IV., type IV.). Part IV. population consists of mostly the bigger localities, part III. consists of the rest.

2.1.2. Sampling units

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

2.1.3. Stratification criteria

Localities of Hungary were stratified by size.

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

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

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

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2008 Hungary

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

2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria

11459 dwellings were selected in 2008. Based on the minimum effective sample size we took expected non-response rate at the first wave and attrition over time into account. We calculate higher non-response rate in urban area, and somewhat lower non-response rate in the rural area.

Table 2. Sample size

	Number
Selected addresses	11459
Contacted addresses	10890
Can not be located	66
Unable to access	5
Non-residential, unoccupied, not principal residence	498

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

2.1. 6. Sample distribution over time

The field work was carried out in March , April and May 2008 with reference month of March 2008. The field work period covered three 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 - 2 March	51	0.58%
3 March - 9 March	461	5.23%
10 March - 16 March	621	7.04%
17 March – 23 March	551	6.25%
24 March - 30 March	688	7.80%
31 March - 6 April	1511	17.14%
7 April - 13 April	1815	20.58%
14 April - 20 April	1525	17.29%
21 April - 27 April	1150	13.04%
28 April - 4 May	293	3.32%
5 May - 11 May	41	0.46%
12 May - 18 May	20	0.23%
19 May - 25 May	42	0.48%
26 May - 1 June	49	0.56%
Total	8818	100.00%

2.1.7. Renewal of the sample, rotational groups

2005 was the first year of EU-SILC in Hungary. The 13 975 selected 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. In 2008 rotational group 3 (of size 1716) was dropped and 4122 new dwellings were introduced as rotational group 7.

Table 4. Size of rotational groups (selected sample)

	2005	2006	2007	2008
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	1805
Rotational group5	-	4 130	2 655	2345
Rotational group6	-	-	6 315	3187
Rotational group7	-	-	-	4122
Total sample	13 975	9 767	12 598	11459

2.1.8. Weighting

This chapter describes the computation of weights of EU-SILC sample 2008.

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 units in stratum j , and l_j is the number of selected units. $w_j \in [740, 1135]$ for each group. For rotational group 6 the same calculation was made with the exception, that weighting classes were defined by regions, category of size of localities and characteristic of head of households (household strata), and that L_j is the estimated number of units in class j . This estimation comes from the frame (master sample) information of HBS which is of size 200000 in terms of household.

2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments

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

2.1.8.3. Adjustment to external data

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

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

Calibration was carried out with a self made SAS program.

2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weights

After calibrating the new and former rotational groups separately, those adjusted weights were reduced proportional to the group size. Finally, one more calibration was applied for the overall sample with a small number of iterations. Final cross-sectional weights for the whole sample are in the interval [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	1 514 845	8 486	8 710	9 498	8 619
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	75 231	789	789	173	734
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	781 021	1 809	1 871	4 796	1 432
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	47 880	1 006	1 006	295	676
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	466 084	41	41	247	42
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	264 418	883	883	799	775
PY100G	Old-age benefit	946 213	5 443	5 533	4 418	5 110
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	442 767	268	268	634	223
PY120G	Sickness benefit	104 363	1 319	1 319	418	1 078
PY130G	Disability benefit	577 712	1 679	1 694	1 830	1 380
PY140G	Education related allowances	141 499	250	250	205	225
<i>Gross income components on household level</i>						
HY010	Total household gross income	2 612 606	8 812	8 812	25 020	8 153
HY020	Total disposable household income	2 055 423	8 816	8 816	16 492	7 999
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 779 388	8 708	8 708	16 375	7 747
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 373 727	7 382	7 382	18 893	6 534
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	524 552	149	149	103 045	117
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	397 317	2 846	2 846	7 204	2 456
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	104 479	542	542	9 707	379
HY070G	Housing allowances	49 531	1 073	1 073	1 675	902
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	159 130	1 108	1 108	8 262	1 070
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	1 202 976	88	88	426 269	75
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	182 590	1 183	1 183	2 737	1 069
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	79 271	14	14	15 061	13
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14 141	5 208	5 208	195	4 313
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	115 979	927	927	6 513	926
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	845 062	5 586	5 586	13 862	5 297

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2008 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	1 489 381	3 881 891	3 996 955	13 517
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	76 487	358 924	358 924	225
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	942 774	847 153	883 192	12 658
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	48 988	389 864	389 864	342
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	444 017	15 757	15 757	254
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	263 042	420 700	420 700	915
PY100G	Old-age benefit	949 236	2 114 943	2 152 543	21 543
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	410 948	109 926	109 926	579
PY120G	Sickness benefit	103 112	609 203	609 203	519
PY130G	Disability benefit	588 141	759 495	766 954	2 267
PY140G	Education related allowances	152 376	100 054	100 054	233
HY010	Total household gross income	2 697 270	2 588 304	2 588 304	41 069
HY020	Total disposable household income	2 101 591	2 589 949	2 589 949	23 423
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 810 434	2 557 429	2 557 429	16 776
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 440 865	2 132 335	2 132 335	34 012
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	599 283	44 235	44 235	122 817
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	388 899	825 595	825 595	7 460
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	105 051	147 165	147 165	10 562
HY070G	Housing allowances	50 098	296 677	296 677	1 980
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	161 739	242 777	242 777	10 332
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	1 238 220	21 681	21 681	308 293
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	188 086	371 974	371 974	3 560
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	72 508	4 034	4 034	14 864
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14 583	1 527 413	1 527 413	223
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	118 197	184 644	184 644	12 587
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	851 769	1 606 048	1 606 048	17 561

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	1 073 052	2 388	14 842	2 107
2 household member	1 310 633	5 330	17 489	2 188
3 household member	1 288 695	4 851	24 838	1 424
4 and more household member	1 158 159	9 794	16 209	1 809
<i>Population by age groups</i>				
Under 25	1 080 054	6 085	13 107	4 840
25-34	1 302 550	2 889	19 095	2 469
35-44	1 201 645	2 904	20 581	2 638
45-54	1 261 316	3 181	19 970	2 861
55-64	1 335 852	3 185	22 648	2 424
65+	1 190 574	4 119	11 491	3 353
<i>Population by gender</i>				
Male	1 223 753	10 360	10 962	9 090
Female	1 190 159	12 003	8 484	10 350
<i>Total</i>	1 205 722	22 363	7 888	7 850

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.

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2008 Hungary

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

- The questionnaire was formed according to Eurostat requirements.
- 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 (Címkartya).
- 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 organization of the field-work of the survey year 2008 was based on the experiences of the previous years.

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.

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

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

2.3.3. Non-response errors

The sample of EU-SILC 2008 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	8846	1655	2132	2503	2556
Achieved sample size	8818	1649	2127	2500	2542
Achieved/Selected sample size	.997	.996	.998	.999	.995

Table 9. Sample size and rotational groups on personal level

Personal level	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Selected sample size	22363	4250	5336	6361	6416
Achieved sample size	18710	3570	4523	5225	5392
Achieved/Selected sample size	.837	.840	.848	.821	.840

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

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

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

$$Ra = \frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]} = \mathbf{0.9935}$$

$$Rh = \frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]} = \mathbf{0.8097}$$

$$NRh = (1 - (0.9935 * 0.8097)) * 100 = \mathbf{19.55 \%}$$

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

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

$$Ra = \frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]} = \mathbf{0.9839}$$

$$Rh = \frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]} = \mathbf{0.7047}$$

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2008 Hungary
 $NRh=(1-(0.9839*0.7047))*100=30.66 \%$

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

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

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

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

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

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

$$NRp=(1-(0.9935*0.8097*1.00))*100=19.55 \%$$

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

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

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

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

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

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

$$NRp=(1-(0.9839*0.7047*1.00))*100=30.66 \%$$

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)	10890	1797	2328	3158	3607
Address can not be located (21)	66	5	4	2	55
Address unable to access (22)	5	0	1	0	4
Address does not exist or etc (23)	498	3	12	27	456
Total	11459	1805	2345	3187	4122

Table 11. Distribution of DB130

DB130- Household questionnaire result	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Household questionnaire completed (11)	8846	1655	2132	2503	2556
Refusal to co-operate (21)	1363	74	105	447	737
Entire household temporarily away (22)	350	13	29	59	249
Household unable to respond (23)	114	8	12	30	64
Other reason(24)	217	47	50	119	1
Total	10890	1797	2328	3158	3607

Table 12. Distribution of DB135

DB135- Household interview acceptance	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Interview accepted for database (1)	8818	1649	2127	2500	2542
Interview rejected (2)	28	6	5	3	14
Total	8846	1655	2132	2503	2556

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	8 812	99.9	8 812	100	0	0	0	0
HY020	Total disposable household income	8 816	100.0	8 816	100	0	0	0	0
	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	8 708	98.8	8 708	100	0	0	0	0
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	7 382	83.7	7 382	100	0	0	0	0
HY023									
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	149	1.7	149	100	0	0	0	0
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	2 846	32.3	2 846	100	0	0	0	0
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	542	6.1	542	100	0	0	0	0
HY070G	Housing allowances	1 073	12.2	1 073	100	0	0	0	0
	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	1 108	12.6	1 108	100	0	0	0	0
HY080G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	88	1.0	88	100	0	0	0	0
HY090G									
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	1 183	13.4	1 183	100	0	0	0	0
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	14	.2	14	100	0	0	0	0
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	5 208	59.1	5 208	100	0	0	0	0
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	927	10.5	927	100	0	0	0	0
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	5 586	63.3	5 586	100	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	45.0	8 424	96.7	62	.7	224	2.6
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	789	4.2	789	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 871	9.3	1 747	93.4	62	3.3	62	3.3
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	1 006	5.4	1 006	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	41	.2	41	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	883	4.7	883	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
PY100G	Old-age benefit	5 533	29.1	5 442	98.4	1	.0	90	1.6
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	268	1.4	268	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
PY120G	Sickness benefit	1 319	7.0	1 319	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
PY130G	Disability benefit	1 694	8.2	1 540	90.9	139	8.2	15	.9
PY140G	Education related allowances	250	1.3	250	100.0	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)	18710	3570	4523	5225	5392
From register...no reason (12-33)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18710	3570	4523	5225	5392

Table 16. Distribution of RB260

RB260- Contact address	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
PAPI (1)	15539	2997	3844	4198	4500
CAPI, CATI, Other(2,3,4)	0	0	0	0	0
Proxy(5)	3171	573	679	1027	892
Total	18710	3570	4523	5225	5392

Table 17. Interview duration in minutes

Interview	Mean	By household size	Mean
Household interview	32	HH with 1 member	51
Personal interview	18	HH with 2 members	68
Total (at household level)	71	HH with 3 members	79
		HH with 4 members	86
		HH with 5+ members	98
		Total	71

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 345 households where the established function did not fit and those records received the self-assessed value as an estimated imputed rent.

Table 18. Regression model for imputed rent calculation

Coefficients	Unstandardized B	Standardized t	Std. Error
(Constant)	25.008	8.627	0.000
Market price of the dwelling	1.001	29.710	0.000
Region	-2.772	-22.763	0.000
Number of rooms	1.617	5.253	0.000
Type of settlement	-5.219	-15.841	0.000
Size of dwelling (in m2)	0.160	14.124	0.000
Cost of housing maintenance	0.183	10.776	0.000
More than 1 bathrooms	7.665	7.652	0.000
Gas	2.242	3.353	0.001
Complex indicator of settlement facilities	1.307	4.268	0.000
Dwelling is not light enough	-3.186	-4.020	0.000
District heating	-1.630	-3.246	0.001

Selection mechanism: stepwise

R square: 0.519

Table 19. Number of imputed records

Household with estimated imputed rent	8603
Of which Households with missing values in explaining variables and received zero estimation	34
Household with actual market rental	215
Total	8818

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 2008.

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 2008.
- viii. *Total duration of data collection of the sample*
The data collection lasted 14 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 96 600 HUF (about 350 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 105 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 2008 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	1 489 381	1 465 276
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	263 042	295 073
PY100G	Old-age benefit	949 236	1 251 071
HY010	Total household gross income	2 697 270	2 839 355
HY020	Total disposable household income	2 101 591	2 133 699
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 810 434	1 938 557
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	388 899	386 622
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	161 739	149 164

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 aged 16-74 by self-classification and by gender in HU-LFS and in HU-EU-SILC, 2008

Age-group	HU-LFS			HU-SILC		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
Persons						
Working	2081137	1718745	3799882	2063424	1737432	3800856
Unemployed	252722	222768	475490	264880	230192	495072
Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience	388905	387247	776152	334708	332829	667537
In retirement or in early retirement or permanently disabled	853928	1189864	2043792	919167	1243270	2162437
Fulfilling domestic tasks and care responsibilities	11066	397604	408670	8882	356389	365271
Other inactive person	47407	48381	95788	48825	77452	126277
Total	3635165	3964609	7599774	3639886	3977564	7617450
Distribution (%)						
Working	57.3	43.4	50.0	56.7	43.7	49.9
Unemployed	7.0	5.6	6.3	7.3	5.8	6.5
Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience	10.7	9.8	10.2	9.2	8.4	8.8
In retirement or in early retirement or permanently disabled	23.5	30.0	26.9	25.3	31.3	28.4
Fulfilling domestic tasks and care responsibilities	0.3	10.0	5.4	0.2	9.0	4.8
Other inactive person	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

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

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

Last but not least the final output of EU-SILC is the annual calculation of the common cross sectional indicators (Laeken indicators). The common cross sectional indicators receives great attention from the public and official users as well. HCSO publish a study on this topic every year describing the results in Hungarian. The latest study was published in September 2009.

<http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/laekindikator/laekindikator08.pdf>

Table 22. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 (weighted)

weighted		2005		2006		2007		2008	
		mean	standard error	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	1 489 381	13 517
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	273 773	29 171	70 510	4 241	98 653	15 256	76 487	225
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 107 428	63 864	1 861 218	99 261	893 234	58 792	942 774	12 658
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	84 413	6 198	0	0	49 644	4 830	48 988	342
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	223 454	39 140	171 382	32 102	388 738	139 349	444 017	255
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	235 522	14 374	185 629	13 192	247 210	18 395	263 042	915
PY100G	Old-age benefit	725 935	5 227	796 206	7 538	861 340	5 508	949 236	21 543
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	216 385	14 113	316 294	18 156	439 261	29 782	410 948	579
PY120G	Sickness benefit	123 267	7 165	81 945	5 346	104 599	7 263	103 112	519
PY130G	Disability benefit	398 041	7 427	526 610	9 731	521 900	10 406	588 141	2 267
PY140G	Education related allowances	81 073	6 367	88 714	6 017	112 671	8 121	152 376	233

Table 22. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 (weighted)- continued -

weighted		2005		2006		2007		2008	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error	mean	standard error
<i>Income components on household level</i>									
HY010	Total household gross income	2 104 914	29 723	2 447 399	34 664	2 510 148	26 020	2 697 270	41 069
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 639 022	17 273	1 968 043	27 270	1 998 043	17 298	2 101 591	23 423
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	1 810 434	16 776
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	1 440 865	34 012
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	347 719	48 525	278 499	69 557	599 990	113 058	599 283	122 817
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	270 218	5 301	268 548	5 755	371 931	7 173	388 899	7 460
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	111 222	7 076	42 755	8 259	49 203	3 903	105 051	10 562
HY070G	Housing allowances	44 623	3 606	49 010	2 854	49 971	2 393	50 098	1 980
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	156 467	9 811	311 243	34 887	111 141	5 479	161 739	10 332
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	219 051	90 562	338 028	66 443	783 803	123 903	1 238 220	308 293
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	219 525	10 937	249 095	12 549	222 814	7 997	188 086	3 560
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	102 499	22 761	45 581	26 574	184 734	85 902	72 508	14 864
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	14 301	318	15 778	359	14 552	183	14 583	223
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	113 933	7 053	277 097	21 319	79 198	3 731	118 197	12 587
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	660 784	19 900	649 140	18 330	720 485	13 738	851 769	17 561

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,2006,2007,2008

			2005	Age group change	2006	2007	2008		
1 Mean equivalised disposable income									
2	Risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$\$NAT	519,937		572,577	623,502	663,367	
			EUR	2,080		2,308	2,359	2,639	
			PPS	3,430		3,778	3,975	3,993	
		2 adults 2 dep. children	\$\$NAT	1,091,867		1,202,412	1,309,354	1,393,070	
			EUR	4,367		4,847	4,955	5,542	
			PPS	7,204		7,933	8,348	8,385	
3 Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender									
	Total	Total	13	Total	16	13	12		
		M	14		16	13	12		
		F	13		16	13	12		
		0-15	Total	20	0-17	24	19	20	
	0-64	Total	15	0-64	17	14	14		
		M	15		18	14	14		
		F	14		17	14	14		
		16-64	Total	13	18-64	15	12	12	
		M	14		15	12	12		
		F	13		14	12	12		
	16-24	Total	17	18-24	18	18	18		
		M	17		18	17	16		
		F	17		19	19	20		
		25-49	Total	14	25-49	16	13	12	
		M	15		16	12	12		
		F	14		16	13	13		
	50-64	Total	10	50-64	11	9	9		
		M	11		12	10	9		
		F	10		10	6	8		
		65+	Total	7	65+	9	6	4	
		M	4		7	3	3		
F		8		11	8	5			
4	Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity	Total	Total	10		7	6	5	
			M	11		8	7	6	
			F	9		5	5	4	
	(a) At work	Total	Total	15		20	15	15	
			M	15		21	16	15	
			F	15		19	15	15	
	(d) Not at work	Total	Total	49		53	47	48	
			M	54		55	53	49	
			F	45		51	41	48	
	(e1) Of which: Unemployed	Total	Total	10		12	8	7	
			M	9		12	8	7	
			F	10		12	9	7	
	(e2) Of which: Retired	Total	Total	17		26	22	24	
			M	15		23	19	20	
			F	19		27	24	25	

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,2006,2007,2008-cont.-

			2005	Age group change	2006	2007	2008
<i>Risk-of-poverty</i>							
5	rate	All hh no dep. childr.	10		10	8	8
<i>by household type</i>							
		1 person hh Total	19		18	16	
		1 person hh M	25		25	20	23
		1 person hh F	16		15	14	12
		1 person hh <65yrs	26		22	21	22
		1 person hh 65+ (both < 65)	11		14	11	8
		2 adults no dep. childr. (at least one 65+)	9		11	9	9
		2 adults no dep. childr.	4		8	4	3
		Other hh no dep. childr.	6		6	4	5
		All hh with dep. childr.	17		21	16	16
		Single parent (at least 1 child)	27		39	29	33
		2 adults 1 dep. child	15		14	12	11
		2 adults 2 dep. childr.	15		18	15	16
		2 adults 3+ dep. childr.	24		33	27	29
		Other hh with dep. childr.	13		15	11	11
6	<i>Risk-of-poverty rate by accommodation tenure status</i>						
	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	13		15	12	12
	(b) Tenant	Total	19		25	22	25
<i>Risk-of-poverty</i>							
7	rate	All hh no dep. childr. WI = 0	18		22	16	15
<i>by work intensity of the household</i>							
		0 < WI < 1	10		9	8	7
		WI = 1	7		2	3	2
		All hh with dep. childr. WI = 0	56		73	62	56
		0 < WI < 0.5	44		52	42	34
		0.5 <= WI < 1	23		16	13	13
		WI = 1	10		6	6	4

Table 23. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005,200,2007,2008-cont.-

			2005	Age group change	2006	2007	2008		
9	Risk-of-poverty								
	rate	Total	Total	50	Total	49	49	52	
	before and after transfers		M	48		47	47	50	
	by age and		F	52		50	51	54	
	gender								
	(a) before all								
	transfers	0-15	Total	48	0-17	48	49	52	
		16+	Total	50	18+	49	49	44	
			M	48		47	47	42	
			F	52		51	52	46	
		65+	Total	90	65+	87	88	89	
			M	90		89	89	91	
			F	90		87	87	88	
	(b) including								
	pensions	Total	Total	29	Total	30	29	30	
			M	30		30	30	31	
			F	29		29	29	30	
			0-15	Total	45	0-17	44	45	47
			16-64	Total	30	18-64	29	29	30
				M	30		29	29	30
			F	29		28	29	30	
		65+	Total	11	65+	14	11	10	
			M	7		10	7	7	
			F	14		16	13	11	
13	Relative median	Total	Total	19	Total	24	20	17	
	risk-of-poverty gap		M	19		25	21	18	
	by age and		F	18		23	19	17	
	gender	0-15	Total	19	0-17	25	20	17	
		16-64	Total	20	18-64	25	21	18	
			M	21		25	21	18	
			F	19		24	22	18	
		65+	Total	9	65+	17	14	10	
			M	9		21	10	10	
			F	11		16	15	10	
	14	S80/S20 quintile share ratio		4.0		5.5	3.7	3,6	
15	Gini coefficient		0.275		0.333	0.260	0,25		