



**Intermediate Quality Report**

**For EU-SILC 2006 operation  
Cross sectional data**

**Hungary**

**Agreement No 36400.2005.001-2005.428**

15. December 2007.

Introduction.....	4
1. Common Cross Sectional European Union Indicators .....	5
2. Accuracy .....	10
2.1. Sample design .....	10
2.2. Sampling errors .....	13
2.3. Non-sampling errors .....	15
2.4. Mode of data collection .....	21
2.5. Imputation procedure .....	21
2.6. Imputed rent .....	22
2.7. Company car .....	22
3. Comparability .....	22
3.1. Basic concepts and definitions.....	22
3.2. Components of income .....	22
3.3. Tracking rules .....	24
4. Coherence .....	24

## **Index of tables**

Table 1: Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC 2006	6
Table 2: Sample size	11
Table 3: sample distribution over time	11
Table 4: Renewal of the sample, rotational groups	11
Table 5: Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, unweighted	13
Table 6: Mean, total number of observation before and after imputation, standard error, weighted	14
Table 7: Mean, number of observation, standard error for disposable income	15
Table 8: Sample size and rotational groups on household level	17
Table 9: Sample size and rotational groups on personal level	17
Table 10: Distribution of DB120	18
Table 11: Distribution of DB130	18
Table 12: Distribution of DB135	18
Table 13: Item non-response on household level by income items	19
Table 14: Item non-response on personal level by personal income items	20
Table 15: Distribution of RB250	21
Table 16: Distribution of RB260	21
Table 17: Interview duration in minutes	21
Table 18: Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC2005 and EU-SILC2006, weighted	25
Table 19: Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC2005 and EU-SILC2006 unweighted	26
Table 20: Comparison of common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005 and EU-SILC2006	27

## **Introduction**

The present final quality report follows the structure outlined in Commission Regulation No 28/2004. The regulation defines 3 chapters to ensure constant documentation on quality of EU-SILC instrument. The three chapters reports 3 dimensions of quality as accuracy, comparability and coherence. According to article 16 of EC regulation No 1177/2003 of European Parliament of the Council of 16<sup>th</sup> 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**

2006 was the second year of EU-SILC survey in Hungary as a part of a longitudinal sample. On the basis of the cross sectional data the calculated Laeken Indicators are presented here.

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary

Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2006

1 Mean equivalised disposable income				
2 Risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$\$NAT	572,577	
		EUR	2,308	
		PPS	3,778	
	2 adults 2 dep. children	\$\$NAT	1,202,412	
		EUR	4,847	
		PPS	7,933	
3 Risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender	Total	Total	15.9	
		M	16.3	
		F	15.5	
	0-17	Total	24.4	
		0-64	Total	17.1
			M	17.6
	F		16.6	
	18+	Total	13.6	
		M	13.7	
		F	13.4	
	18-64	Total	14.5	
		M	14.9	
		F	14.2	
	18-24	Total	18.3	
		M	17.9	
		F	18.7	
	25-49	Total	15.8	
		M	15.9	
		F	15.7	
	50-64	Total	11.2	
		M	12.1	
		F	10.4	
	65+	Total	9.4	
		M	6.9	
		F	10.8	
4 Risk-of-poverty rate by most frequent activity	Total	Total	6.9	
		M	8.1	
		F	5.4	
	(a) At work	Total	Total	19.6
			M	20.7
			F	18.9
	(d) Not at work	Total	Total	52.9
			M	54.9
			F	50.6
	(e1) Of which: Unemployed	Total	Total	11.7
			M	11.9
			F	11.7
	(e2) Of which: Retired	Total	Total	25.8
			M	23.4
			F	26.9
5 Risk-of-poverty rate by household type	All hh no dep. childr.		10.1	
	1 person hh	Total	17.6	
	1 person hh	M	24.7	
	1 person hh	F	14.5	
	1 person hh <65yrs		13.5	
	1 person hh 65+		22.0	
	2 adults no dep. childr.	(both < 65)	10.5	
	2 adults no dep. childr.	(at least one 65+)	8.1	
	Other hh no dep. childr.		5.9	
	All hh with dep. childr.		20.5	
	Single parent	(at least 1 child)	38.9	
	2 adults 1 dep. child		13.6	
	2 adults 2 dep. childr.		18.0	
	2 adults 3+ dep. childr.		33.2	
	Other hh with dep. childr.		14.7	
Risk-of-poverty rate by accomodation				
6 tenuresstatus	(a) Owner or rent-free	Total	15.3	
		Total	24.9	
	(b) Tenant	Total	24.4	
		Total	24.4	

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary

Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2006 –continued

7	Risk-of-poverty rate	All hh no dep. childr.	WI = 0	21.7
	by work intensity of		0 < WI < 1	9.0
	the household		WI = 1	2.3
		All hh with dep. childr.	WI = 0	72.5
			0 < WI < 0.5	51.9
			0.5 <= WI < 1	15.9
			WI = 1	5.8
9	Risk-of-poverty rate	Total	Total	48.6
	before and after transfers		M	46.7
	by age and gender		F	50.4
	(a) before all transfers	0-17	Total	47.6
		18+	Total	48.9
			M	46.5
			F	51.0
		18-64	Total	40.0
			M	39.2
			F	40.7
		65+	Total	87.4
			M	88.7
			F	86.6
	(b) including pensions	Total	Total	29.6
			M	30.2
			F	29.0
		0-17	Total	44.0
		18+	Total	25.7
			M	26.2
			F	25.4
		18-64	Total	28.5
			M	29.0
			F	28.1
		65+	Total	13.7
			M	9.7
			F	15.9
13	Relative median risk-of-poverty gap	Total	Total	24.0
	by age and gender		M	25.2
			F	23.3
		0-17	Total	25.2
		18+	Total	23.7
			M	25.1
			F	22.6
		18-64	Total	24.9
			M	25.4
			F	24.1
		65+	Total	17.0
			M	20.5
			F	15.6
14	S80/S20 quintile share ratio			5.46178
15	Gini coefficient			0.33300

*Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*

*Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2006 – continued*

16	Distribution of population by age and gender	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	100.0
			0-17	18.0
(a)	total population		18-24	11.9
			25-49	35.4
			50-64	19.8
			65+	15.0
			18+	82.0
			18-64	67.1
			0-64	85.1
		<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	100.0
			0-17	19.4
			18-24	13.2
			25-49	36.8
			50-64	19.3
			65+	11.4
			18+	80.6
			18-64	69.2
			0-64	88.6
		<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>	100.0
			0-17	16.7
			18-24	65.1
			25-49	34.1
			50-64	20.3
			65+	18.1
(b)	poor population		18+	83.3
			18-64	65.1
			0-64	81.9
		<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	100.0
			0-17	28.5
			18-24	13.7
			25-49	35.1
			50-64	13.9
			65+	8.8
			18+	71.5
			18-64	62.7
			0-64	91.2
		<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	100.0
			0-17	30.7
			18-24	14.4
			25-49	35.8
			50-64	14.3
			65+	4.8
			18+	69.3
			18-64	64.5
			0-64	95.2
		<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>	100.0
			0-17	26.3
			18-24	13.0
			25-49	34.4
			50-64	13.6
			65+	12.6
			18+	73.7
			18-64	61.0
			0-64	87.4



*Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*

*Table 1. Laeken Indicators EU-SILC2006 – continued*

17	Distribution of population by most frequent activity Status and gender - (a) total population	Total	18+	100.0
			At work	46.6
			Not at work	53.4
			of which:	
			unemployed	5.6
			of which: retired	32.6
			of which: other	
			inactive	15.2
		Male	18+	100.0
			At work	54.0
			Not at work	46.0
			of which:	
			unemployed	6.6
			of which: retired	27.7
			of which: other	
			inactive	11.8
		Female	18+	100.0
			At work	40.2
			Not at work	59.8
			of which:	
			unemployed	4.7
			of which: retired	37.0
			of which: other	
			inactive	18.2
(b) poor population		Total	18+	100.0
			At work	23.2
			Not at work	76.7
			of which:	
			unemployed	21.5
			of which: retired	27.8
			of which: other	
			inactive	27.4
		Male	18+	100.0
			At work	31.3
			Not at work	68.7
			of which:	
			unemployed	26.0
			of which: retired	23.5
			of which: other	
			inactive	19.2
		Female	18+	100.0
			At work	16.0
			Not at work	84.0
			of which:	
			unemployed	17.6
			of which: retired	31.6
			of which: other	
			inactive	34.8

## **2. Accuracy**

### *2.1. Sample design*

#### *2.1.1. Type of sampling*

2006 is the second year for the Hungarian EU-SILC survey. In 2006 a new rotational group with 4103 dwellings was introduced, the sample design of which coincides with the previous year sample design. The Hungarian EU-SILC survey was a supplementary survey in 2005, the new rotational group in 2006 was standalone.

In 2005 the sample of the Hungarian EU-SILC survey was a sub-sample of the Income survey sample which was a sub-sample of the micro census sample. It has a stratified two stage sample design in a part of the population (part I., type I., one PSU per stratum), while a stratified one stage sample design on the other part of the population (part II., type II.). Part II. population consists of mostly the bigger localities, part I. consists of the rest.

#### *2.1.2. Sampling units*

In type I. sample design PSU-s are localities, SSU-s are dwellings. In type II. PSU-s are dwellings.

#### *2.1.3. Stratification criteria*

Localities of Hungary were stratified by size.

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

Micro census has 806 localities in the sample, but EU-SILC could not allow more than 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: 2, 3 or 4 micro census strata similar in size of localities were collapsed. Within these collapsed strata only one locality was selected for EU-SILC (one PSU per stratum).

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

#### *2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria*

9767 dwellings were selected in 2006. Based on the minimum effective sample size we took expected non-response rate at the first wave and attrition over time into account. Our

*Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*

aim was to achieve a nearly proportional allocation for the realized sample. 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	9767
Contacted addresses	9314
Can not be located	50
Unable to access	0
Non-residential, unoccupied, not principal residence	403

*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. Before selection dwellings were sorted by the characteristic of area, enumeration district and serial number of dwellings.

*2.1. 6. Sample distribution over time*

The field work was carried out in May , June 2006 with reference month of April 2006.

*Table 3. Fieldwork timing and sample development over time*

Weeks of interview	Achieved sample size	Distribution of achieved sample
1 May – 8 May	2 179	28.2%
9 May – 15 May	2 605	33.7%
16 May – 22 May	2 028	26.3%
23 May – 29 May	632	8.2%
30 May – 5 June	126	1.6%
6 June – 12 June	109	1.4%
13 June – 19 June	30	0.4%
20 June – 26 June	7	0.1%
27 June – 30 June	6	0.1%
Total	7 722	100.0%

*2.1.7. Renewal of the sample, rotational groups*

2005 was the first year of EU-SILC in Hungary. The 13 975 selected dwellings were divided into 4 rotational groups, sized 2702, 3344, 3731 and 4198, where we took the expected attrition into account. In 2006 the first rotational group (of size 2702) was dropped out and 4103 new dwellings were introduced.

*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	1 686	-
Rotational group4	4 198	2 077	1 892	1 717
Rotational group5	-	4 130	2 628	1 927
Rotational group6	-	-	3 850	2 663
Rotational group7	-	-	-	4 103
Total sample	13 975	9 767	10 056	6 766

### *2.1.8. Weighting*

This chapter describes the computation of weights of EU-SILC sample 2006.

#### *2.1.8.1. Design factors*

It was calculated by strata; in stratum  $j$  the design weight, the reciprocal of inclusion probability  $w_j = L_j / l_j$ , where  $L_j$  is the total number of dwellings in stratum  $j$ , and  $l_j$  is the number of selected dwellings.  $w_j \in [227, 410]$ .

#### *2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments*

Non-response weights were introduced to reduce bias caused by unit non-response on household level. Non-response adjustment was applied by strata. Primary weight in stratum  $j$ ,  $w'_j = L_j / l'_j$ , where  $l'_j$  is the number of observed dwellings. A care was taken to primary weights not to exceed 1600.

#### *2.1.8.3. Adjustment to external data*

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

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

Calibration was carried out with a self made SAS program.

#### *2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weights*

After calibrating the new and former rotational groups separately, those adjusted weights were reduced proportional to the group size. Finally, one more calibration was applied for the overall sample with a small number of iterations. Final cross-sectional weights are in the interval  $[150, 1100]$ .

### *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
			Before imputation	After imputation	
<i>Gross income components on personal level</i>					
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1 354 109	6 920	7 504	25 435
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	68 715	754	754	4 228
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 636 084	742	1 092	105 208
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	0	0	0	0
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	169 861	79	79	32 713
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	183 938	983	983	12 654
PY100G	Old-age benefit	790 015	4 641	4 808	7 593
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	318 519	283	283	18 383
PY120G	Sickness benefit	88 083	859	859	5 448
PY130G	Disability benefit	530 430	1 246	1 269	9 875
PY140G	Education related allowances	91 137	395	395	6 087
<i>Gross income components on household level</i>					
HY010	Total household gross income	2 320 552	6 839	7 701	37 147
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 885 861	6 846	7 708	26 674
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 700 773	7 097	7 560	27 065
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 469 836	5 995	6 153	32 610
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	251 004	126	137	48 826
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	281 147	2 406	2 406	8 042
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	44 273	417	433	6 587
HY070G	Housing allowances	47 206	667	667	2 363
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	301 385	756	756	35 905
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	319 210	96	125	57 391
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	236 214	525	525	10 426
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	42 771	7	9	23 321
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	15 091	3 570	3 570	307
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	256 014	778	778	17 048
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	634 144	4 859	4 859	18 847

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	1 378 174	3 611 136	3 940 004	21 143
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	70 510	407 631	407 631	4 241
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 861 218	397 146	629 334	99 261
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	0	0	0	0
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	171 382	40 587	40 587	32 102
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	185 629	517 648	517 648	13 192
PY100G	Old-age benefit	796 206	1 985 959	2 061 081	7 538
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	316 294	129 057	129 057	18 156
PY120G	Sickness benefit	81 945	455 225	455 225	5 346
PY130G	Disability benefit	526 610	572 534	583 457	9 731
PY140G	Education related allowances	88 714	182 372	182 372	6 017
HY010	Total household gross income	2 447 399	3 306 390	3 799 323	34 664
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 968 043	3 311 088	3 804 021	27 270
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 784 588	3 464 601	3 736 368	28 050
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 595 723	3 075 416	3 147 334	33 000
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	278 499	63 047	70 518	69 557
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	268 548	1 286 580	1 286 580	5 755
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	42 755	184 176	192 628	8 259
HY070G	Housing allowances	49 010	315 722	315 722	2 854
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	311 243	401 516	401 516	34 887
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	338 028	53 636	69 740	66 443
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	249 095	282 324	282 324	12 549
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	45 581	3 764	4 815	26 574
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	15 778	1 815 898	1 815 898	359
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	277 097	391 280	391 280	21 319
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	649 140	2 580 195	2 580 195	18 330

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

Disposable income	Mean	Number of observation	Standard error
<i>Equivalised disposable income By household size</i>			
1 household member	992 449	1 940	27 471
2 household member	1 237 896	4 830	29 755
3 household member	1 223 124	4 278	36 948
4 and more household member	1 079 592	8 854	31 407
<i>Per capita disposable income</i>			
<i>Population by age groups</i>			
Under 25	595 374	5 661	15 477
25-34	838 983	2 756	23 871
35-44	717 257	2 464	25 422
45-54	821 157	2 933	21 754
55-64	909 627	2 592	19 111
65+	811 368	3 496	12 527
<i>Population by gender</i>			
Male	747 814	9 199	11 179
Female	759 756	10 703	11 080
<i>Total</i>	754 109	19 902	10 068

### 2.3. Non-sampling errors

#### 2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

The 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  $30,000 / 4,260,000 \approx 0.7 \%$ .

#### 2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

##### 2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

Measurement errors can be defined as a bias between the recorded value on the basis of the respondent answer and the real, true, but unknown value of the given variable. The sources of the difference can be:

- i. questionnaire problem
- ii. data collection problem
- iii. respondent misinterpreting the question

These unavoidable problems were kept in mind during the preparations of the data collection and following steps were done to reduce them.

Based on the experiences of the previous wave (EU-SILC2005) 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 (Címkérttya).

### *Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*

- A detailed manual was compiled for interviewers to deepen their knowledge about the structure of the questionnaire and the management of the interview.

#### *Interviewers training*

The training for interviewers was organized by regional and county offices that were responsible for the fieldwork of SILC. 'Inspectors' – who are working on the EU-SILC project at Social Statistics Department – actively participated each trainings. Each of the counties (20) had one training section organized for the interviewers. The number of interviewers was approximately 400.

We put a great effort using the same interviewers participated the carry out of the survey in the previous year.

A uniformed training schedule and script were used all the counties of the country.

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 interviewer. Interviewers did not fulfill the requirements was excluded from the data collection.

The inspectors and the colleagues worked in county offices controlled the fieldwork personally. They met each interviewer 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 called 5% of the households 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 county offices, inspectors and head office experts. After the testing the data entry program was corrected.

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

The program contained checks to ensure the basic data consistency.

#### *Data controlling, editing*

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



### Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary

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

#### 2.3.3. Non-response errors

The sample of EU-SILC 2006 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	9 767	1 697	1 863	2 077	4 130
Achieved sample size	7 722	1 548	1 685	1 889	2 600
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.79	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.63

Table 9. Sample size and rotational groups on personal level

Personal level	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Selected sample size	24 004	4 419	4 820	5 328	9 437
Achieved sample size	16 516	3 389	3 608	4 033	5 486
Achieved/Selected sample size	0.69	0.77	0.75	0.76	0.58

#### 2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

Household non-response rates (NRh)

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

$$Ra = \frac{\text{Number of addresses successfully contacted}}{\text{Number of valid addresses selected}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB120=11]}{\Sigma[DB120=all] - \Sigma[DB120=23]} = \mathbf{0.9947}$$

$$Rh = \frac{\text{Nr of hhold interviews completed \& accepted for database}}{\text{Number of eligible households at contacted addresses}} = \frac{\Sigma[DB135=1]}{\Sigma[DB130=all]} = \mathbf{0.8291}$$

$$NRh = (1 - (1.00 * 0.62)) * 100 = \mathbf{17.5 \%}$$

Individual non-response rate (NRp):

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

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

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

Overall individual non-response rate (\*NRp):

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

$$NRp=(1-(1.00*0.62*1.00))*100=17.5 \%$$

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)	9 314	1 687	1 852	2 065	3 710
Address can not be located (21)	50	10	3	2	45
Address unable to access (22)	0	0	0	0	0
Address does not exist or etc (23)	403	0	8	10	375
Not contacted address (24)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9 767	1 697	1 863	2 077	4 130

*Table 11. Distribution of DB130*

DB130- Household questionnaire result	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Household questionnaire completed (11)	7 722	1 548	1 685	1 889	2 600
Refusal to co-operate (21)	1 144	104	127	134	779
Entire household temporarily away (22)	333	29	29	30	245
Household unable to respond (23)	59	3	8	7	41
Other reason(24)	56	3	3	5	45
Total	453	10	11	12	420
	9 767	1 697	1 863	2 077	4 130

*Table 12. Distribution of DB135*

DB135- Household interview acceptance	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Interview accepted for database (1)	7 722	1 548	1 685	1 889	2 600
Interview rejected (2)	2 045	149	178	188	1 530
Total	9 767	1 697	1 863	2 077	4 130

#### 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	7 701	99.7	6 839	88.8	862	11.2	0	0.0
HY020	Total disposable household income	7 708	99.8	6 846	88.8	862	11.2	0	0.0
	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit								
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	7 560	97.9	7 097	93.9	456	6.0	7	0.1
HY023		6 153	79.7	5 995	97.4	108	1.8	50	0.8
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	137	1.8	126	92.0	0	0.0	11	8.0
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	2 406	31.2	2 406	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	433	5.6	417	96.3	0	0.0	16	3.7
HY070G	Housing allowances	667	8.6	667	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received								
HY080G	Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment	756	9.8	756	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY090G		125	1.6	96	76.8	0	0.0	29	23.2
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	525	6.8	525	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	9	0.1	7	77.8	0	0.0	2	22.2
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	3 570	46.2	3 570	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	778	10.1	778	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	4 859	62.9	4 859	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

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

Personal income items		Household having received an amount		Full information		Partial information		Missing	
		count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	7 504	45.4	6 920	92.2	231	3.1	353	4.7
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	754	4.6	754	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 092	6.6	742	67.9	3	0.3	347	31.8
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	131	0.8	79	60.3	0	0.0	52	39.7
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	983	6.0	983	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY100G	Old-age benefit	4 808	29.1	4 641	96.5	1	0.0	166	3.5
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	283	1.7	283	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY120G	Sickness benefit	859	5.2	859	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PY130G	Disability benefit	1 269	7.7	1 246	98.2	0	0.0	23	1.8
PY140G	Education related allowances	395	2.4	395	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

## 2.4. Mode of data collection

Distribution of persons aged 16 or over by "data status" (RB250) and by "type of interview" (RB260)

Table 15. Distribution of RB250

RB250- Data status	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
Information completed only from interview(11)	16 516	3 389	3 608	4 033	5 486
From register...no reason (12-33)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	16 516	3 389	3 608	4 033	5 486

Table 16. Distribution of RB260

RB260- Contact address	Total	R1	R2	R3	R4
PAPI (1)	14 341	2 943	3 163	3 507	4 728
CAP, CATI, Other(2,3,4)	0	0	0	0	0
Proxy(5)	2 175	446	445	526	758
Total	16 516	3 389	3 608	4 033	5 486

Table 17. Interview duration in minutes

Interview	Mean	By household size	Mean
Household interview	25	HH with 1 member	49
Personal interview	21	HH with 2 members	65
Total (at household level)	69	HH with 3 members	76
		HH with 4 members	84
		HH with 5+ members	94
		Total	69

## 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*

Imputed rent was not calculated for EU-SILC 2006 wave.

## *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 2006.

## *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 2005.
- 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 was 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 April 2006.
- viii. Total duration of data collection of the sample*  
The data collection lasted 9 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*

*Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*

- 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*  
Imputed rent was not calculated.
- vi. *Income from rental of property or land*  
No difference to the common methodology.
- vii. *Family/children related allowances*  
The sophisticated child related allowance system of Hungary was covered here. For the age of 6 months of the baby, the mother can stay at home with the baby on a *Child birth leave* receiving the amount of a normal sickpay, about 80 % of her former salary. For the age of 2 years of the child the mother or the father of the child can stay home receiving *Child care allowance (Gyed)*, which is equal to 75 % of her/his former salary, but not higher than 80 000 HUF (about 320 Euro/months). Until the age of 3 of the child the parent can stay home receiving *Child care aid (Gyes)*, which equals to the minimum old age pension (about 110 Euro). This allowance can be passed to the any of grandparents who is responsible for the daily care of the child if the parent goes back to work again. If the family has got 3 or more children and the mother does not work full time (max. 20 hours a week) or does not work at all she can receive *Child care benefit (Gyet)*, which equals to the minimum old-age pension until the youngest child does not fulfill the age of 8.
- viii. *Social exclusion payment not elsewhere classified*  
No difference to common methodology

*3.2.2. The source or procedure used for collecting income variables*

All the income variables were collected from the respondents. The income target variables were grouped into more detailed sub-components according to Hungarian tax and benefit system.

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

Gross income data were collected for the income items but in case of certain benefits according to tax law which were not considered to be belonging to the taxable income net value were asked, like old-age pension or family allowance.

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

The income items were divided into sub-components according to the Hungarian tax regulations and benefit practice in the questionnaire. The personal and household incomes were separated. Gross income items were asked for work related incomes and other incomes belonging to the personal tax system and net income items were asked for benefits and other allowances. The following steps were taken to obtain income target variables in the required form.

- i. The subcomponents were summed up to obtain the income items on personal income level.

### *Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*

- 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. The initial survey year for EU-SILC survey was launched in 2005 although Hungarian Statistical Office calculated the common cross-sectional indicators on the basis of Household Budget Survey data from 2002. It was our aim to provide reliable data and indicators by the new tool, so detailed comparison was done on output- indicator- level between HBS and EU-SILC. From the comparison point of view we were in a very pleasant situation because our Office carried out three surveys focused on Hungarian private households' income and expenditure structures in 2005 with the reference year of 2004. Namely: EU-SILC, HBS, Income Survey (IS). A comparative study was published in Hungarian in August 2006.

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

The final quality report on EU-SILC2005 wave covered the main areas of the comparison such as sample design, imputation and calibration procedures.

Current study focus on the comparison of the target variables and common cross sectional indicators on the basis of the first EU-SILC wave (2005) and second EU-SILC wave (2006) database.

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. Governmental measures also were taken to encourage unemployed persons to find new job opportunities the decrease of unemployment related allowances is acceptable as well. At certain items – like income of household members under 16 – the number of observations was small. If we study the results from the output view - meaning the Laeken indicators results – the data are reflecting Hungarian private households' economic situation on similar way.



Table 18. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2005 and EU-SILC 2006 (weighted)

weighted		2006		2005	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1 378 174	21 143	1 190 048	18 898
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	70 510	4 241	273 773	29 171
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 861 218	99 261	1 107 428	63 864
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	0	0	84 413	6 198
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	171 382	32 102	223 454	39 140
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	185 629	13 192	235 522	14 374
PY100G	Old-age benefit	796 206	7 538	725 935	5 227
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	316 294	18 156	216 385	14 113
PY120G	Sickness benefit	81 945	5 346	123 267	7 165
PY130G	Disability benefit	526 610	9 731	398 041	7 427
PY140G	Education related allowances	88 714	6 017	81 073	6 367
<i>Income components on household level</i>					
HY010	Total household gross income	2 447 399	34 664	2 104 914	29 723
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 968 043	27 270	1 639 022	17 273
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 784 588	28 050	1 125 088	17 548
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 595 723	33 000	1 217 498	21 308
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	278 499	69 557	347 719	48 525
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	268 548	5 755	270 218	5 301
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	42 755	8 259	111 222	7 076
HY070G	Housing allowances	49 010	2 854	44 623	3 606
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	311 243	34 887	156 467	9 811
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	338 028	66 443	219 051	90 562
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	249 095	12 549	219 525	10 937
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	45 581	26 574	102 499	22 761
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	15 778	359	14 301	318
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	277 097	21 319	113 933	7 053
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	649 140	18 330	660 784	19 900

Table 19. Comparison of income target variables EU-SILC 2005 and EU-SILC 2006 (unweighted)

		2006		2005	
		mean	standard error	mean	standard error
PY010G	Employee cash or near-cash income	1 354 109	25 435	1 164 079	18 381
PY020G	Non-cash employee income	68 715	4 228	256 719	29 506
PY050G	Cash benefit or losses from self-employment	1 636 084	105 208	1 024 458	81 544
PY070G	Value of goods produced by own-consumption	0	0	85 690	5 940
PY080G	Pension from individual private plans	169 861	32 713	237 333	41 325
PY090G	Unemployment benefit	183 938	12 654	228 103	15 248
PY100G	Old-age benefit	790 015	7 593	718 409	5 118
PY110G	Survivor's benefit	318 519	18 383	214 819	13 392
PY120G	Sickness benefit	88 083	5 448	125 707	7 554
PY130G	Disability benefit	530 430	9 875	389 645	7 585
PY140G	Education related allowances	91 137	6 087	82 540	7 025
<i>Income components on household level</i>					
HY010	Total household gross income	2 320 552	37 147	2 115 944	27 791
HY020	Total disposable household income	1 885 861	26 674	1 677 865	17 239
HY022	Total disp.hhold income before soc.trans other than old-age benefit and survivor's benefit	1 700 773	27 065	1 102 166	17 731
HY023	Total disp.hhold income before soc.transfers including old-age and survivor's benefit	1 469 836	32 610	1 199 447	20 325
HY040G	Income from rental of a property or land	251 004	48 826	353 972	67 582
HY050G	Family/Children related allowances	281 147	8 042	273 704	6 018
HY060G	Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	44 273	6 587	113 332	6 856
HY070G	Housing allowances	47 206	2 363	44 399	3 306
HY080G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers received	301 385	35 905	145 652	8 357
HY090G	Interest, dividends, profit from cap.investment	319 210	57 391	207 468	90 185
HY100G	Interest repayment on mortgage	236 214	10 426	209 533	9 782
HY110G	Income received by people under 16	42 771	23 321	101 417	22 399
HY120G	Regular taxes on wealth	15 091	307	14 214	315
HY130G	Regular interhousehold cash transfers paid	256 014	17 048	107 098	5 857
HY140G	Tax on income and social contribution	634 144	18 847	640 606	17 214

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary  
Table 20. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators  
– EU-SILC2005 and EU-SILC2006

			2005	Age group change	2006
<b>1 Mean equivalised disposable income</b>					
<b>2 Risk-of-poverty threshold</b> (illustrative values)	1 person hh	\$NAT	519,937		572,577
		EUR	2,080		2,308
		PPS	3,430		3,778
	2 adults 2 dep. children	\$NAT	1,091,867		1,202,412
		EUR	4,367		4,847
		PPS	7,204		7,933
<b>3 Risk-of-poverty rate</b> by age and gender	Total	Total	<b>13.4</b>	Total	15.9
		M	13.8		16.3
		F	13.0		15.5
	0-15	Total	19.5	0-17	24.4
	0-64	Total	14.6	0-64	17.1
		M	15.1		17.6
		F	14.2		16.6
	16+	Total	12.1	18+	13.6
		M	12.5		13.7
		F	11.8		13.4
	16-64	Total	13.4	18-64	14.5
		M	13.9		14.9
		F	12.9		14.2
	16-24	Total	16.7	18-24	18.3
		M	16.9		17.9
		F	16.5		18.7
	25-49	Total	14.1	25-49	15.8
		M	14.6		15.9
		F	13.6		15.7
	50-64	Total	10.1	50-64	11.2
		M	10.6		12.1
		F	9.8		10.4
	65+	Total	6.5	65+	9.4
		M	4.2		6.9
		F	7.9		10.8
<b>4 Risk-of-poverty rate</b> by most frequent activity	Total	Total	9.8		6.9
		M	10.6		8.1
		F	8.9		5.4
	(a) At work	Total	14.9		19.6
		M	15.2		20.7
		F	14.7		18.9
	(d) Not at work	Total	49.2		52.9
		M	53.5		54.9
		F	45.2		50.6
	(e1) Of which: Unemployed	Total	9.9		11.7
		M	9.2		11.9
		F	10.4		11.7
	(e2) Of which: Retired	Total	17.4		25.8
		M	15.4		23.4
		F	19.0		26.9
	(f) Of which: Other inactive	Total			
		M			
		F			

Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary  
Table 20. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators  
EU-SILC2005 and EU-SILC2006 –(continued)

			2005	Age group change	2006
5 Risk-of-poverty rate by household type	All hh no dep. childr.		9.6		10.1
	1 person hh	Total	18.5		17.6
	1 person hh	M	24.1		24.7
	1 person hh	F	15.5		14.5
	1 person hh <65yrs		25.7		22.0
	1 person hh 65+		10.5		13.5
	2 adults no dep. childr. (both < 65)		9.3		10.5
	2 adults no dep. (at least one childr. 65+)		4.4		8.1
	Other hh no dep. childr.		5.7		5.9
	All hh with dep. childr.		16.8		20.5
	(at least 1 Single parent child)		27.1		38.9
	2 adults 1 dep. child		15.1		13.6
	2 adults 2 dep. childr.		15.0		18.0
	2 adults 3+ dep. childr.		23.9		33.2
	Other hh with dep. childr.		12.9		14.7
<hr/>					
6 Risk-of-poverty rate by accomondation tenure status					
(a) Owner or rent-free		Total	13.0		15.3
(b) Tenant		Total	18.8		24.9
<hr/>					
7 Risk-of-poverty rate by work intensity of the household	All hh no dep. childr.	WI = 0	18.2		21.7
		0 < WI < 1	9.5		9.0
		WI = 1	7.0		2.3
	All hh with dep. childr.	WI = 0	56.3		72.5
		0 < WI < 0.5	43.7		51.9
		0.5 <= WI < 1	22.7		15.9
		WI = 1	10.2		5.8

*Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*  
*Table 20. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators*  
*EU-SILC2005 and EU-SILC2006 –(continued)*

			2005	Age group change	2006
9 Risk-of-poverty rate before and after transfers by age and gender (a) before all transfers	Total	Total	49.8	Total	48.6
		M	47.7		46.7
		F	51.6		50.4
	0-15	Total	48.0	0-17	47.6
	16+	Total	50.2	18+	48.9
		M	47.6		46.5
		F	52.4		51.0
	16-64	Total	41.2	18-64	40.0
		M	40.3		39.2
		F	42.0		40.7
	65+	Total	89.7	65+	87.4
		M	89.8		88.7
		F	89.6		86.6
	(b) including pensions	Total	29.3	Total	29.6
		M	30.1		30.2
		F	28.7		29.0
	0-15	Total	44.8	0-17	44.0
	16+	Total	26.2	18+	25.7
		M	26.7		26.2
		F	25.7		25.4
	16-64	Total	29.5	18-64	28.5
		M	30.1		29.0
		F	29.0		28.1
	65+	Total	11.4	65+	13.7
		M	7.0		9.7
		F	14.0		15.9
13 Relative median risk-of-poverty gap by age and gender	Total	Total	18.8	Total	24.0
		M	19.3		25.2
		F	17.9		23.3
	0-15	Total	18.8	0-17	25.2
	16+	Total	18.7	18+	23.7
		M	19.9		25.1
		F	17.6		22.6
	16-64	Total	19.9	18-64	24.9
		M	21.1		25.4
		F	19.2		24.1
	65+	Total	9.3	65+	17.0
		M	8.5		20.5
		F	10.8		15.6
14 S80/S20 quintile share ratio			4.0400		5.4618
15 Gini coefficient			0.2754		0.3330

Table 20. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators EU-SILC2005 2006 (cont.)

			2005	Age group change	2006
16 Distribution of population by age and gender (a) total population	Total	Total	100.0	Total	100.0
		0-15	17.1	0-17	18.0
		16-24	11.6	18-24	11.9
		25-49	36.3	25-49	35.4
		50-64	19.7	50-64	19.8
		65+	15.3	65+	15.0
		16+	82.9	18+	82.0
		16-64	67.6	18-64	67.1
		0-64	84.7	0-64	85.1
	Male	Total	100.0	Total	100.0
		0-15	18.5	0-17	19.4
		16-24	12.5	18-24	13.2
		25-49	38.2	25-49	36.8
		50-64	18.9	50-64	19.3
		65+	12.0	65+	11.4
		16+	81.5	18+	80.6
		16-64	69.5	18-64	69.2
		0-64	88.0	0-64	88.6
	Female	Total	100.0	Total	100.0
		0-15	15.9	0-17	16.7
		16-24	10.9	18-24	65.1
		25-49	34.6	25-49	34.1
		50-64	20.4	50-64	20.3
		65+	18.3	65+	18.1
		16+	84.1	18+	83.3
		16-64	12.9	18-64	65.1
		0-64	14.2	0-64	81.9
(b) poor population	Total	Total	100.0	Total	100.0
		0-15	24.9	0-17	28.5
		16-24	14.5	18-24	13.7
		25-49	38.3	25-49	35.1
		50-64	14.9	50-64	13.9
		65+	7.5	65+	8.8
		16+	75.1	18+	71.5
		16-64	67.7	18-64	62.7
		0-64	92.6	0-64	91.2
	Male	Total	100.0	Total	100.0
		0-15	26.1	0-17	30.7
		16-24	15.3	18-24	14.4
		25-49	40.5	25-49	35.8
		50-64	14.5	50-64	14.3
		65+	3.7	65+	4.8
		16+	74.0	18+	69.3
		16-64	13.9	18-64	64.5
		0-64	15.1	0-64	95.2
	Female	Total	100.0	Total	100.0
		0-15	23.7	0-17	26.3
		16-24	13.8	18-24	13.0
		25-49	36.1	25-49	34.4
		50-64	15.3	50-64	13.6
		65+	11.1	65+	12.6
		16+	76.3	18+	73.7
		16-64	65.2	18-64	61.0
		0-64	89.0	0-64	87.4

*Intermediate Quality Report EU-SILC 2006 Hungary*  
*Table 20. Comparison of Common cross-sectional indicators*  
*EU-SILC2005 and EU-SILC2006 –(continued)*

			2005	Age group change	2006
<i>Distribution of population by most</i>					
17	<i>frequent activity</i>	<i>Total</i>	16+	18+	100.0
<i>Status and gender – (a) total population</i>			<i>At work</i>		46.6
			<i>Not at work</i>		53.4
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>unemployed</i>		5.6
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>retired</i>		32.6
			<i>of which: other</i>		
			<i>inactive</i>		15.2
<i>Male</i>			16+	18+	100.0
			<i>At work</i>		54.0
			<i>Not at work</i>		46.0
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>unemployed</i>		6.6
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>retired</i>		27.7
			<i>of which: other</i>		
			<i>inactive</i>		11.8
<i>Female</i>			16+	18+	100.0
			<i>At work</i>		40.2
			<i>Not at work</i>		59.8
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>unemployed</i>		4.7
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>retired</i>		37.0
			<i>of which: other</i>		
			<i>inactive</i>		18.2
<hr/>					
<i>(b) poor population</i>		<i>Total</i>	16+	18+	100.0
			<i>At work</i>		23.2
			<i>Not at work</i>		76.7
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>unemployed</i>		21.5
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>retired</i>		27.8
			<i>of which: other</i>		
			<i>inactive</i>		27.4
<i>Male</i>			16+	18+	100.0
			<i>At work</i>		31.3
			<i>Not at work</i>		68.7
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>unemployed</i>		26.0
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>retired</i>		23.5
			<i>of which: other</i>		
			<i>inactive</i>		19.2
<i>Female</i>			16+	18+	100.0
			<i>At work</i>		16.0
			<i>Not at work</i>		84.0
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>unemployed</i>		17.6
			<i>of which:</i>		
			<i>retired</i>		31.6
			<i>of which: other</i>		
			<i>inactive</i>		34.8