



CYPRUS

INTERMEDIATE QUALITY REPORT

**STATISTICS ON INCOME AND LIVING CONDITIONS
2009**

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	5
1. COMMON CROSS-SECTIONAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS	
1.1. Common cross-sectional EU indicators based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC	6
1.2. Other indicators	9
1.2.1. Equivalised disposable income	9
1.2.2. The unadjusted gender pay gap	9
2. ACCURACY	
2.1. Sample design	9
2.1.1. Type of sample design	9
2.1.2. Sampling units	10
2.1.3. Stratification and sub-stratification criteria	10
2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria	10
2.1.5. Sample selection schemes	12
2.1.6. Sample distribution over time	12
2.1.7. Renewal of sample: rotational groups	12
2.1.8. Weightings	13
2.1.8.1. Design factor	13
2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments	14
2.1.8.3. Adjustments to external data	14
2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weight	15
2.1.9. Substitutions	15
2.1.9.1. Method of selection of substitutes	15
2.1.9.2. Main characteristics of substituted units compared to original units, by region (NUTS 2) if available	15
2.1.9.3. Distribution of substituted units by record of contact at address (DB120), household questionnaire result (DB130) and household interview acceptance (DB135) of the original units	15
2.2. Sampling errors	15
2.2.1. Standard error and effective sample size	15
2.3. Non-sampling errors	22
2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors	22
2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors	23
2.3.2.1. Measurement errors	23
2.3.2.2. Processing errors	24
2.3.3. Non-response errors	25
2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size	25
2.3.3.2. Unit non-response	25

2.3.3.3. Distribution of households (original units) by ‘record of contact at address’ (DB120), by ‘household questionnaire result’ (DB130) and by ‘household interview acceptance’ (DB135), for each rotational group and for the total	27
2.3.3.4. Distribution of substituted units (if applicable) by ‘record of contact at address’ (DB120), by ‘household questionnaire result’ (DB130) and by ‘household interview acceptance’ (DB135), for each rotational group and for the total	28
2.3.3.5. Item non-response	29
2.3.3.6. Total item non-response and number of observations in the sample at unit level of the common cross-sectional European Union indicators based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC, for equivalised disposable income and for the unadjusted gender pay gap	30
2.4. Mode of data collection	32
2.5. Interview duration	33
3. COMPARABILITY	
3.1. Basic concepts and definitions	33
3.2. Components of income	35
3.2.1. Differences between the national definitions and standard EU-SILC definitions	35
3.2.2. The source or procedure used for the collection of income variables	35
3.2.3. The form in which income variables at component level have been obtained	35
3.2.4. The method used for obtaining income target variables in the required form	36
4. COHERENCE	
4.1. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who receive income from each ‘income component’, with external sources	36

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1.1.1 At-risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	6
1.1.2 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by age and gender	6
1.1.3 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by most frequent activity status and by gender.....	7
1.1.4 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by household type	7
1.1.5 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by accommodation tenure status	7
1.1.6 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by work intensity of the household	8
1.1.7 Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold	8
1.1.8 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers including old-age/ survivor's pensions, by gender and age group	8
1.1.9 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers except old-age/ survivor's pensions, by gender and age group	8
1.1.10 Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap, by age and gender	9
1.1.11 Income distribution S80/S20	9
1.1.12 Inequality of income distribution: Gini coefficient (%)	9
2.1.4.1 Population and sample distribution	11
2.1.4.2 Sample size	11
2.1.6.1 Sample distribution over time	12
2.1.7.1 Size of the Rotational Groups	13
2.2.1.1 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by age and gender	18
2.2.1.2 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by most frequent activity status and by gender.....	19
2.2.1.3 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by household type	20
2.2.1.4 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by accommodation tenure status	20
2.2.1.5 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by work intensity of the household	21
2.2.1.6 Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold	21
2.2.1.7 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers including old-age/ survivor's pensions, by gender and age group	21
2.2.1.8 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers except old-age/survivor's pensions, by gender and age group	22
2.2.1.9 Mean equivalised disposable income per person (EURO)	22
2.3.3.1.1 Sample Size and Accepted Interviews	25
2.3.3.3.1 Distribution of DB120	27
2.3.3.3.2 Distribution of DB130	28
2.3.3.3.3 Distribution of DB135	28
2.3.3.5.1 Distribution of item non-response, household level income variables	29
2.3.3.5.2 Distribution of item non-response, personal level income variables	30
2.3.3.6 Indicator sample size and non-response	31
2.4.1 Distribution of individuals aged 16 or over by data status and rotational group	32
2.4.2 Distribution of individuals aged 16 or over by type of interview and rotational group	33
4.1.1 Comparison between EU-SILC 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 for all income target variables at household level	37
4.1.2 Comparison between EU-SILC 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 for all income target variables at individual level	38
4.1.3 Comparison between Labour Force Survey 2009 and EU-SILC 2009 for the labour force participation rates	39

PREFACE

The present quality report complies with the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 Article 16. The structure of the report follows Commission Regulation No 28/2004 and presents results on common cross-sectional European Union indicators, accuracy, comparability and coherence of the EU-SILC survey 2009.

1. COMMON CROSS-SECTIONAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS

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

The common cross-sectional EU indicators given below are based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC 2009 and they were calculated using the SAS programs provided by Eurostat.

1.1.1 At-risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)

1 person household (euros)	10.459,4
2 adults and 2 dependent children (euros)	21.964,8

1.1.2 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by age and gender

Total	Total	16,2
	0 – 17	12,0
	18 – 24	12,8
	25 – 49	10,0
	50 – 64	13,7
	65+	48,6
	18+	17,3
	18 – 64	11,5
Male	Total	14,4
	18 – 24	12,1
	25 – 49	8,6
	50 – 64	10,8
	65+	44,1
	18+	14,8
	18 – 64	9,8
Female	Total	17,9
	18 – 24	13,4
	25 – 49	11,5
	50 – 64	16,4
	65+	52,4
	18+	19,7
	18 – 64	13,1

1.1.3 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by most frequent activity status and by gender

Age 18+	Total		Total	17,2		
			Male	14,5		
			Female	19,8		
	At work		Total	7,0		
			Male	6,8		
			Female	7,3		
	Not at work		Total	32,3		
			Male	30,8		
			Female	33,3		
			Unemployed		Total	32,8
					Male	35,6
					Female	30,9
			Retired		Total	47,8
					Male	44,8
Female					50,5	
Other inactive		Total	20,1			
		Male	14,8			
		Female	22,7			

1.1.4 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by household type

All households without dependent children	Total		25,7
	1 person household	Total	37,7
		Male	17,6
		Female	52,3
		0 – 64	15,7
		65+	62,4
	2 adults without dependent children	both 0 – 64	14,0
		at least one 65+	50,0
Other household without dependent children		9,0	
All households with dependent children	Total		10,7
	Single parent	At least 1 dep.	37,1
	2 adults	1 dep. Child	12,5
		2 dep. Children	7,2
		3+ dep. Children	22,2
	Other household with dependent children		7,4

1.1.5 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by accommodation tenure status

Age 0+	Total		16,2
	Owner or rent free		14,8
	Tenant		27,1

1.1.6 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by work intensity of the household

All households without dependent children	WI=0	44,5
	0<WI<1	12,0
	WI=1	11,3
All households with dependent children	WI=0	51,3
	0<WI<0,5	46,4
	0,5<=WI<1	16,3
	WI=1	3,2

1.1.7 Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold

Total	At-risk-of-poverty rate (40% of median)	3,4
	At-risk-of-poverty rate (50% of median)	8,8
	At-risk-of-poverty rate (70% of median)	25,1

1.1.8 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers including old-age/survivor's pensions, by gender and age group

Total	Total	30,6
	0 – 17	21,2
	18+	33,2
	18 – 64	22,8
	65+	88,7
Male	Total	28,3
	18+	29,7
	18 – 64	20,1
	65+	85,4
Female	Total	32,9
	18+	36,5
	18 – 64	25,5
	65+	91,6

1.1.9 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers except old-age/survivor's pensions, by gender and age group

Total	Total	22,7
	0 – 17	20,4
	18+	23,4
	18 – 64	18,0
	65+	52,4
Male	Total	21,1
	18+	20,8
	18 – 64	16,1
	65+	47,6
Female	Total	24,4
	18+	25,9
	18 – 64	19,8
	65+	56,4

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

Total	Total	19,0
	0 – 17	16,4
	18+	19,1
	18 – 64	19,1
	65+	19,0
Male	Total	17,1
	18+	16,9
	18 – 64	15,6
	65+	17,9
Female	Total	19,9
	18+	20,6
	18 – 64	20,8
	65+	20,3

1.1.11 Income distribution S80/S20

S80/S20 quintile share ratio	4,2
------------------------------	-----

1.1.12 Inequality of income distribution: Gini coefficient (%)

Gini coefficient	28,4
------------------	------

1.2. Other indicators

1.2.1. Equivalised disposable income: 19.654,6 EURO

1.2.2. The unadjusted gender pay gap

The unadjusted gender pay gap indicator will not be computed on the basis of the EU-SILC survey, but from the Wages and Salaries Survey conducted by the Labour Statistics Unit.

2. ACCURACY

2.1. Sample design

2.1.1. Type of sample design (stratified, multi-stage, clustered)

The sample was drawn from the 2001 Census of Population sampling frame, which was updated by the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (E.A.C.) list of new domestic consumers (between 2002 and 2008). The sample design was one-stage stratification.

The allocation of the sample in the 9 strata is shown in the table below:

Table 2.1.4.1 : Population and sample distribution

DISTRICT	N			n		
	NO. OF HOUSEHOLDS - CENSUS & EAC			DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE		
	TOTAL	URBAN	RURAL	TOTAL	URBAN	RURAL
TOTAL	301.049	204.456	96.593	3.709	2.505	1.204
LEFKOSIA	115.192	88.685	26.507	1.427	1.061	366
AMMOCHOSTOS	17.574	0	17.574	206	0	206
LARNAKA	48.787	29.279	19.508	628	382	246
LEMESOS	80.742	62.463	18.279	1.025	800	225
PAFOS	38.754	24.029	14.725	423	262	161

For the data collection 22 interviewers were appointed, 8 in Lefkosia district, 5 in Larnaka/ Ammochostos, 6 in Lemesos and 3 in Pafos. The sampled households were grouped as much as possible in small areas so as to minimise travelling expenses. Each interviewer had to visit on average 15 households per week.

The 2009 sample results are shown in the table below:

Table 2.1.4.2 : Sample size

Addresses in initial sample	3.709
Addresses used for the survey	3.513
Addresses out of scope	196
Addresses used	3.513
Addresses successfully contacted	3.503
Addresses not successfully contacted	10
Addresses successfully contacted	3.503
Household questionnaire completed	3.145
Refusal to cooperate	277
Entire household away for the duration of fieldwork	8
Household unable to respond	64
Other reasons for not completing the Household questionnaire	9
Household questionnaire completed	3.145
Interviews accepted for database	3.145
Interviews rejected for database	0

The 196 addresses that were out of scope of the survey correspond to vacant accommodation, or buildings used as secondary residences or for business purposes, or demolished housing units. Furthermore, 10 addresses were not successfully contacted. Out of the 3.503 addresses successfully contacted, 3.145 households completed the Household questionnaire and were all accepted for the database. Unfortunately this was below the minimum effective sample size (3.250 households) requested by the Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 Article 9. Thus, the achieved sample size was 3.145 households, 9.283 persons in total and 7.557 persons aged 16 or over.

2.1.5. Sample selection schemes

The sample was selected from each stratum with simple random sampling.

2.1.6. Sample distribution over time

Table 2.1.6.1 that follows gives an overview of the cumulative sample development during the fieldwork period from the 17th of March 2009 to the 31st of July 2009.

Table 2.1.6.1 : Sample distribution over time

Period	Addresses in initial sample	Addresses out of scope	Addresses used	Addresses not successfully contacted	Non-response	Household Questionnaire Completed
17/03 – 31/03	593	28	565	1	50	514
17/03 – 15/04	1.041	48	993	3	86	904
17/03 – 30/04	1.443	88	1.355	5	117	1.233
17/03 – 15/05	2.011	116	1.895	6	186	1.703
17/03 – 31/05	2.652	148	2.504	7	245	2.252
17/03 – 15/06	3.216	182	3.034	8	299	2.727
17/03 – 30/06	3.646	195	3.451	10	350	3.091
17/03 – 15/07	3.687	196	3.491	10	351	3.130
17/03 – 31/07	3.709	196	3.513	10	358	3.145

2.1.7. Renewal of sample: rotational groups

The sample in the first round was divided in 4 sub-samples as it was based on a rotational design of 4 replications with a rotation of one replication per year. Each sub-sample was separately selected so as to represent the whole population. Every year one sub-sample is going to be dropped and substituted by a new one. Thus for 2009 one specific sub-sample, pre-selected from 2005 (R4), was dropped and substituted by a new one (R4). The new sub-sample was also separately selected, so as to represent the whole population.

The size of each Rotational Group for the 2009 survey is shown in Table 2.1.7.1:

Table 2.1.7.1: Size of the Rotational Groups

	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Addresses in initial sample	3.709	869	860	827	1.153
Household Questionnaire completed	3.145	798	793	754	800
Interviews Accepted for database	3.145	798	793	754	800

2.1.8. Weightings

2.1.8.1. Design factor

The methodology that was used for the computation of the weights of the survey is the one proposed in Doc. EU-SILC 065/09. For a household in the new panel 4 (R4) – new panel 4 replaced the old panel 4 of the first, second, third and the fourth wave - the design weight is the inverse of its inclusion probability that is the probability belonging to the selected sample of households:

$$DB080_i = \frac{1}{\pi_i} = \frac{1}{\frac{n_i}{4N_i}} = \frac{4N_i}{n_i}, \quad i=1, \dots, 9$$

π_i = the probability of a household to be selected from stratum i

n_i = the sample size of stratum i

N_i = the total number of households in the sampling frame of stratum i

For households in panels 1, 2 and 3 the household design weights were calculated by following the methodology proposed by Eurostat in Doc. 065/09. The general steps followed were:

- Computation of panel person base weights
- Correction for non response due to attrition
- Computation of base weights for persons entering panel households for the first time, i.e. newborns of sample women or persons moving into sample households from abroad
- Non-panel persons (co-residents) have a basic panel weight equal to zero
- Computation of household weights by averaging within household over all household members

2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments (for panel 4)

The aim of non-response adjustments is to reduce the bias due to non-response, i.e. household was contacted (DB120=11) but household questionnaire was not completed (DB130≠11). The empirical response rate within each stratum provides an estimate of the response probability for all the households of the stratum. The weight of a household after correction for the non-response at the household level is:

$$DB080_i * \frac{1}{\hat{p}_i}$$

$DB080_i$ = the design weight of a household in stratum i before non-response adjustment

\hat{p}_i = the estimated response probability of the household in stratum i

2.1.8.3. Adjustments to external data (level, variables used and sources)

The next step is to combine the entire sample (panels 1 – 4) and apply the calibration procedure. The target of the calibration procedure is to improve the accuracy of the estimated household and personal weights by using external known information. Eurostat recommends an “*integrative*” calibration. The idea is to use calibration variables defined at both household and individual level. The individual variables are aggregated at the household level by calculating household totals such as the number of male/female in the household, the number of persons aged 16 and over etc. After that, calibration is done at the household level using the household variables and the individual variables in their aggregate form.

The calibration variables used at household level were the household size (household size=1, household size=2, household size=3, household size≥4) and the tenure status (tenure status=1 (i.e. owned or provided free), tenure status =2 (i.e. rented)). At personal level the calibration variables used were the distribution of population by age (age≤15, 16≤age≤19, 20≤age≤24, ..., 70≤age≤74, age≥75) and gender.

Based on this calibration procedure and using the weight after non-response adjustment as the initial weight, the household (DB090) and the personal (RB050) cross-sectional weights were calculated.

Calibration procedures were further used for the calculation of cross-sectional weights for household members aged 16 and over (PB040) and for the children aged 0 to 12 years (inclusive) (RL070). For both PB040 and RL070 the personal cross-sectional weight RB050 was used as the initial weight. The calibration variables used for the cross-sectional weight of

household members aged 16 and over were the distribution of population aged 16 and over by age (five years age groups) and gender. The respective calibration variable for the children cross-sectional weight for childcare (RL070) was the distribution of population aged 0 to 12 by single years of age.

2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weight

The final cross-sectional weights were calculated as described above, i.e. using DB080 after non-response adjustment as the initial weight for panel 4 and base weights adjusted for non-response due to attrition for panels 1 – 3. The calibration methods were then applied on the total sample.

2.1.9. Substitutions

No substitution procedures were applied.

2.1.9.1. Method of selection of substitutes

Not applicable.

2.1.9.2. Main characteristics of substituted units compared to original units, by region (NUTS 2) if available

Not applicable.

2.1.9.3. Distribution of substituted units by record of contact at address (DB120), household questionnaire result (DB130) and household interview acceptance (DB135) of the original units

Not applicable.

2.2. Sampling errors

2.2.1. Standard error and effective sample size

The sampling frame is divided into 4 Urban areas and 5 Rural areas in Cyprus. These 9 geographic areas are regarded as strata and independent sample of households is selected from each stratum.

Let h denote the stratum $h=1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9$

Let i denote the selected household

Let k denote the member of the household

Suppose the total of a variable of interest is T . Then our estimate is

$$\hat{T} = \sum_{h=1}^9 \sum_i \sum_k w_{hik} t_{hik} \quad (1)$$

Where \hat{T} is the estimate of T

w_{hik} is the weight of the k^{th} member of household i in the h^{th} stratum

t_{hik} is the value of the variable of interest of k^{th} member in household i in the h^{th} stratum

Variance estimation

The objective is to estimate or approximate precision of the estimator under consideration.

Suppose the total of a variable of interest is T and our estimate \hat{T} is defined by (1).

We are to estimate $V = \text{Var}(\hat{T})$ or the coefficient of variation \sqrt{V}/T . Since the latter is obviously estimated by $\sqrt{\hat{V}}/\hat{T}$, we focus on \hat{V} . Since the sample is stratified, the variance can be separately estimated in strata:

$$\hat{V} = \sum_{h=1}^9 \hat{V}_h \quad (2)$$

Now we proceed to estimation of the variances \hat{V}_h in strata.

The estimator of the **Total** is
$$\hat{T}_h = \sum_i \sum_k w_{hik} t_{hik} .$$

The following estimator gives the variance of a simple random sample for the latter:

$$\hat{V}_h(\hat{T}_h) = \frac{n_h(1-f_h)}{n_h-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} (t_{hi\bullet} - \bar{t}_{h\bullet\bullet})^2, \quad (3)$$

where $t_{hi\bullet} = \sum_k w_{hik} t_{hik}$,

$$\bar{t}_{h\bullet\bullet} = \left(\sum_i t_{hi\bullet} \right) / n_h. \quad h=1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9$$

and $f_h = n_h / N_h$

Suppose the **Mean** of a variable of interest y is \bar{Y} . Then the estimator \hat{Y}_h for stratum h is:

$$\hat{Y}_h = \left(\sum_i \sum_k w_{hik} y_{hik} \right) / \left(\sum_i \sum_k w_{hik} \right)$$

and the variance of \hat{Y}_h is:

$$\hat{V}_h(\hat{Y}_h) = \frac{n_h(1-f_h)}{n_h-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} (y_{hi\bullet} - \bar{y}_{h\bullet\bullet})^2$$

Where $y_{hi\bullet} = \left(\sum_k w_{hik} (y_{hik} - \hat{Y}_h) \right) / \left(\sum_i \sum_k w_{hik} \right)$

$$\bar{y}_{h\bullet\bullet} = \left(\sum_i y_{hi\bullet} \right) / n_h$$

The coefficient of variation and the effective sample size for each indicator are shown in the tables that follow:

2.2.1.1 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by age and gender

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	Total	16,2	0,5	2,8	1,4	9.283	6.617
	0 - 17	12,0	0,9	7,8	1,7	2.028	1.197
	18 - 24	12,8	1,4	10,9	1,8	1.044	582
	25 - 49	10,0	0,7	6,7	1,8	2.946	1.666
	50 - 64	13,7	0,9	6,8	1,2	1.800	1.499
	65+	48,6	1,5	3,0	1,0	1.465	1.445
	18+	17,3	0,5	3,0	1,4	7.255	5.362
	18 - 64	11,5	0,5	4,4	1,6	5.790	3.642
Male	Total	14,4	0,6	4,4	1,5	4.458	2.994
	18 - 24	12,1	2,0	16,6	1,9	533	276
	25 - 49	8,6	0,9	10,6	1,9	1.340	717
	50 - 64	10,8	1,2	11,4	1,3	868	675
	65+	44,1	2,2	4,9	1,0	679	678
	18+	14,8	0,7	4,7	1,4	3.420	2.408
	18 - 64	9,8	0,7	7,2	1,7	2.741	1.601
Female	Total	17,9	0,6	3,6	1,3	4.825	3.587
	18 - 24	13,4	1,9	14,3	1,7	511	304
	25 - 49	11,5	1,0	8,6	1,7	1.606	950
	50 - 64	16,4	1,4	8,3	1,2	932	808
	65+	52,4	2,0	3,9	1,0	786	765
	18+	19,7	0,7	3,8	1,3	3.835	2.919
	18 - 64	13,1	0,7	5,6	1,5	3.049	2.023

2.2.1.2 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by most frequent activity status and by gender

			Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size	
Age 18+	Total	Total	17,2	0,5	3,0	1,3	7.143	5.299	
		Male	14,5	0,7	4,8	1,4	3.366	2.392	
		Female	19,8	0,8	3,8	1,3	3.777	2.899	
	At work	Total	7,0	0,5	7,1	1,6	3.872	2.395	
		Male	6,8	0,7	9,8	1,7	2.102	1.245	
		Female	7,3	0,7	10,1	1,5	1.770	1.155	
	Not at work	Total	Total	32,3	1,0	3,0	1,3	3.271	2.557
			Male	30,8	1,6	5,1	1,3	1.264	967
			Female	33,3	1,3	3,8	1,3	2.007	1.583
		Unemployed	Total	32,8	5,4	16,4	1,6	118	72
			Male	35,6	9,0	25,1	1,7	47	27
			Female	30,9	6,7	21,6	1,6	71	45
		Retired	Total	47,8	1,5	3,1	1,1	1.543	1.468
			Male	44,8	2,2	4,8	1,1	715	659
			Female	50,5	2,0	3,9	1,0	828	807
Other inactive	Total	20,1	1,3	6,4	1,6	1.610	1.022		
	Male	14,8	2,1	14,2	1,8	502	275		
	Female	22,7	1,6	7,0	1,5	1.108	740		

2.2.1.3 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by household type

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size	
All hh no dep. children	Total	25,7	0,8	3,2	1,2	3.555	2.953	
	1 person hh	Total	37,7	2,3	6,1	1,2	517	431
	2 adults no dep. children	both 0 - 64	14,0	1,4	10,3	1,2	752	616
		at least one 65+	50,0	1,6	3,2	1,0	1.172	1.197
	Other hh no dep. children		9,0	1,0	11,6	1,7	1.114	669
All hh with dep. children	Total	10,7	0,5	4,9	1,7	5.728	3.326	
	Single parent	At least 1 dep. child	37,1	3,7	10,0	1,8	210	115
	2 adults	1 dep. child	12,5	1,4	10,9	1,7	780	464
		2 dep. children	7,2	0,6	8,8	2,0	1.676	846
		3+ dep. children	22,2	2,0	9,1	1,0	1.494	1.558
	Other hh with dep. children		7,4	1,0	13,3	1,4	1.568	1.094

2.2.1.4 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by accommodation tenure status

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size	
Age 0+	Total	16,2	0,5	2,8	1,4	9.283	6.617	
	Owner or rent free		14,8	0,4	2,9	1,2	8.671	6.965
	Tenant		27,1	2,0	7,4	2,1	612	291

2.2.1.5 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), by work intensity of the household

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
All hh no dep. children	WI=0	44,5	2,7	6,0	1,0	485	465
	0<WI<1	12,0	1,1	9,1	1,6	1.216	782
	WI=1	11,3	1,3	11,3	1,4	897	619
All hh with dep. children	WI=0	51,3	5,5	10,7	1,5	125	85
	0<WI<0.5	46,4	4,2	9,0	1,8	250	142
	0.5<=WI<1	16,3	1,0	6,3	1,6	2.348	1.428
	WI=1	3,2	0,4	12,6	1,8	2.998	1.659

2.2.1.6 Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	At-risk-of-poverty rate (40% of median)	3,4	0,2	6,2	1,3	9.283	7.391
	At-risk-of-poverty rate (50% of median)	8,8	0,3	3,8	1,3	9.283	7.059
	At-risk-of poverty rate (70% of median)	25,1	0,5	2,2	1,5	9.283	6.148

2.2.1.7 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers including old-age/survivor's pensions, by gender and age group

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	Total	30,6	0,6	1,9	1,5	9.283	6.226
	0 - 17	21,2	1,2	5,5	1,6	2.028	1.230
	18+	33,2	0,7	2,0	1,5	7.255	4.929
	18 - 64	22,8	0,7	3,0	1,6	5.790	3.592
	65+	88,7	1,0	1,2	1,3	1.465	1.169
Male	18+	29,7	0,9	3,1	1,5	3.420	2.288
	18 - 64	20,1	0,9	4,7	1,7	2.741	1.628
	65+	85,4	1,7	2,0	1,3	679	526
Female	18+	36,5	0,9	2,6	1,5	3.835	2.627
	18 - 64	25,5	1,0	3,8	1,6	3.049	1.952
	65+	91,6	1,2	1,3	1,2	786	664

2.2.1.8 At-risk-of-poverty rate (%), before all social transfers except old-age/survivor's pensions, by gender and age group

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	Total	22,7	0,5	2,3	1,5	9.283	6.277
	0 - 17	20,4	1,2	5,7	1,7	2.028	1.226
	18+	23,4	0,6	2,5	1,4	7.255	5.035
	18 - 64	18,0	0,6	3,5	1,6	5.790	3.570
	65+	52,4	1,5	2,8	1,0	1.465	1.425
Male	18+	20,8	0,8	4,0	1,5	3.420	2.289
	18 - 64	16,1	0,9	5,3	1,7	2.741	1.616
	65+	47,6	2,2	4,6	1,0	679	665
Female	18+	25,9	0,8	3,3	1,4	3.835	2.726
	18 - 64	19,8	0,9	4,5	1,6	3.049	1.935
	65+	56,4	2,0	3,6	1,0	786	756

2.2.1.9 Mean equivalised disposable income per person (CYP)

	Value	Standard Error	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Mean equivalised disposable income	19.654,6	162,19	1,3	9.283	6.897

2.3. Non-sampling errors

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

The list of households from the 2001 Census of Population was used as sampling frame with a supplementary list of newly constructed houses (built after 2001 up to 2008). The Statistical Service of Cyprus was provided by the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (E.A.C.) with a list of domestic electricity consumers, which contained all the new connections of electricity between 2002 and 2008 (last update April of 2008). The E.A.C. distinguishes domestic consumers from other consumers (e.g. industrial etc). It has been established that each domestic electricity consumer registered by the E.A.C. corresponds to the statistical definition of a housing unit. Each of these new electricity meter connections represented one new household.

Coverage problems encountered were:

1. The frame of the 2001 Census of Population was somehow outdated and as a result some housing units were found to be empty or to be used for other purposes other than housing.
2. Some houses included in the E.A.C. list were used as secondary residence, so they were out of scope of the survey.

3. Some houses listed by the E.A.C. were impossible to be located due to incomplete information regarding their addresses.
4. Housing units built after April 2008, were not included in our sampling frame.

2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

Possible sources of measurement errors are the questionnaire (design, content and wording), the method of data collection, the interviewers and the respondents. As the 2009 EU-SILC round was the 5th in the series, quality has considerably improved due to interviewers' feedback, continuous data analysis and research.

The questionnaire for EU-SILC was developed on the basis of the EU-SILC Doc. 065 and Doc. 055. Even though, the questionnaire was well tested and despite the fact that this was the 5th wave of the survey, some questions were still difficult to be answered with precision. Difficulties due to memory lapses were encountered in questions regarding income, housing cost, main activity each month as well as for the age at first job especially with older persons. In an effort to minimise these problems respondents were requested to prepare pay slips and utility bills when the interviewer was making an appointment. In the case that the respondents could have the pay slips at a later date then they could send them by fax at the central offices. Difficulties were also encountered in distinguishing the various benefits and pensions. In order to overcome these difficulties a part of the training of the interviewers was focused specifically on social benefits and pensions.

As the method of data collection was Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) many validation and consistency checks were implemented during the interview. This had a positive impact on the quality of the data collected. Additionally, problems usually accounted to the routing of the questionnaire were fully avoided because of CAPI.

In order to reduce interviewer effects a two week training session for all the interviewers and an extra week training for newly recruited interviewers (i.e. those working for the first time in EU-SILC), was organised at the head offices of the Statistical Service. The training was conducted by permanent staff, Statistics Officers responsible for the EU-SILC survey. The aim of the training was to ensure that all interviewers were uniformly trained both in regard to the

content of the questionnaire, as well as their behaviour during the interview. The extra week training for the newcomers focused mainly on the terminology of the survey giving also general information on the previous rounds of the survey. In this way the newcomers were able to follow the other interviewers who worked the year before in the survey. In the second week where all interviewers were together, the training mainly focused on refreshing the terminology used in the questionnaire and on the understanding of new terminology used for the first time in the questionnaire (e.g. Material deprivation module). Main emphasis was given on difficult definitions and on explaining the various public benefits as well as the importance of the accuracy of the information collected. On the third week the interviewers had intensive sessions on working with their laptops and the electronic questionnaires in the environment of BLAISE. An interviewer manual was prepared explaining each and every single question of the questionnaire as well as their respective possible answers.

Apart from the 22 interviewers the training sessions were also attended by 6 supervisors. Each one of them was responsible for a group of 3 or 4 interviewers. During the fieldwork period the supervisor had meetings with each one of the interviewers in his/her group at least once a week. During these meetings, apart from discussing problems or questions raised during the week, the supervisors also collected (from the interviewers' laptops) all completed questionnaires. Their main duty during the data collection period was to examine the interviewers' work and refer back to them for inconsistencies or for problems identified in connection with terminology. Furthermore the supervisors had to double check some of the answers with respondents either by telephone or by personally visiting the household in question, especially in the case of unusual answers or missing data. Additionally from 2nd wave onwards, data for households in the survey for 2 years or more were further checked based on the data from previous years. For the 2009 survey the number of interviewers and supervisors was increased by 2 and 1 respectively, for better quality.

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

Processing errors were reduced because of CAPI and the implementation of validation and consistency checks during the data collection phase (BLAISE software). The processing errors were further reduced as the questionnaires were edited and coded by the supervisors prior to finalising the data files for processing. For the households which were in the survey for at least 2 years an additional tool during editing was the preloading of certain variables from the

previous survey. Inconsistencies were further examined with interviewers and in many cases with the households directly. The coding requested was minimal, i.e. occupation (2 digits ISCO), economic activity (2 digits NACE) and country of birth; and was carried out using drop down lists.

The finalised data files prepared by supervisors were then processed using SAS programs with various other logical and consistency checks. The main errors found were connected to self-employment income and the recording of the various benefits and pensions under the correct income variable according to EU-SILC Doc. 065.

Before sending the final D-, R-, H- and P- files, data files were further checked using EUROSTAT's SAS programs.

2.3.3. Non-response errors

2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size

The table below presents the achieved samples of persons aged 16 years and over, as well as of households, within each rotational group.

Table 2.3.3.1.1 : Sample Size and Accepted Interviews

	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Persons 16 years and over	7.557	1.931	1.934	1.802	1.890
Number of accepted personal questionnaires	7.557	1.931	1.934	1.802	1.890
Accepted household interviews	3.145	798	793	754	800

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

Household non-response rates (NRh)

DB120 is the record of contact at the address

DB130 is the household questionnaire result

DB135 is the household interview acceptance result

For the new rotational group, i.e. **panel 4 (R4)**:

Address contact rate:

$$Ra = \frac{\sum[DB120 = 11]}{\sum[DB120 = all] - \sum[DB120 = 23]} = \frac{948}{1153 - 196} = 0,9906$$

Proportion of complete household interviews accepted for the database:

$$Rh = \frac{\sum[DB135 = 1]}{\sum[DB130 = all]} = \frac{800}{948} = 0,84388$$

Household non-response rate:

$$NRh = (1 - (Ra * Rh)) * 100 = 16,405\%$$

For the **total sample**:

Address contact rate:

$$Ra = \frac{\sum[DB120 = 11]}{\sum[DB120 = all] - \sum[DB120 = 23]} = \frac{3.503}{3.709 - 196} = 0,99715$$

Proportion of complete household interviews accepted for the database:

$$Rh = \frac{\sum[DB135 = 1]}{\sum[DB130 = all]} = \frac{3.145}{3.503} = 0,8978$$

Household non-response rate:

$$NRh = (1 - (Ra * Rh)) * 100 = 10,476\%$$

Individual non-response rates (NRp)

RB245 is the respondent status

RB250 is the data status

For the new rotational group, i.e. **panel 4 (R4)**:

Proportion of complete personal interviews within the households accepted for the database:

$$Rp = \frac{\sum[RB250 = 11 + 12 + 13 + 14^{(1)}]}{\sum[RB245 = 1 + 2 + 3]} = \frac{1.890}{1.890} = 1$$

Individual non-response rate:

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

For the **total sample**:

Proportion of complete personal interviews within the households accepted for the database:

$$Rp = \frac{\sum[RB250 = 11 + 12 + 13 + 14^{(1)}]}{\sum[RB245 = 1 + 2 + 3]} = \frac{7.557}{7.557} = 1$$

⁽¹⁾This code corresponds to individuals for whom the information was completed from full record imputation (4 cases).

Individual non-response rate:

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

Overall individual non-response rates (* NRp)

For the new rotational group, i.e. **panel 4 (R4)**:

$$* NRp = (1 - (Ra * Rh * Rp)) * 100 = 16,405\%$$

For the **total sample**:

$$* NRp = (1 - (Ra * Rh * Rp)) * 100 = 10,476\%$$

2.3.3.3. Distribution of households (original units) by ‘record of contact at address’ (DB120), by ‘household questionnaire result’ (DB130) and by ‘household interview acceptance’ (DB135), for each rotational group and for the total

Table 2.3.3.3.1 : Distribution of DB120

DB120 – Contact at address	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Address contacted (11)	3.503	869	860	826	948
Address cannot be located (21)	10	0	0	1	9
Address unable to access (22)	0	0	0	0	0
Address does not exist or empty etc. (23)	196	0	0	0	196
Total	3.709	869	860	827	1.153

Table 2.3.3.3.2 : Distribution of DB130

DB130 – Household questionnaire result	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Household questionnaire completed (11)	3.145	798	793	754	800
Refusal to co-operate (21)	277	57	48	59	113
Entire household temporarily away (22)	8	2	2	2	2
Household unable to respond (23)	64	12	17	11	24
Other reasons (24)	9	0	0	0	9
Total	3.503	869	860	826	948

Table 2.3.3.3.3 : Distribution of DB135

DB135 – Household interview acceptance	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Interview accepted for database (1)	3.145	798	793	754	800
Interview rejected (2)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3.145	798	793	754	800

2.3.3.4. Distribution of substituted units (if applicable) by ‘record of contact at address’ (DB120), by ‘household questionnaire result’ (DB130) and by ‘household interview acceptance’ (DB135), for each rotational group and for the total

Not applicable.

2.3.3.5. Item non-response

The tables that follow provide an overview of non-response for all household and individual income variables.

Table 2.3.3.5.1: Distribution of item non-response, household level income variables

Item non-response	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values (before imputation)	% of households with partial information (before imputation)
Total household gross income HY010	100,0	0,0	2,3
Total disposable household income HY020	100,0	0,0	0,1
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits HY022	99,5	0,0	0,1
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits HY023	89,1	0,0	0,1
Imputed rent HY030G	92,7	na	na
Income from rental of a property or land HY040G	8,5	0,0	0,0
Family/children related allowances HY050G	51,3	0,0	0,0
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified HY060G	0,6	0,0	0,0
Housing allowances HY070G	2,0	0,0	0,0
Regular inter-household cash transfer received HY080G	7,6	0,0	0,0
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment in unincorporated business HY090G	11,4	0,0	0,0
Interest repayments on mortgage HY100G	11,9	0,0	0,0
Income received by people aged under 16 HY110G	0,0	0,0	0,0
Regular taxes on wealth HY120G	60,0	0,0	0,0
Regular inter household cash transfer paid HY130G	12,2	0,0	0,0
Tax on income and social contributions HY140G	73,6	0,7	1,6

Table 2.3.3.5.2: Distribution of item non-response, personal level income variables

Item non-response	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	% of persons with missing values (before imputation)	% of persons with partial information (before imputation)
Employee cash or near cash income PY010G	48,7	0,0	0,8
Non-cash employee income PY020G	6,2	0,0	0,0
Company car PY021G	1,1	0,0	0,0
Employer's social insurance contribution PY030G	44,7	0,0	0,0
Contributions to individual private pension plans PY035G	0,5	0,0	0,0
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment PY050G	11,9	0,0	0,1
Value of goods produced by own consumption PY070G	0,8	0,0	0,0
Pension from individual private plans PY080G	0,6	0,0	0,0
Unemployment benefits PY090G	2,7	0,0	0,0
Old-age benefits PY100G	22,5	0,0	0,0
Survivor benefits PY110G	0,8	0,0	0,0
Sickness benefits PY120G	1,0	0,0	0,0
Disability benefits PY130G	2,5	0,0	0,0
Education-related allowances PY140G	6,3	0,0	0,0

2.3.3.6. Total item non-response and number of observations in the sample at unit level of the common cross-sectional European Union indicators based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC, for equivalised disposable income and for the unadjusted gender pay gap

The table that follows provides an overview of non-response for individuals regarding common cross-sectional indicators.

Table 2.3.3.6: Indicator sample size and non-response

Indicator	Actual Sample Size	Missing values	Remarks	Individual non-response
Mean equivalised disposable income	9.283	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by age and gender	9.283	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by most frequent activity and gender	7.557	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by household type	9.283	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate: one person household	517	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate: household with 2 adults and 2 dependent children	1.676	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by accommodation tenure status	9.283	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by work intensity of the household	8.319	0	964 persons belonged to households without any member aged 16 to 64 years or households composed solely of students	0
Dispersion around the risk of poverty threshold (ARPT 40%)	9.283	0	-	0
Dispersion around the risk of poverty threshold (ARPT 50%)	9.283	0	-	0
Dispersion around the risk of poverty threshold (ARPT 70%)	9.283	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate before all social transfers including old age/survivor's pensions by age and gender	9.283	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate before all social transfers except old age/survivor's pensions by age and gender	9.283	0	-	0
Relative median at risk of poverty gap by age and gender	9.283	0	-	0
S80/S20 quintile share ratio	9.283	0	-	0
Gini coefficient	9.283	0	-	0
Gender pay gap	NA	NA	NA	NA

2.4. Mode of data collection

The mode of data collection for EU-SILC survey was CAPI. Paper Assisted Personal Interviewing (PAPI) was only used in the extreme case of a technical problem with the interviewer's laptop. Of all completed personal questionnaires 21% were filled with proxy interviews; 44% of them corresponded to persons who were temporarily absent mainly national guards and students who were supported by their parents. For these cases we preferred to have a personal questionnaire filled with a proxy interview rather than a refusal. Also in many cases where a person was not temporarily absent and a proxy interview existed, the interviewer would communicate with the interviewee by telephone and some personal questions would be answered directly by the interviewee.

The following tables present the distribution of individuals aged 16 or over by data status and type of interview.

Table 2.4.1: Distribution of individuals aged 16 or over by data status and rotational group

RB250 Data status	Total		R1		R2		R3		R4	
	Count	%								
Total	7.557	100	1.931	100	1.934	100	1.802	100	1.890	100
information completed only from interview (11)	7.553	99,9	1.928	99,8	1.933	99,9	1.802	100	1.890	100
information completed from full record imputation (14)	4	0,1	3	0,2	1	0,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
individual unable to respond and no proxy possible (21)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
refusal to co-operate (23)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
person temporarily away and no proxy possible (31)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
no contact for other reasons (32)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
information not completed: reason unknown (33)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0

Table 2.4.2: Distribution of individuals aged 16 or over by type of interview and rotational group

RB260 Type of interview	Total		R1		R2		R3		R4	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total	7.553⁽¹⁾	100	1.928	100	1.933	100	1.802	100	1.890	100
face to face interview-PAPI (1)	7	0,1	3	0,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	4	0,2
face to face interview-CAPI (2)	5.959	78,9	1.505	78,1	1.505	77,9	1.434	79,6	1.515	80,2
proxy interview (5)	1.587	21,0	420	21,8	428	22,1	368	20,4	371	19,6

(1) The total number of individuals aged 16 and over is 7.557. The information for 4 of these individuals was completed from full record imputation.

2.5. Interview duration

The mean household interview duration was approximately 52 minutes and was calculated as the sum of the duration of all household interviews plus the sum of the duration of all personal interviews, divided by the number of household questionnaires completed and accepted for the database.

3. COMPARABILITY

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions

Reference population

There is no difference to the standard EU-SILC definition, hence the reference population is defined as all the households and their members living in the areas under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. Population in collective households and institutions is excluded.

Private household definition

No deviation from the standard EU-SILC definition. A private household is a person living alone or a group of persons living together in the same dwelling sharing expenses, including the joint provision of the essentials of living.

Household membership

The definition of household membership is the one recommended by EUROSTAT. Students (either in Cyprus or abroad) are considered to be members of their parents' household given they are fully financially supported by them.

Income reference period(s) used

For EU-SILC 2009 the income reference period was 2008.

The period for taxes on income and social insurance contributions

The period for taxes payments/refunds and social insurance contributions was 2008. Tax refunds received during 2008 referred to income received in previous years.

Reference period for taxes on wealth

The reference period for taxes on wealth was 2008.

The lag between the income reference period and current variables

Since EU-SILC 2009 was carried out during the middle of March and the end of July 2009, the time lag between the income reference period and current variables varied between 3 to 7 months.

Total duration of the data collection of the sample

The data collection phase of the survey lasted almost 5 months.

Basic information on activity status during the income reference period

The information on activity status was collected using an activity calendar covering each month of the income reference period.

3.2. Components of income

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

The total household gross income and its components were calculated based on the definitions of income provided in the Commission Regulation (EC) 1980/2003 and the guidelines given in DOC.065. The definitions were fully applied and an effort was made to collect data as accurately as possible.

Imputed rent was calculated using Heckman Method as one of the methods proposed by Eurostat. The following variables were taken into account for the calculation: type of dwelling, number of rooms, area in square meters, year of construction, heating, air-conditioning and income brackets. Despite the fact that efforts were made to make correct estimates using the Heckman method, however we still have our reservations as regards to the accuracy of these estimates, due to the fact that the rental market in Cyprus is considered quite small.

Interest paid on mortgages is collected asking directly the amount. Over and above, a double check is carried out with an estimation of the amount, which is calculated on the basis of the following questions: year the housing loan was taken, the initial amount borrowed, years of repayment of the initial loan, the monthly payment, the outstanding amount at the end of the previous year, the actual total amount paid on the previous year and the interest rate applied for the loan.

Non-cash employee income (except company car), value of goods produced for own consumption and employers' social insurance contributions were collected according to the guidelines provided by Eurostat.

Gross monthly earnings for employees were not collected as the gender pay gap is calculated from other sources than EU-SILC.

3.2.2. The source or procedure used for the collection of income variables

Data on income variables were collected by Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing. Each and every income component was separately collected.

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

The instructions to the interviewers were to collect each income component as gross and to record separately taxes on income at source and social insurance contributions. In the very few cases where gross income was impossible to collect, net income was recorded.

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

In the cases where gross income or taxes on income at source or social insurance contributions were impossible to collect, at least net value was collected for the specific income component. It was then converted to gross by applying the existing tax system and social insurance contributions rules.

4. COHERENCE

4.1. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who receive income from each ‘income component’, with external sources

In the tables that follow, we compare the results on income components between EU-SILC 2006, EU-SILC 2007, EU-SILC 2008 and EU-SILC 2009 at both household and personal level. More specifically in the two tables that follow the percentages of households and persons having received an amount on specific income target variables, as well as their mean value per household are presented.

The results show that the percentages of either households or persons receiving an amount between the four surveys are very close and hence consistent. The only big difference corresponds to the “family children related allowance” (HY050G). This is due to the fact that in 2005 (EU-SILC 2006) an ad-hoc benefit was paid after a special government decision to households independently of family or child allowances.

In EU-SILC 2007, 2008 and 2009, PY020G corresponds to the variable Non-cash employee income, whereas in EU-SILC 2006 it corresponded to the variable Company car. In EU-SILC 2007, 2008 and 2009 Company car corresponds to PY021G.

Table 4.1.1: Comparison between EU-SILC 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 for all income target variables at household level

Income target variable	EU-SILC							
	2006		2007		2008		2009	
	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)
Total household gross income HY010	100,0	34.140	100,0	37.725	100,0	38.807	100,0	40.028
Total disposable household income HY020	100,0	30.596	100,0	33.866	100,0	34.589	100,0	35.731
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits HY022	99,4	28.660	99,2	31.757	99,5	32.594	99,5	33.568
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits HY023	90,7	24.810	90,0	26.998	90,0	27.880	89,1	28.471
Imputed rent HY030G	-	-	91,8	5.797	91,8	6.097	92,7	6.317
Income from rental of a property or land HY040G	8,9	670	9,6	789	8,9	669	8,5	665
Family/children related allowances HY050G	70,4	633	51,8	599	50,1	600	51,3	626
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified HY060G	1,1	48	0,9	37	0,7	26	0,6	27
Housing allowances HY070G	2,8	157	2,7	143	1,9	120	2,0	136
Regular inter-household cash transfer received HY080G	8,5	357	8,1	298	8,3	361	7,6	329
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment in unincorporated business HY090G	11,1	569	12,6	766	11,1	494	11,4	488
Interest repayments on mortgage HY100G	-	-	14,7	510	13,6	499	11,9	543
Regular taxes on wealth HY120G	58,6	47	56,0	46	61,2	53	60,0	51
Regular inter household cash transfer paid HY130G	13,2	451	11,9	396	11,5	391	12,2	358
Tax on income and social contributions HY140G	75,0	3.046	75,5	3.416	75,1	3.575	73,6	3.888

Table 4.1.2: Comparison between EU-SILC 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 for all income target variables at individual level

Income target variable	EU-SILC							
	2006		2007		2008		2009	
	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (EURO)
Employee cash or near cash income PY010G	51,8	22.672	51,2	24.508	50,3	24.983	48,7	26.336
Non-cash employee income PY020G	-	-	7,1	126	7,3	223	6,2	195
Company car PY021G	1,8	77	1,6	84	1,4	76	1,1	67
Employer's social insurance contribution PY030G	-	-	45,8	3.062	45,9	3.204	44,7	3.289
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment PY050G	10,3	3.913	11,3	4.226	12,2	5.088	11,9	4.564
Value of goods produced by own consumption PY070G	-	-	1,0	18	1,0	6	0,8	14
Unemployment benefits PY090G	3,8	425	3,7	537	3,6	365	2,7	483
Old-age benefits PY100G	19,6	3.815	20,1	4.796	21,2	4.769	22,5	5.212
Survivor benefits PY110G	0,9	130	0,9	148	1,0	174	0,8	204
Sickness benefits PY120G	1,0	32	0,8	41	0,9	49	1,0	52
Disability benefits PY130G	1,9	281	2,5	355	2,5	402	2,5	408
Education-related allowances PY140G	5,0	361	6,2	396	6,4	432	6,3	431

The next table presents the labour force participation rates as they were recorded by Labour Force Survey 2009 and EU-SILC 2009. There is one main methodological difference between the two surveys, for LFS students studying abroad or national guards (compulsory army service) are not considered to be part of the population, whereas they are part of the EU-SILC population. Thus, the totals as well as the rates of the ages 16-24 are not comparable. The rest of the results up to the age of 59 fit very well. EU-SILC seems to underestimate the rates for persons aged 60 years and over, but this is understandable since LFS is the core survey with main objective to collect information on employment.

Table 4.1.3: Comparison between Labour Force Survey 2009 and EU-SILC 2009 for the labour force participation rates

Age Groups	Total		Males		Females	
	LFS	EU-SILC	LFS	EU-SILC	LFS	EU-SILC
16 - 19	11,3	3,5	15,2	4,9	8,2	2,0
20 - 24	70,8	43,2	70,4	40,7	71,1	45,5
25 - 29	86,0	84,4	88,0	86,0	83,9	82,9
30 - 34	90,2	89,6	94,5	94,5	85,8	84,7
35 - 39	89,0	90,7	95,0	95,4	83,0	86,0
40 - 44	88,3	89,9	96,7	97,2	79,9	82,7
45 - 49	85,0	84,8	95,1	96,9	74,5	72,4
50 - 54	80,7	80,7	92,8	92,4	68,8	69,2
55 - 59	68,8	66,2	85,5	82,5	52,4	50,2
60 - 64	46,2	39,3	62,1	54,5	31,3	25,1
65+	12,4	6,3	19,1	11,2	6,6	2,2
Total	64,4	59,8	72,7	66,9	56,4	52,9