EU-SILC

Intermediate Quality Report

-HUNGARY-

In 2005 the Hungarian Central Statistical Office carried out three surveys in connection with the living conditions of households and their members. Microcensus focused the basic household and personal data, demographic data, education, including highest ISCED level attained, basic labour information on current acitivity status and on current main job, dwelling type and housing conditions. The Income Survey focused the income data. The SILC survey examined the basic information on activity status during income reference period, detailed labour information, activity history, non monetary household deprivation, including problems in making ends meet, extent of debt and enforced lack of basic necessities, physical and social environment, child care, amenities in dwelling, housing costs, health and access to health care. The SILC survey contained the Module 2005 relating to the „Intergenerational transmission of poverty".

The sample of Microcensus covered 80 000 addresses, the sample of Income Survey consisted 22 000 addresses. The Income Survey was implemented on the sub-sample of Microcensus.

The Microcensus is a compulsory survey that was – already in the fieldwork phase – supplemented by the voluntary Income Survey. Both of them were carried out in April 2005.

SILC survey was implemented using the sub-sample of Income Survey (with 13 507 addresses) based on the Microcensus' sub-sample. SILC was carried out in the second phase covering only the households that had been involved sucessfully in the other two surveys. The fieldwork period of SILC was May and June 2005.

In both phases of the surveys the reference time of interviewing – that was the reference time for household structure – were 1 April 2005. This ensures that changes in between the two phases doesn't affect data consistency, and the overlapping sample ensures the connection of data from different sources.

1. COMMON CROSS-SECTIONAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS

characteristic	estimate	standard error	relative standard error	standard error for srs	design effect (deff)	effective sample size, dwellings	effective sample size, households	effective sample size, individuals
average income HUF	984 110	11 570	1,2	10 044	1,3	5 097	5 220	13 540
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 0=<age	17,9	1,0	5,7	1,0	1,1	6 152	6 301	16 344
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 16=<age=<24	19,9	2,4	11,9	2,2	1,2	5 555	5 689	14 758
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 25=<age=<49	19,3	1,6	8,1	1,5	1,1	6 374	6 527	16 932
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 50=<age=<64	17,4	2,0	11,6	2,0	1,0	6 638	6 798	17 634
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 65=<age	10,8	1,5	14,2	1,3	1,3	5 071	5 193	13 472
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 16=<age	17,6	1,0	5,5	0,9	1,1	6 177	6 326	16 410
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 16=<age=<64	19,2	1,3	6,5	1,2	1,1	6 378	6 532	16 943
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, female, 0=<age=<64	19,2	1,2	6,4	1,2	1,1	6 143	6 291	16 320
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 0=<age	19,3	1,4	7,5	1,3	1,2	5 619	5 755	14 928
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 16=<age=<24	23,7	3,3	14,0	3,0	1,3	5 398	5 528	14 341
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 25=<age=<49	19,7	1,4	7,2	1,3	1,2	5 483	5 615	14 567
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 50=<age=<64	23,6	2,9	12,2	2,6	1,2	5 551	5 685	14 746
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 65=<age	8,5	1,8	21,0	1,7	1,1	6 224	6 374	16 535
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 16=<age	19,9	1,5	7,5	1,3	1,2	5 543	5 676	14 725
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 16=<age=<64	21,1	1,5	7,3	1,3	1,4	4 951	5 071	13 154
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, male, 0=<age=<64	20,6	1,5	7,2	1,3	1,2	5 645	5 781	14 996
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 0=<age	18,8	1,1	5,9	1,0	1,2	5 851	5 992	15 543
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 0=<age=<15	18,8	1,6	8,4	1,5	1,1	6 147	6 295	16 329
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 16=<age=<24	21,9	2,3	10,6	2,1	1,2	5 560	5 694	14 772
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 25=<age=<49	19,5	1,3	6,7	1,2	1,2	5 713	5 851	15 178
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 50=<age=<64	19,3	2,3	11,7	2,2	1,1	6 123	6 270	16 266
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 65=<age	9,3	1,0	10,3	0,8	1,3	5 325	5 454	14 147
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 16=<age	18,7	1,1	5,8	1,0	1,1	5 926	6 068	15 742
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 16=<age=<64	19,9	1,3	6,6	1,2	1,2	5 801	5 940	15 410
relative median at-risk-of poverty gap, 0=<age=<64	19,5	1,3	6,5	1,2	1,2	5 818	5 958	15 456
inequality of income distribution Gini coefficient	0,275	0,0	2,6	0,0	1,3	5 384	5 513	14 302
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, age>=0	13,1	0,6	4,2	0,5	1,3	5 037	5 159	13 382
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, 16=<age=<24	16,5	1,4	8,8	1,3	1,3	5 092	5 215	13 528

at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, 25=<age=<49	13,6	0,7	5,2	0,6	1,2	5 653	5 790	15 018
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, 50=<age=<64	9,8	0,9	9,1	0,8	1,4	4 879	4 997	12 962
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, 65=<age	7,9	0,8	9,6	0,7	1,2	5 524	5 657	14 674
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, 16=<age	11,8	0,5	4,0	0,4	1,3	5 287	5 414	14 044
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, 16=<age=<64	12,9	0,6	4,4	0,5	1,3	5 081	5 204	13 499
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, 0=<age=<64	14,2	0,6	4,6	0,6	1,4	4 898	5 016	13 011
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, age>=0	13,8	0,6	4,5	0,5	1,4	4 908	5 027	13 039
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, 16=<age=<24	16,9	1,6	9,6	1,4	1,3	5 184	5 309	13 771
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, 25=<age=<49	14,6	0,8	5,2	0,7	1,2	5 625	5 760	14 943
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, 50=<age=<64	10,6	1,0	9,5	0,9	1,4	4 958	5 078	13 173
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, 65=<age	4,2	0,7	17,0	0,6	1,3	5 290	5 417	14 052
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, 16=<age	12,5	0,6	4,5	0,5	1,3	5 135	5 259	13 642
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, 16=<age=<64	13,9	0,7	4,7	0,6	1,3	5 158	5 282	13 702
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, 0=<age=<64	15,1	0,7	4,7	0,6	1,4	4 902	5 020	13 023
at-risk-of-poverty rate, age>=0	13,4	0,5	3,9	0,4	1,3	5 011	5 132	13 313
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 0=<age=<15	19,5	1,3	6,5	1,1	1,4	4 921	5 040	13 074
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 16=<age=<24	16,7	1,2	7,3	1,0	1,4	4 991	5 111	13 259
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 25=<age=<49	14,1	0,6	4,4	0,6	1,2	5 588	5 723	14 845
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 50=<age=<64	10,1	0,8	7,7	0,7	1,4	4 891	5 009	12 994
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 65=<age	6,5	0,6	8,9	0,5	1,2	5 503	5 636	14 619
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 16=<age	12,1	0,5	3,8	0,4	1,3	5 205	5 331	13 829
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 16=<age=<64	13,4	0,5	4,0	0,5	1,3	5 075	5 198	13 483
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 0=<age=<64	14,6	0,6	4,1	0,5	1,4	4 922	5 041	13 076
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, employed	8,9	0,6	6,4	0,5	1,2	5 782	5 922	15 361
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, unemployed	45,2	3,5	7,7	3,2	1,2	5 523	5 656	14 672
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, retired	10,4	0,7	6,9	0,6	1,3	5 311	5 439	14 110
at-risk-of-poverty rate, female, other inactive	19,0	1,9	10,1	1,7	1,3	5 149	5 273	13 678
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, employed	10,6	0,7	6,3	0,6	1,3	5 171	5 295	13 736
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, unemployed	53,5	3,8	7,0	3,3	1,3	5 064	5 186	13 452
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, retired	9,2	0,8	9,1	0,7	1,3	5 299	5 427	14 077
at-risk-of-poverty rate, male, other inactive	15,4	1,9	12,4	1,8	1,1	6 022	6 167	15 998
at-risk-of-poverty rate, employed	9,8	0,5	5,3	0,5	1,3	5 348	5 477	14 207
at-risk-of-poverty rate, unemployed	49,2	2,7	5,6	2,5	1,2	5 436	5 567	14 441
at-risk-of-poverty rate, retired	9,9	0,6	6,1	0,5	1,3	5 058	5 180	13 438

at-risk-of-poverty rate, other inactive	17,4	1,4	8,3	1,3	1,2	5 859	6 001	15 566
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 2 adults, one dependent children	14,9	1,6	11,1	1,6	1,1	6 256	6 406	16 619
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 2 adults, two dependent children	14,8	1,7	11,5	1,4	1,5	4 551	4 661	12 090
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 2 adults, three or more dependent children	23,6	3,3	14,2	2,9	1,4	4 986	5 106	13 246
at-risk-of-poverty rate, household without dependent children	9,6	0,5	5,5	0,5	1,3	5 311	5 439	14 108
at-risk-of-poverty rate, household with dependent children	16,5	0,9	5,5	0,8	1,4	4 952	5 071	13 155
at-risk-of-poverty rate, one person household, under 65 years	25,7	1,9	7,5	1,8	1,2	5 716	5 854	15 186
at-risk-of-poverty rate, one person household, 65 years and over	10,5	1,2	11,7	1,0	1,4	4 788	4 903	12 719
at-risk-of-poverty rate, one person household, male	24,1	2,4	9,9	2,2	1,2	5 776	5 915	15 343
at-risk-of-poverty rate, one person household, female	15,5	1,3	8,4	1,2	1,2	5 585	5 719	14 837
at-risk-of-poverty rate, one person household	18,5	1,2	6,5	1,1	1,3	5 291	5 419	14 056
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 2 adults, no dependent children, both adults under 65 years	9,3	1,1	12,0	1,0	1,2	5 437	5 568	14 444
at-risk-of-poverty rate, 2 adults, no dependent children, at least one adult 65 years or more	4,4	0,8	17,4	0,7	1,2	5 449	5 581	14 476
at-risk-of-poverty rate, other household without dependent children	5,7	1,0	18,3	0,9	1,2	5 447	5 578	14 470
at-risk-of-poverty rate, single parent household, one or more dependent children	27,4	3,1	11,2	2,7	1,3	5 385	5 515	14 307
at-risk-of-poverty rate, accomodation tenure status, owner or rent free	13,0	0,5	4,2	0,5	1,4	4 937	5 056	13 117
at-risk-of-poverty rate, accomodation tenure status, tenant	18,8	2,3	12,3	2,1	1,2	5 476	5 608	14 547
at-risk-of-poverty rate (40% of median)	3,1	0,3	9,4	0,2	1,4	4 866	4 983	12 927
at-risk-of-poverty rate (50% of median)	7,4	0,4	5,7	0,4	1,2	5 683	5 820	15 098
at-risk-of-poverty rate (60% of median)	13,4	0,5	3,9	0,4	1,3	5 032	5 153	13 367
at-risk-of-poverty rate (70% of median)	21,0	0,6	2,7	0,5	1,4	4 737	4 851	12 584
inequality of income distribution s80/s20 income quantile share ratio	4,04	0,1	3,1	0,1	1,3	5 311	5 439	14 109
at-risk-of-poverty threshold HUF	519 937	3 261	0,6	2 843	1,3	5 139	5 263	13 653
at-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers except old-age and survivors benefits	46,3	0,5	1,1	0,5	1,1	6 162	6 310	16 369
at-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers including old-age and survivors benefits	48,8	0,5	1,0	0,5	1,1	6 089	6 235	16 175

2. ACCURACY

2.1. Sample design

2.1.1. *Type of sampling design (stratified, multi-stage, clustered)*: stratified two-stage sampling design in a part of the population (PART 1), while a stratified one-stage design in the rest (PART 2). The finally sampling units are the dwellings, and in each selected dwelling every household are observed.

2.1.2. *Sampling units (one stage, two stages):* in PART 1 the PSU-s are the localities and the SSU-s are the dwellings. In PART 2 the PSU-s are the dwellings.

2.1.3. *Stratification and substratification*: localities of the country are stratified by General Election Districts and size (measured by the number of dwellings). The population are divided into 403 strata.

2.1.4. *Sample size and allocation criteria*: 13 507 dwellings were selected in 2005. The allocation was nearly proportional, disturbed by the expected non-response rates, different by types of localities.

2.1.5. *Sample selection scheme*: in PART 1 PSU-s were selected with pps (measured by the number of dwellings). Dwellings in the sampled localities were selected systematically.

2.1.6. *Sample distribution over time:* The fieldwork period of SILC was in May and June. The following table show the sample distribution over time:

Weeks of interview	Achived sample size	Distribution of the achieved sample
1 May – 8 May	473	6.8 %
9 May – 15 May	2 088	30.1 %
16 May – 22 May	2 206	31. 8 %
23 May – 29 May	1 459	21.1 %
30 May – 5 June	652	9.4 %
6 June – 12 June	33	0.5 %
13 June – 19 June	16	0.2 %
May	6 596	95.2
June	331	4.8
Total	6 927	100.0 %

2.1.7. *Renewal of sample:* rotational groups: in 2005 the 13 507 selected dwellings were divided into 4 rotational groups, sized 2 613, 3 233, 3 598 és 4 063. In each subsequent year 4103 new dwellings are planned to be selected.

2.1.8. *Weightings*

2.1.8.1. *Design factor*: it was calculated by strata; in stratum j the design weight, the reciprocal of inclusion probality $w_j = L_j / l_j$, where L_j is the total number of dwellings in stratum j, and l_j is the number of selected dwellings. In 2005 $w_j \in [227,410]$.

2.1.8.2. *Non-response adjustments*: non-response adjustement were applied by strata. Primary weight in stratum j, $w_j^{'} = L_j / l_j^{'}$, where $l_j^{'}$ is the number of observed dwellings. A care was taken to primary weights not to exceed 2500.

2.1.8.3. *Adjustments to external data (level, variables used and sources)*: iterative raking scale method were applied. For calibration the following controls were used:

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

		Variable	Source	Control
Sex by age groups (population)	male	0_15	Updated Census (2001)	861 986
		16_19		249 754
		20_29		750 779
		30_39		718 881
		40_49		645 214
		50_59		659 592
		60_x		813 983
	female	0_15		821 705
		16_19		243 524
		20_29		734 915
		30_39		709 803
		40_49		680 647
		50_59		752 762
		60_x		1 292 227
Region (polulation)		Közép-Magyarország (HU10)		2 796 743
		Közép-Dunántúl (HU21)		1 091 265
		Nyugat-Dunántúl (HU22)		987 572
		Dél-Dunántúl (HU23)		962 052
		Észak-Magyarország (HU31)		1 252 794
		Észak-Alföld (HU32)		1 516 994
		Dél-Alföld (HU33)		1 328 352
size (number of households)		1	Microcensus 2005	1 168 370
		2		1 191 803
		3		754 073

		4	593 445
		5 or more	315 231
Economic status (population)		At work, employee	3 134 323
		At work, self-employed	401 111
		At work, others	303 998
		Unemployed	466 715
		In retirement	3 044 800
		Other inactive	2 584 823
Highest education level attained		ISCED-97 = 0, 1, 2	6 516 683
		ISCED-97 = 3, 4	2 311 763
		ISCED-97 =5, 6	1 107 325
Population at work by highest education level attained		ISCED-97 = 0, 1, 2	1 704 941
		ISCED-97 = 3, 4	1 329 693
		ISCED-97 =5, 6	804 797
Type of settlement		Budapest	1 670 149
		County centre	1 946 673
		Other cities	2 840 492
		Villages	3 478 456

2.1.8.4. *Final cross-sectional weight*: after steps 2.1.8.1-2.1.8.3 we have the final weights. During calibration weights were constrained in interval $[300, 2500]$.

2.1.9. *Substitutions:* There was no substitution.

2.2. Sampling errors

2.2.1.   *Standard error and effective sample size*:

See above.

2.3. Non-sampling errors

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

The target population of our survey was the population living in private households covering the total national territory of Hungary. The Census 2001 was the sampling frame which had been updated with the new residences. The undercoverage is due to the new dwellings completed after the last updating. The undercoverage in percentages amounts to about 30 000/4 260 000 =0.7 %.

Sampling units were addresses. All households have been taken into the sample from any selected addresses containing more than one households.

The following table shows the number and percentage of address doesn't exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or isn't principal residence at household level.

	Number	Percentage
Selected addresses	13 975	100.0 %
Address contacted	11 172	79.9 %
Address non-contacted from this:	2 803	20.1 %
Address cannot be located	11	0.1 %
Address unable to access	0	0.0 %
Address does not exist or is non-residental address or is unoccupied or not principal residence	2 792	20.0 %

2.3.2 Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

Questionnaires and address sheet:

Previous to the main operation we implemented two pilot surveys. In frame of the pilots we tested the address sheet, the household and personal questionnaire in different ways:
- We organised some meetings to discuss the draft questionnaires with our colleagues who are responsible for the fieldwork and with some interviewers;
- We used cognitive laboratory to test the design, content and wording of questionnaires;
- We made supplementary questionnaires containing interviewers' remarks on the experiences with each household and personal interviews under the pilots;
- After the pilots we organized a meeting with some interviewers to discuss their experiences concerning with the asking.

We made use of the experiences of testing, and the final address sheet and questionnaires were built up before the main operation.

Selection of interviewers and training:

The training for interviewers were organized by regional and county offices who were responsible for the fieldwork of SILC. 'Inspectors' – who are working on the SILC project in the Social Statistics Department – participated each trainings, and they tried to help the training. Each counties (20) one training was organized for the interviewers. The number of interviewers were approximately 400.

Before the fieldwork we try to test the skills and achievement of the interviewers. All of them had to fill two questionnaires in with their friends, neighbours and the inspectors controlled all of them. After that some interviewers didn't continue their work, because their questionnaire didn't meet the minimum requirement.

We prepared a uniform script of training which was very useful since we could conduct uniform training in different counties and regions.
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 the county office made report three times with the ratio of the address contacted and the response rate in case of each interviewers. Those who didn' t comply with the requirements the county offices had to change them to another.

The inspectors and the colleagues worked in county offices controlled the fieldwork personally. They met each interviewers at least once during the fieldwork and they visited some households asked before.

During the fieldwork period we had a hotline for interviewers and also for the selected sample households.

Ex post control by phone: After the fieldwork the inspectors ring the 5% of the households asked up to inquire about the interviewer (whether the interviewer visited the households, is he/she sympathetic to the household or not etc.).

2.3.2.2 Processing errors

Data entry program

Blaise was used as data entry program. The data entry program was tested by some county offices and all of the inspectors. After the testing the data entry program was corrected.
Approximately 50 colleagues made the data entry and there was hot line for them. They can call the information specialist with their problems.
The program contained checks to ensure the basic data consistency.

Data controlling, editing

After the data entry we controlled the data 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

2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size

Number of households for which an interview is accepted for the database (DB135=1)

Household level	Rotational group				Total
	1.	2.	3.	4.	
Selected sample size	2 702	3 344	3 731	4 198	13 975
Achieved sample size	1 300	1 688	1 875	2 064	6 927
Achieved/selected sample size	0.48	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50

Number of person 16 years or older whose interview is accepted for the database (RB250=11)

Personal level	Rotational group				Total
	1.	2.	3.	4.	
Selected sample size	4 709	5 839	6 423	7 239	24 210
Achieved sample size	2 802	3 638	3 975	4 376	14 791
Achieved/selected sample size	0.60	0.62	0.62	0.60	0.61

2.3.3.2. Unit non response

Household non-response rates (NRh)

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

Ra=<u>Number of addresses successfully contacted</u>= $\frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]}$ = $\frac{11\ 172}{13\ 975\text{-}2\ 792}$ =**1.00**
Number of valid addresses selected

Ra =0.99. *Ra* is the address contact rate, but we calculated *DB120* on household level. As it was mentioned before the sampling unit was the address, and if more than one household lived at the same address, then we interviewed all of them. The database is also a household level database so we calculeted the rate on household level. If we aggregate this number to the level of addresses, the value of the indicator is also 1.00. (10 704/(13 507-2 792))

Rh= <u>Number of household interviews completed and accepted for database</u> =
Number of eligible households at contacted addresses

= $\frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]}$ = $\frac{6\ 927}{11\ 172}$ = **0.62**

$NRh=(1-(1.00*0.62))*100=$**38 %**

Individual non-response rate (NRp):

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

As it was mentioned, in 2005 the SILC data requirements came from three different data sources. The basic personal data, demographic data, education, including highest ISCED level attained, basic labour information on current activity status and on current main job were asked in

Microcensus. Microcensus was a compulsory survey so every household and personal interviews were successful. (at this phase the non response rate is 0) . The Income Survey and the SILC was not compulsory so many households refused to cooperate. SILC was implemented in the second phase covering only the households that had been involved sucessfully in the Microcesus and the Income Survey. If the SILC household questionnaire was not completed then the value of DB130 is 21,22,23 or 24. (unit non-response) But if somebody refused to cooperate at personal level we didn't regard as unit non-response just item non-response, because most of the personal data we had from the Microcensus.

$$R_p = \frac{\text{Number of personal interviews completed}}{\text{Number of eligible individuals in the households whose interviews were completed and accepted for the data base}} = \frac{\Sigma[RB250=11]}{\Sigma[RB245=1]} =$$

$$= \frac{14\ 791}{14\ 791} = \mathbf{1.00}$$

Overall individual non-response rate (*NRp):

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

$NRp = (1-(1.00*0.62*1.00))*100 = \mathbf{38\%}$

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

1. Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address'

	Number					Percentage				
	Rotational group				total	Rotational group				total
	1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.	
Total (DB120=11 to 23)	**2 702**	**3 344**	**3 731**	**4 198**	**13 975**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Address contacted (DB120=11)	2 149	2 703	2 984	3 336	11 172	79.5	80.8	80.0	79.5	79.9
Address non-contacted (DB120= 21 to 23)	553	641	747	862	2 803	20.5	19.2	20.0	20.5	20.1
Total address non-contacted (DB120=21 to 23)	**553**	**641**	**747**	**862**	**2 803**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Address cannot be located (DB120=21)	3	1	3	4	11	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4
Address unable to access (DB120=22)	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Address does not exists or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120=23)	550	640	744	858	2 792	99.5	99.8	99.6	99.5	99.6

2. Distribution of households contacted by 'household questionnaire result' and by household interview acceptance

	Number					Percentage				
	Rotational group				total	Rotational group				total
	1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.	
Total	**2 149**	**2 703**	**2 984**	**3 336**	**11 172**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Household questionnaire completed (DB130=11)	1 300	1 688	1 875	2 064	6 927	60.5	62.4	62.8	61.9	62.0
Interview not completed (DB130=21 to 24)	849	1 015	1 109	1 272	4 245	39.5	37.6	37.2	38.1	38.0
Total interview not completed (DB130=21 to 24)	**849**	**1 015**	**1 109**	**1 272**	**4 245**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Refusal to cooperate (DB130=21)	812	954	1 049	1 208	4023	95.6	94.0	94.6	95.0	94.8
Entirely household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork (DB130=22)	26	48	43	46	163	3.1	4.7	3.9	3.6	3.8
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity etc.) (DB130=23)	6	5	7	7	25	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6
Other reasons (DB130=24)	5	8	10	11	34	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8

	Number					Percentage				
	Rotational group				total	Rotational group				Total
	1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.	
Household questionnaire completed (DB135=1+2)	**1 300**	**1 688**	**1 875**	**2 064**	**6 927**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Interview accepted for data base (DB135=1)	1 300	1 688	1 875	2 064	6 927	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Interview rejected (DB135=2)	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

2.4. Mode of data collection

1. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by 'RB205' (Respondent status)

RB245=1 $\Rightarrow$ 14 791 person

(number)

Rotational group	RB250		
	11	12-33	Total
1	2 802	0	2 802
2	3 638	0	3 638
3	3 975	0	3 975
4	4 376	0	4 376
Total	14 791	0	14 791

2. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by 'RB260' (Type of interview)

RB245=1 ⇒ 14 791 person

(number)

Rotational group	RB260			
	1 (PAPI)	5 (proxy)	2-4 (others)	missing
1	2 471	331	0	0
2	3 247	391	0	0
3	3 531	444	0	0
4	3 888	488	0	0
Total	13 137	1 654	0	0

(%)

Rotational group	RB260			
	1 (PAPI)	5 (proxy)	2-4 (others)	missing
1	88.2	11.8	0	0
2	89.3	10.7	0	0
3	88.8	11.2	0	0
4	88.8	11.2	0	0
Total	88.8	11.2	0	0

2.5. Interview duration

(min.)

Unit	Mean
Household interview	21
Personal interview	14
Total (at household level)	51

Total interview duration by household size

(min.)

Unit	Mean
HH with 1 member	37
HH with 2 members	48
HH with 3 members	55
HH with 4 members	60
HH with 5 or more members	69
Total	51

3. COMPARABILITY

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions

– *Reference population*: The reference population of our survey is all private households and their current members living in the territory of Hungary. There is no part of the national territory which is exluded from the survey. The diplomatic representatives of foreign countries and their households are excluded from SILC.
– *Private household definition*: Private household is defined as a person living alone or a group of people who live together in the same dwelling and share expenditures. The persons being educated or working away from home were also regarded as household members irrespective of the length of absence if they have very close ties to the household, and they share the expenditures.

- *Invome reference period*: We used a fixed twelve-month period namely the previous calendar year, which is also the tax year in Hungary. The lag between the income reference period and current variables is 3 month since the reference time of interviewing was 1 April.

Differences between the national definitions and standard EU-SILC definitions

- *Person responding the household questionnaire (HB070):* Our priority was to chose a household member aged 16 and over who is the best placed to give the information on household members, their living conditions, income situation etc.
- *Leaking roof, damp walls/floors/foundation, or rot in window frames or loor (HH040):* We asked the different items in separated questions. If the dwelling has a problem with at least one items we indicated "yes' to the variable HH040.
- *Total housing cost (HH070):* We calculate the total housing cost according to the regulation but the housing benefit is excluded from the variable. The housing benefit is provided by local authorities usually once or two times a year (many local authorities give this social assistance for the winter period as a lump-sum). Under this circumstance only the income reference period is adequate, not the current reference period.
- *Arrears on mortgage or rent payments (HS010):* We used the income reference period instead of last 12 months. Under the pilots our experience was that the various reference period (current, income reference period, last twelve months, since last year, working life, childcare reference period) was very confusing for the interviewer and also for the asked. Especially in case of mortgage where we use the income reference period (HS010), the current reference period (HH070) and also the last 12 month (HS010).
- *Arrears on utility bills (HS020):* We used the income reference period instead of last 12 months.
- *Arrears on hire purchase instalments or other loan payments (HS030):* We used the income reference period instead of last 12 months.
- *Managerial position (PL150):* The variable is missing in case of records where the household member do not work. We have no information concerning the last situation. This variable came from Microcensus which did not include this information.

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

We have no register, so all of the income variables come from interviews.

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

We collected gross income at component level.

4. COHERENCE

We tried to compare our results with data came from administrative sources, but we found numerous problems concerning the comparison.
- The administrative data sources cover both the privat and institutional households, and it could not be separated the two elements.
- The administrative data refer to a fix date (for instance: 1th Jan or 31th Dec) not for the income reference period

Laeken indicators from EU-SILC and Household Budget Survey were compared. We tried to analyse the reasons of deviation. We identified the main reasons:
- Different concept of disposable income in the two surveys
- Different methodological procedures used