STATISTIKOS DEPARTAMENTAS
STATISTICS LITHUANIA

INTERMEDIATE QUALITY REPORT EU-SILC 2006 OPERATION

Vilnius 2007

CONTENTS

1. Common cross-sectional European Union indicators

Table 1. Overarching indicators

Indicator	Value
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – total	20.0
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – men total	19.1
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – women total	20.8
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – 0-17 years	25.1
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – 65+ years	22.0
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – 18+ years	18.6
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – 18-64 years	17.8
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – men 65+ years	10.3
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – men 18+ years	16,8
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – men 18-64 years	17.9
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – women 65+ years	28.1
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – women 18+ years	20.2
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women 18-64 years	17.7
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – employed	10.0
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – non-employed	29.7
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - unemployed	61.4
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - retired	22.7
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - other inactive	26.6
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men, employed	10.9
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – men, non-employed	26.5
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men, unemployed	64.5
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men, retired	11.3
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men, other inactive	21.6
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women, employed	9.0
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers – women, non-employed	31.7
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women, unemployed	57.2
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women, retired	28.3
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women, other inactive	30.0
Median of the equivalised disposable household income	8742.9
At-risk-of-poverty threshold - single	5245.7
At-risk-of-poverty threshold - 2 adults, 2 children	11016.1
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - total	29.1
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - men total	30.6
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - women total	24.7
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - 0-17 years	31.4
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - 18-64 years	31.4
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - 65+ years	13.1
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - 18+ years	27.1
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - men, 18-64 years	33.4
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - men, 65+ years	10.1

Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - men, 18+ years	**30.6**
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - women, 18-64 years	**29.9**
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - women, 65+ years	**13.5**
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap - women, 18+ years	**21.3**
Inequality of income distribution S80/S20 income quintile share ratio	**6.3**
Relative median income ratio people aged 65+	**0.737**
Aggregate replacement ratio - total	**0.437**
Aggregate replacement ratio – men total	**0.469**
Aggregate replacement ratio – women total	**0.422**
Before social transfers except old-age and survivors' benefits	
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - total	**26.6**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men total	**25.5**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women total	**27.5**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 0-17 years	**32.4**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 18-64 years	**24.8**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 65+ years	**25.8**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 18+ years	**25.0**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 18-64 years	**24.8**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 65+ years	**12.3**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 18+ years	**22.9**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 18-64 years	**24.8**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 65+ years	**32.7**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 18+ years	**26.7**
Before social transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits	
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - total	**40.7**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men total	**38.5**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women total	**42.7**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 0-17 years	**35.2**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 18-64 years	**31.8**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 65+ years	**85.3**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 18+ years	**42.2**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 18-64 years	**31.2**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 65+ years	**83.5**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 18+ years	**38.9**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 18-64 years	**32.3**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 65+ years	**86.2**
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 18+ years	**45.0**

2. Accuracy

2.1. Sample design

2.1.1 Type of sampling design

2006 operation was the second wave of EU-SILC in Lithuania. An integrated (rotational) design was used, i.e. with cross–sectional and longitudinal dimension. The sample consisted of two parts. The first part contained 3 rotational groups of households that where selected and responded in 2005 and where fallowed up during 2006 operation. For the second part, a new sub-sample of households was selected. Moreover, considering decent-sized non-response rate, it was decided to increase the new sub-sample to 2565 households. For new sub-sample stratified sample design was used. Population register was used as a sampling frame. Simple random sample of persons was used in each stratum.

2.1.2 Sampling units

The sampling units are private households.

2.1.3 Stratification criteria

While selecting the new part of the sample the country were grouped into 7 strata: 5 largest cities, other cities and rural area. Simple random sample of non–institutional persons aged 16 and over was selected from the Population Register in each stratum. Household which lives in the selected persons address was surveyed.

2.1.4 Sample size

The sample consisted of 5982 households. This number includes 3342 households, which responded to the survey in 2005 and where fallowed up during 2006 operation (3 rotational groups), 75 split-off households and newly selected rotational group - 2565 households.

2.1.5 Sample selection schemes

Within each of 7 strata simple random sample was used to select the person's address.

2.1.6. Sample distribution over time

Fixed income reference period was used and therefore the sample was not principally divided into months or weeks. Fieldwork period was from the beginning of May 2006 till the middle of August.

Table 2. Distribution of households by month of interview (HB050)

Month	Per cent
May	44.03
June	44.48
July	11.05
August	0.44

2.1.7. Renewal of sample: Rotational groups

In 2005 operation the sample was randomly divided into 4 equally sized rotational groups. In 2006 operation, one of four groups was dropped out after 2005 operation and not included to the survey of 2006 according to the original integrated design. Furthermore, for a split-off household the rotational group was set the same as one of original household. New rotational group was named as 1st.

2.1.8. Weightings

Weightings

Detailed description of the weightings
Step 1. Computation of panel base weights (only for panel of wave 2, i.e. repeated part of the sample).

The personal base weight at wave $t = 1$ is defined:

$$w_1^{(RB)} = RB060 = RB050 \, .$$

Then for the each person j, who are enumerated at $t = 1$ and still in-scope at $t = 2$ define variable:

$$R_j = \begin{cases} 1, & \textit{if the person successfully enumerated at } t = 2; \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using logit model, define the response propensity of each person j:

$$p_j = \Pr(R_j = 1 \mid V_j)$$

where V_j – auxiliary variables (like strata, age, basic activity status, tenure status, dwelling type, total disposable household income), R_j is defined above.

Then the personal base weight at wave $t = 2$ is defined:

$$RB060 = w_2^{(RB)} = \frac{w_1^{(RB)}}{p_j} \, .$$

Step 2. Computation of the sub-samples household weights.

Case 1. Panel of wave 1, i.e. sub-sample appear first time in the survey.
Inclusion probability of a household in each stratum of new sub-sample is equal:

$$\pi_{hk} = \frac{n_h m_{hk}}{N_h} \, ,$$

here m_{hk} – the number of persons in kth household aged 16 and over in hth stratum in Population Register; n_h – the number of households in hth stratum; N_h – the number of persons aged 16 and older in hth stratum.
Sample design weights are:

$$d_{hk} = \frac{1}{\pi_{hk}} \, .$$

Response probability:

$$p_h = \frac{a_h}{n_h} \, ,$$

here a_h – the number of responding households in hth stratum, n_h – the number of households in hth stratum.

6

The weight of the household k after correction for the non-response level is

$$d'_{hk} = d_{hk} \times 1/p_h = \frac{N_h}{n_h m_{hk}} \frac{n_h}{a_h} = \frac{N_h}{a_h m_{hk}} .$$

Case 2. Panel of wave 2, i.e. sub-sample is repeated second time in the survey.
The subsample household weight is the same as the average base personal weight:

$$d'_{hk} = \text{RB060}.$$

Step 3. Computation of the household design weighs

Weights of step 2 (case 1 and case 2) are combined and household design weights (DB080) were calculated in the same way for all households:

$$DB080 = d'_{hk} / 4 .$$

Step 4. Calibration of the household weights, computation of the household cross-sectional weights

Let's have a vector of L auxiliary variables: $X = (x_1, x_2,...,x_L)$ with the population values $x_1 = (x_{11}, x_{12},...,x_{1N}),..., x_L = (x_{L1}, x_{L2},...,x_{LN})$, which sums are known from the Demographical data:

$$t_{x1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{1i}, \ t_{x2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{2i}, \ ..., \ t_{xL} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{Li} .$$

Let's construct the new weights w_k, which satisfy

1) new weights are as close as possible to the design weights: $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(w_i - d_i)^2}{d_i} \to \min$;

2) and satisfy the calibration equations: $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_k x_{1i} = t_{x1}, \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_k x_{2i} = t_{x2},..., \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_k x_{1L} = t_{xL}$.

Auxiliary information vector $X = (x_1, x_2,...,x_L)$ is used for calibration weights. Auxiliary information components are:
-   number of persons aged 0 and older (including newborn children) by different strata;
-   number of persons by different age groups;
-   number of males by different age groups.

Result of the calibration procedure is the household cross-sectional weights DB090.

Step5. Computation of the personal cross-sectional weights
The personal cross-sectional weight RB060 of person in household is equal to the household cross-sectional weight DB090 of this household.

Step 6. Computation of the personal cross-sectional weights for all household members aged of 16 and over (PB040)

Treatment of non response at the individual level (for weights PB040)

Response homogeneity group approach is used.

Each stratum is divided into a number of response homogeneity groups with (assumed) equal response probabilities within groups.

Stratum h is divided into L_h response homogeneity groups. The unit in a given group are assumed to respond independently and with the same probability, let r_{gh} be the set of responding sampling units in group g, stratum h. Simple random sample is used in each stratum. The population size is assumed to be unknown in each group.

In stratum h we know:

N_h – the number of population units in stratum h;

n_h – the number of sampling units in stratum h.

In response homogeneity group hg, $g = 1,2,...L_h$ we know:

n_{hg} – the number of sampling units in group hg, $\sum_g n_{hg} = n_h$ m_{hg} – the number of responding sampling units in r_{hg}. The total t_y of variable y is estimated by,

$$\hat{t} = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \frac{N_h}{n_h} \sum_{g=1}^{L_h} \frac{n_{hg}}{m_{hg}} \sum_{r_{hg}} y_k \ .$$

Calibration of the personal weights PB040

Calibration procedure is the same as in the Step 4.
Auxiliary information components are:
-   number of persons aged 16 and older by different strata;
-   number of persons (aged 16 and older) by different age groups;
-   number of males (aged 16 and older) by different age groups.
Result of the calibration procedure is the personal cross-sectional weights PB040.

SAS macro program CLAN is used for calculation of the calibrated weights.

2.1.9. Substitutions

No substitution was used.

2.2. Sampling errors

The variance estimates were computed using SAS macro-programme Clan. Some coefficients were estimated using Jackknife method.

Table 3. Estimates, their standard error, confidence interval and design effect for the common cross-sectional indicators

Indicator	Value	Standard error	Confidence interval at 95%		CV(%)	Deff (calibration used)
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - total	**20.0**	0,8	18.4	21.6	4.0	1,189
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men total	**19.1**	0.9	17.3	20.9	4.8	1,166
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women total	**20.8**	0.9	19.1	22.5	4.1	1,184
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - 0-17 years	**25.1**	1.6	21.9	28.3	6.5	1,410
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - 65+ years	**22.0**	1.3	19.6	24.5	5.7	0,823
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - 18+ years	**18.6**	0.7	17.2	20.0	3.9	1,257
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - 18-64 years	**17.8**	0.8	16.2	19.4	4.6	1,332
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men 65+ years	**10.3**	1.4	7.5	13.1	14.0	1,055
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men 18+ years	**16.8**	0.9	15.1	18.4	5.1	1,127
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - men 18-64 years	**17.9**	1,0	16.0	19.7	5.3	1,206
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women 65+ years	**28.1**	1.6	24.9	31.2	5.7	1,071
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women 18+ years	**20.2**	0.8	18.6	21.7	3.9	1,248
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers - women 18-64 years	**17.7**	0.9	16.0	19.4	4.9	1,242
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - total	**26.6**	0,9	24,9	28,3	3,29	1,115
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men total	**25.5**	1,0	23,6	27,5	3,93	1,147
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women total	**27.5**	0,9	25,7	29,3	3,38	1,094
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 0-17 years	**32.4**	1,7	29,1	35,7	5,20	1,274
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 18-64 years	**24.8**	0,9	23,0	26,6	3,71	1,236
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 65+ years	**25.8**	1,3	23,2	28,3	5,05	0,821
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - 18+ years	**25.0**	0,8	23,4	26,6	3,24	1,166
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 18-64 years	**24.8**	1,1	22,7	26,8	4,30	1,260
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 65+ years	**12.3**	1,5	9,3	15,3	12,39	1,059
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - men, 18+ years	**22.9**	1,0	21,1	24,8	4,16	1,158
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 18-64 years	**24.8**	1,0	22,9	26,7	3,89	1,034
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 65+ years	**32.7**	1,7	29,5	36,0	5,06	1,056
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers - women, 18+ years	**26.7**	0,9	25,0	28,4	3,19	1,095
Mean equivalised disposable income	**10547**	145	10262.6	10831.5	1.4	1.276

2.3. Non-sampling errors

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

As stated above, the sampling frame of EU-SILC 2006 was the Population Register. Population Register is updated regularly. However, not all movements of population within country are reflected, whereas not all population reports about changing of address to the migration office. Consequently, the households, living in selected person's address, were surveyed. The sample was extracted 2 weeks before the fieldwork.

Percentage of addresses does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied (DB120=23) out of total selected addresses – 2.6.

2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

The measurement errors originate from the questionnaire (its wording, design), the data collection method, the interviewers and the respondents. While it is impossible to avoid this type of errors completely, procedures were taken to reduce them as much as possible.

The questionnaires for EU-SILC 2006 were developed according to the EU-SILC regulations and EU-SILC doc 65/04. The questionnaires were tested during the first wave of pilot survey conducted in 2004. Designing questionnaires for main operation errors and interviewers feedbacks from the pilot survey were considered. Also the experience from the first wave (2005) of the survey was used to improve the questionnaire for the operation 2006.

The interviewers training were organized in each territorial statistics office in the period between April 20 and May 4. Interviewers manual presented instructions on filling in the questionnaires and detailed explanation all income components, particularly benefits, were prepared. Special emphasis was placed on tracing rules and specifics of assigning household and person numbers in the longitudinal survey. Methodical explanations were combining with practical tests. Interviewers filled in questionnaires, our specialists checked and then mistakes were discussed. Fieldwork has started immediately after interviewers training.

Fieldwork was carried out by Households' interviewers who usually work for the other household surveys carried out by Statistics Lithuania with additionally hired temporary interviewers. Temporary staff was selected from current or former employees in regional statistical offices, or persons, formerly employed as enumerators in the Population Census or Agricultural Census. In total 161 interviewers were involved into 2006 year operation. One interviewer had an average 37 selected addresses.

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

Living Standard Statistics Division of the Statistics Lithuania checked the completed questionnaires. Necessary call-backs were made. Data were entered centrally by Statistics Lithuania. For data entry Blaise software was used. The computer programme included the possible logical checks between questions and questionnaires, also a package of alerts (warning and error ones) related to ranges of admissible values and logical connections between questions. Coding controls were implemented in post-data-collection. After the data entry was finished the data were checked for consistency.

2.3.3. Non-response errors

2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size

Achieved sample size: 4660 households, 12134 persons and 10219 persons aged 16 or older.

Table 4. Accepted interviews

Rotational group	Number of households for which an interview is accepted for the database (DB135 = 1)	Number of persons aged 16 or older who are members of the households for which the interview is accepted for the database (DB135 = 1) and who completed personal interview (RB205 = 11 to 14)
Total	**4660**	**10219**
1	1689	3620
2	1011	2250
3	1004	2269
4	956	2080

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

Address contact rate:
$$Ra = \frac{5820}{5982 - 144} \approx 0.997$$

The proportion of completed household interviews accepted for the database:
$$Rh = \frac{4660}{5982} \approx 0.779$$
Household non-response rates:

$$NRh = \left(1 - \left(Ra * Rh\right)\right) * 100 = \left(1 - \left(0.997 * 0.779\right)\right) * 100 = 22.33$$

The proportion of completed personal interviews within the households accepted for the database:
$$Rp = \frac{10219}{10227} \approx 0.999$$
Individual non-response rate:

$$NRp = \left(1 - \left(Rp\right)\right) * 100 = \left(1 - 0.999\right) * 100 = 0.1$$

Overall individual non-response rate:

$$* NRp = \left(1 - \left(Ra * Rh * Rp\right)\right) * 100 = \left(1 - \left(0.997 * 0.779 * 0.999\right)\right) * 100 \approx 22.41$$

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)

Table 5. Distribution of households by '*record of contact at address*'

	Rotational group 1		Rotational group 2		Rotational group 3		Rotational group 4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total (DB120=11 to 23)	**2565**	**100**	**1155**	**100**	**1146**	**100**	**1116**	**100**	**5982**	**100**
Address contacted (DB120=11)	2484	96.84	1131	97.92	1119	97.64	1086	97.31	5820	97.29
Address non-contacted (DB120=21 to 23)	81	3.16	24	2.08	27	2.36	30	2.69	162	2.71
Total address non-contacted (DB120=21 to 23)	**81**	**100**	**24**	**100**	**27**	**100**	**30**	**100**	**162**	**100**
Address cannot be located (DB120=21)	13	16.05	1	4.17	4	14.81	0	0	18	11.11
Address unable to access (DB120=22)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120=23)	68	83.95	23	95.83	23	85.19	30	100	144	88.89

Table 6. Distribution of address contacted by 'household questionnaire result' and by 'household interview acceptance'

	Rotational group 1		Rotational group 2		Rotational group 3		Rotational group 4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total (DB130=11 to 24)	**2484**	**100**	**1131**	**100**	**1119**	**100**	**1086**	**100**	**5820**	**100**
Household questionnaire completed (DB130=11)	1689	67.99	1011	89.39	1004	89.72	956	88.03	4660	80.07
Interview not completed (DB130=21 to 24)	795	32.01	120	10.61	115	10.28	130	11.97	1160	19.93
Total interview not completed (DB130=21 to 24)	**795**	**100**	**120**	**100**	**115**	**100**	**130**	**100**	**1160**	**100**
Refusal to co-operate (DB130=21)	627	78.87	93	77.5	89	77.39	102	78.46	911	78.53
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork (DB130=22)	152	19.12	25	20.83	25	21.74	28	21.54	230	19.83
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc) (DB130=23)	11	1.38	2	1.67	1	0.87	0	0	14	1.21
Other (DB130=24)	5	0.63	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0.43
Household questionnaire completed (DB135=1 to 2)	**1689**	**100**	**1011**	**100**	**1004**	**100**	**956**	**100**	**4660**	**100**
Interview accepted to database (DB135=1)	1689	100	1011	100	1004	100	956	100	4660	100
Interview rejected (DB135=2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The following tables show the amount of item non-response for income variables on household and individual level. The value obtained by net/gross conversion or from administrative sources was not considered as non-response.

Table 7. Distribution of item non-response, household-level variables

Income variable	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values (before imputation)
Total household gross income (HY010)	99.6	0.2
Total disposable household income (HY020)	99.6	0.2
Total disposable household income before social transfers except old-age and survivor's benefits (HY022)	97.3	0.2
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits (HY023)	75.5	0.1
Gross income components at household level		
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040G)	5.3	0.0
Family/child related allowances (HY050G)	12.4	1.4
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060G)	2.7	0.0
Housing allowances (HY070G)	4.1	0.0
Regular inter-household cash transfer received (HY080G)	7.1	0.0
Interest, dividends, etc. (HY090G)	3.7	0.0
Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110G)	0.1	0.0
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120G)	19.4	0.0
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid (HY130G)	8.9	0.0

Table 8. Distribution of item non-response, person-level variables

Income variable	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	% of persons with missing values (before imputation)
Gross income components at personal level		
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010G)	46.3	0.2
Non-cash employee income (PY020G)	0.9	0.0
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035G)	1.3	0.0
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment (PY050G)	9.0	2.5
Pension from individual private plans (PY080G)	0.0	0.0
Unemployment benefits (PY090G)	1.4	2.1
Old-age benefits (PY100G)	30.0	0.2
Survivor's benefits (PY110G)	1.9	0.0
Disability benefits (PY130G)	6.7	0.6
Education-related allowances (PY140G)	3.1	0.0

2.3.3.5. 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 and for equivalised disposable income

Item non-response:
1. Number of persons with no information on most frequent activity status, when applicable to indicator (134);
2. Number of persons with no information on household type, when applicable to indicator (1).

Non-response at individual level, i.e. an individual questionnaire is missing (8).

Non-response at household level, i.e. interview rejected for data base DB135=2 (0), address cannot be located DB120=21 (18) or address unable to access DB120=22 (0).

Table 9. Number of observations and total item non-response

	Number of sample observations (achieved sample size)	Number of sample observations not taken into account due to item non-response	Non-response at individual level (if applicable)	Non-response at household level (number of households)
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers				
Total[1]	12,134	0	NA	18
By age and gender[1]			NA	18
men total	5,619	0	NA	18
women total	6,515	0	NA	18
0-17 years	2,354	0	NA	18
18-24 years	1,165	0	NA	18
25-49 years	3,783	0	NA	18
50-64 years	2,528	0	NA	18
65+ years	2,304	0	NA	18
18+ years	9,780	0	NA	18
18-64 years	7,476	0	NA	18
0-64 years	9,830	0	NA	18
men 18-24 years	590	0	NA	18
men 25-49 years	1,775	0	NA	18
men 50-64 years	1,131	0	NA	18
men 65+ years	880	0	NA	18
men 18+ years	4,376	0	NA	18
men 18-64 years	3,496	0	NA	18
men 0-64 years	4,739	0	NA	18
women 18-24 years	575	0	NA	18
women 25-49 years	2,008	0	NA	18
women 50-64 years	1,397	0	NA	18
women 65+ years	1,424	0	NA	18
women 18+ years	5,404	0	NA	18
women 18-64 years	3,980	0	NA	18
women 0-64 years	5,091	0	NA	18
By most frequent activity status[2] and gender				
Total 18+ years	9,646	134	8	18
employed	4,855	134	8	18
non-employed	4,791	134	8	18
unemployed	558	134	8	18
retired	2,746	134	8	18
other inactive	1,487	134	8	18
total men 18+ year	4,310	66	6	18
men, employed	2,396	66	6	18

men, non-employed	1,914	66	6	18
men, unemployed	296	66	6	18
men, retired	983	66	6	18
men, other inactive	635	66	6	18
total women 18+ years	5,336	68	2	18
women, employed	2,459	68	2	18
women, non-employed	2,877	68	2	18
women, unemployed	262	68	2	18
women, retired	1,763	68	2	18
women, other inactive	852	68	2	18
By household type[3]				
single, < 65 years	497	1	NA	18
single, 65+ years	519	0	NA	18
single, male	266	0	NA	18
single, female	750	1	NA	18
single, total	1016	1	NA	18
2 adults, no children, both < 65	1320	0	NA	18
2 adults, no children, at least one 65+	1528	0	NA	18
other households without children	1344	0	NA	18
single parent, at least one child	562	0	NA	18
2 adults, 1 child	1650	0	NA	18
2 adults, 2 children	1864	0	NA	18
2 adults, 3+ children	804	0	NA	18
other households with children	2045	0	NA	18
households without children	5208	0	NA	18
households with children	6925	0	NA	18
By accommodation tenure status				
owner or rent-free	11,905	0	NA	18
tenant	229	0	NA	18
Inequality of income distribution S80/S20 income quintile share ratio	12,134	0	NA	18
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap				
Total	2,174	0	NA	18
By age and gender			NA	
men total	956	0	NA	18
women total	1218	0	NA	18
0-17 years	545	0	NA	18
18-64 years	1,247	0	NA	18
65+ years	382	0	NA	18

18+ years	1,629	0	NA	18
men, 18-64 years	586	0	NA	18
men, 65+ years	78	0	NA	18
men, 18+ years	664	0	NA	18
women, 18-64 years	661	0	NA	18
women, 65+ years	304	0	NA	18
women, 18+ years	965	0	NA	18
Dispersion around the at-risk-of-poverty threshold				
40%	12,134	0	NA	18
50%	12,134	0	NA	18
70%	12,134	0	NA	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers except old-age and survivors' benefits				
Total[1]	12,134	0	NA	18
By age and gender[1]				
men total	5,619	0	NA	18
women total	6,515	0	NA	18
0-17 years	2,354	0	NA	18
18-64 years	7,476	0	NA	18
65+ years	2,304	0	NA	18
18+ years	9,780	0	NA	18
men, 18-64 years	3,496	0	NA	18
men, 65+ years	880	0	NA	18
men, 18+ years	4,376	0	NA	18
women, 18-64 years	3,980	0	NA	18
women, 65+ years	1,424	0	NA	18
women, 18+ years	5,404	0	NA	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits				
Total[1]	12,134	0	NA	18
By age and gender[1]				18
men total	5,619	0	NA	18
women total	6,515	0	NA	18
0-17 years	2,354	0	NA	18
18-64 years	7,476	0	NA	18
65+ years	2,304	0	NA	18
18+ years	9,780	0	NA	18
men, 18-64 years	3,496	0	NA	18
men, 65+ years	880	0	NA	18
men, 18+ years	4,376	0	NA	18
women, 18-64 years	3,980	0	NA	18
women, 65+ years	1,424	0	NA	18

women, 18+ years	5,404	0	NA	18
Gini coefficient	12,134	0	NA	18
Mean equivalised disposable income	12,134	0	NA	18

[1] children born in 2006 are included;

[2] the information on activity status refers to the population of individuals aged 18+

[3] all persons aged less then 18 are considered as dependent children, plus those economically inactive persons aged 18-24 living with at least one of their parents.

2.4. Mode of data collection

The method for data collection was paper assisted personal interview (PAPI). If necessary, telephone interviews were allowed. Proxy interview was allowed for persons temporarily away or in incapacity. To avoid non-response within household proxy interview as an exception was allowed when it was no possibility to make personal interview and another member of household could provide the information. Some data collected by proxy interview were specified by telephone, but method of data collection was not changed in the microdata.

According to Eurostat recommendations for dealing with the individual non-response problem full imputation of missing personal interviews were used (9 cases). In case of full imputation the variable RB250 (data status) = 14 "information completed from record imputation" and flag of variable RB260_F (type of interview) = -2.

Table 10. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by 'data status' (RB250) and rotational group
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 16+ (RB245=1 to 3)

	Total	RB250=11	=12	=14	=21	=22	=23	=31	=32	=33
Total	10227	10210	0	9	0	0	5	2	1	0
%	100	99.83	0	0.1	0	0	0.05	0.01	0.01	0
Rotation 1	3621	3620	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
%	100	99.97	0	0	0	0	0	0.03	0	0
Rotation 2	2255	2247	0	3	0	0	4	0	1	0
%	100	99.65	0	0.13	0	0	0.18	0	0.04	0
Rotation 3	2269	2264	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
%	100	99.78	0	0.22	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation 4	2082	2079	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
%	100	99.85	0	0.05	0	0	0.05	0.05	0	0

Table 11.Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by 'Type of Interview' (RB260) and rotational group
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 16+ (RB245=1 to 3) and RB250=11 or 13

	Total	RB260=1	RB260=2	RB260=3	RB260=4	RB260=5	Missing
Total*	10210	8163	0	228	139	1680	0
%	100	79.95	0	2.23	1.36	16.46	0
Rotation 1	3620	2952	0	66	45	557	0
%	100	81.55	0	1.82	1.24	15.39	0
Rotation 2	2247	1791	0	51	39	366	0
%	100	79.71	0	2.27	1.74	16.28	0
Rotation 3	2264	1767	0	62	35	400	0
%	100	78.05	0	2.74	1.55	17.66	0
Rotation 4	2079	1653	0	49	20	357	0
%	100	79.51	0	2.36	0.96	17.17	0

*Full imputed not included

2.5. Interview duration

Mean duration of household interview 22 minutes (HB100).
Mean duration of personal interview 18 minutes (PB120).
Mean interview duration per household 62 minutes.

3. Comparability

3.1. Basic concepts and definition

The reference population

No difference to the common definition. The target population of EU-SILC is all persons living in private households within national territory of Lithuania at the time of data collection. Collective households and institutions are excluded from the target population.

The private household definition

No difference to the common definition. The private household is defined as a person living alone or a group of people, who live together in the same private dwelling and share expenditures, including the joint provision of the essentials of living.

The household membership

No difference to the common definition.

The income reference period used

No difference to the common definition. The income reference period was a fixed twelve-month period, namely the last calendar year. In the 2006 operational income data were collected for the reference year 2005.

The period for taxes on income and social insurance contributions

No difference to the common definition. Taxes on income and social insurance contributions, as well as tax repayments and receipts refer to the income reference period (year 2005).

The reference period for taxes on wealth

No difference to the common definition. Taxes on wealth paid during the income reference period (year 2005) were recorded.

The lag between the income reference period and current variables

The lag between the end of the income reference period and current variables ranges from 4 to 8 months.

The total duration of the data collection of the sample

The fieldwork period started on 1st of May 2006 and ended on the 15th of August. 88.6% of households were interviewed during the first 2 months and only 11.4% were interviewed in July and August.

Basic information on activity status during the income reference period

This information was collected with the questionnaire by 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

Imputed rent

For 2006 Statistics Lithuania has not calculated imputed rent.

Cash or near cash employee income

Sickness benefits (PY120) could not be separated from cash or near cash employee income and recorded under this variable.

No-cash employee income

All components of this variable were collected, including components which will be mandatory from 2007. Only the value related to company car were recorded under variable PY020 and were added to the calculation variables HY010, HY020, HY022 and HY023.

Cash benefits or losses from self-employment

The self-employment income was collected as the amount of money drawn out of the business for household, personal use. Income from agriculture, included in this variable, was calculated as difference of total revenue from agriculture and total expenditure on it.

Value of goods produced by own-consumption

Variable was collected but not recorded to microdata file.

Gross monthly earnings for employees

Variable was not collected because EU-SILC is not used to calculated gender pay gap.

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

Where applicable the EU-SILC income target variables were split into sub-components. The sub-components were defined according to the Lithuanian regulations and benefit system. All data related to income variables were collected from interviews.

Administrative data were used for making the survey income data more accurate or for supplementing them. The State Social Insurance Fund Board data and the State Tax Inspectorate under the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania data have been linked to sample data and used for checking cash or near-cash employee income (PY010), maternity and maternity/paternity allowances (component of HY050), dividends from capital investments (component of HY090), social insurance contributions and taxes on income (components of HY140).

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

Employee cash and near-cash income (PY010), self-employment income (PY050), unemployment benefits (PY090), family/children related allowances (HY050), interest, dividends, profit from capital investments (HY090), income received by people aged under 16 (HY110) were collected in net and/or gross. The remaining variables were collected only in gross.

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

The gross-net/net-gross conversion was used for either gross or net was collected. Conversion algorithms were created on the bases of country tax system. All income variables that are subjected to taxation and/or social insurance contribution were recorded gross and net in to the microdata files (except for variable PY120 which included into variable PY010). Other income variables were recorded only gross.

4. Coherence

This section will compare the EU-SILC data to Household Budget Survey (HBS), wage statistics and administrative data.

The HBS is continuous survey. The survey conducted in line with the current methodology has been carried out since 1996. The HBS uses two data collection methods combined into one: the interview conducted by an interviewer and self-registration of particular household indicators. Social and economic information on household members, their living conditions and income are collected during the interview. HBS was the source of Laeken indicators until started EU-SILC survey.

4.1. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who received income from each 'income component', with external source

There are differences between EU-SILC and HBS income components definitions. Only comparable income components are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons/households who received income components

Income component	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2005	Other sources*
	Average annual number of people, thousand		
Cash or near cash employee income (PY010N)	1,390.7	1,282.0	1,195.8
Old-age benefits (PY100)	676.8	681.1	595.6
Survivors benefits (PY110)	66.1	40.1	
	Average annual number of households, thousand		
Housing allowances (HY070)	75.6	42.7	

* Wage statistics in the case of PY010 and administrative source in the case of PY100

The number of people receiving employee income is higher in SILC than in the HBS and wage statistics. In HBS, the yearly income figures are derived from monthly data. People who were employed, but did not receive income during the survey month (being on vacation, started job and so on) were not included in this category. In case of wage statistics, this figure is lower whereas the illegal work has not been taken into account.

The estimate of number of people receiving old-age benefits is higher in SILC than in administrative source. This is due to old-age pensions from foreign countries and disability benefits paid after the standard retirement age being included in SILC variable that have not been taken into account in the case of administrative source. The differences between SILC and HBS are not substantial.

The estimate of number of people receiving survivor's benefits is higher in SILC than in HBS. The reason of the difference is in assignment of survivor benefits value for eligible person. In SILC values of benefit are recorded to each person 16 years and older who receive

this benefits. Whereas in HBS, values of benefit received by persons younger than 18 years old are recorded to the older persons in that household.

The number of households receiving housing allowances is lower in the HBS. This difference is related to the survey design of HBS and the seasonal aspect of housing allowances. As was noted above, the yearly income figures are derived from monthly data in HBS. The compensations to cover expenditure of the heating of dwelling are the most part of housing allowances and are paid in winter time. So, the number of households receiving them is lower in HBS data.

4.2. Comparison of other target variables with external source

Table 13. Distribution of households by type of dwelling

Dwelling type	EU-SILC 2006 %	HBS 2006 %
Detached house	30.1	30.7
Semi-detached or terraced house	8.9	10.7
Apartment or flat	60.8	58.4
Some other kind of accommodation	0.1[*]	0.1[*]
Total	100	100

[*] Unreliable estimate, based on less than 20 sample observations

Table 14. Distribution of households by amenities in the dwellings

Amenities in the dwellings	EU-SILC 2006 %	HBS 2006 %
Bath or shower	76.4	75.0
Indoor flushing toilet	75.4	73.4

Table 15. Share of households in possession of various consumer durables

Consumer durable	EU-SILC 2006 %	HBS 2006 %
Telephone, including mobile phone	90.0	90.2
Colour TV	96.1	96.8
Personal computer	38.7	37.7
Washing machine	81.9	83.6
Car	49.4	50.3

The estimates of the number of household by dwelling type, amenities in the dwellings, various consumer durables are almost the same in SILC and HBS.

Finally, in Table 16 there are reported data for the distribution of population by self-defined economic status. This variable is not absolutely the same in the SILC and HBS. The main activity status is self-defined in EU-SILC. So, in opposition to HBS, there are no strict criteria for people who consider themselves 'unemployed'.

Table 16. Distribution of population aged 16 and over by self-defined activity status

Activity status	EU-SILC 2006 %	HBS 2006 %
At work	52.9	57.0
Unemployed	5.7	5.0
Pupil, student	10.5	9.2
In retirement	22.5	22.1
Permanently disabled	4.7	3.7
Other inactive person	3.7	3.1
Total	100	100

Regina Deveikyte
Head, Living Standard Statistics Division
Statistics Lithuania
Phone +370 5 2364 919
e-mail: regina.deveikyte@stat.gov.lt