CYPRUS

INTERMEDIATE QUALITY REPORT

STATISTICS ON INCOME AND LIVING CONDITIONS 2008

CONTENTS

3. COMPARABILITY

4. COHERENCE

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

The present quality report complies with the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 Article 16. The structure of the report follows Commission Regulation No 28/2004 and presents results on common cross-sectional European Union indicators, accuracy, comparability and coherence of the EU-SILC survey 2008.

1. COMMON CROSS-SECTIONAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS

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

The common cross-sectional EU indicators given below are based on the cross-sectional component of EU-SILC 2008 and they were calculated using the SAS programs provided by Eurostat.

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

1 person household (euros)	10.021,8
2 adults and 2 dependent children (euros)	21.045,8

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

Total	**Total**	**16,3**
	0 – 17	13,6
	18 – 24	11,3
	25 – 49	10,6
	50 – 64	12,4
	65+	49,0
	18+	17,1
	18 – 64	11,2
Male	**Total**	**14,1**
	18 – 24	10,1
	25 – 49	9,0
	50 – 64	9,7
	65+	43,5
	18+	14,4
	18 – 64	9,4
Female	**Total**	**18,5**
	18 – 24	12,4
	25 – 49	12,3
	50 – 64	15,0
	65+	53,8
	18+	19,7
	18 – 64	13,0

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

Age 18+	Total		Total	**17,0**
			Male	14,2
			Female	19,7
	At work		Total	**6,4**
			Male	6,1
			Female	6,7
	Not at work		Total	**33,1**
			Male	32,4
			Female	33,5
		Unemployed	Total	**30,6**
			Male	38,4
			Female	26,0
		Retired	Total	**49,8**
			Male	47,2
			Female	52,0
		Other inactive	Total	**19,8**
			Male	14,3
			Female	22,4

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

All households without dependent children	Total		**25,2**
	1 person household	Total	**41,7**
		Male	21,1
		Female	56,4
		0 – 64	20,9
		65+	67,3
	2 adults without dependent children	both 0 – 64	12,8
		at least one 65+	50,2
	Other household without dependent children		8,2
All households with dependent children	Total		**11,2**
	Single parent	At least 1 dep.	31,5
	2 adults	1 dep. Child	9,9
		2 dep. Children	10,1
		3+ dep. Children	19,7
	Other household with dependent children		5,0

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

Age 0+	Total	**16,3**
	Owner or rent free	14,6
	Tenant	30,2

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

All households without dependent children	WI=0	51,1
	0<WI<1	9,2
	WI=1	10,4
All households with dependent children	WI=0	70,0
	0<WI<0,5	37,2
	0,5<=WI<1	17,9
	WI=1	2,0

1.1.7 Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold

Total	At-risk-of-poverty rate (40% of median)	3,1
	At-risk-of-poverty rate (50% of median)	8,1
	At-risk-of poverty rate (70% of median)	22,9

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

Total	Total	**29,3**
	0 – 17	21,0
	18+	31,7
	18 – 64	21,6
	65+	86,2
Male	**Total**	**26,9**
	18+	28,5
	18 – 64	19,0
	65+	83,7
Female	**Total**	**31,7**
	18+	34,7
	18 – 64	24,1
	65+	88,2

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

Total	Total	**21,6**
	0 – 17	20,3
	18+	22,0
	18 – 64	16,4
	65+	52,6
Male	**Total**	**19,6**
	18+	19,3
	18 – 64	14,7
	65+	46,5
Female	**Total**	**23,6**
	18+	24,6
	18 – 64	18,1
	65+	57,8

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

Total	Total	**16,5**
	0 – 17	14,3
	18+	17,0
	18 – 64	15,1
	65+	18,7
Male	Total	**15,6**
	18+	16,0
	18 – 64	14,5
	65+	20,2
Female	Total	**17,1**
	18+	18,0
	18 – 64	16,0
	65+	20,2

1.1.11 Income distribution S80/S20

S80/S20 quintile share ratio	4,1

1.1.12 Inequality of income distribution: Gini coefficient (%)

Gini coefficient	27,9

1.2. Other indicators

1.2.1. Equivalised disposable income: 18.845,4 EURO

1.2.2. The unadjusted gender pay gap

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

2. ACCURACY

2.1. Sample design

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

The sample was drawn from the 2001 Census of Population sampling frame, which was updated by the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (E.A.C.) list of new domestic consumers (between 2002 and 2007). The sample design was one-stage stratification.

2.1.2. Sampling units (one stage, two stages)

The sampling units are private households, which were selected with simple random sampling within each stratum.

2.1.3. Stratification and sub-stratification criteria

Geographical stratification criteria were used for the sample selection. The households were stratified in 9 strata based on District (Urban / Rural), i.e. 1) Lefkosia Urban, 2) Lefkosia Rural, 3) Ammochostos Rural[1], 4) Larnaka Urban, 5) Larnaka Rural, 6) Lemesos Urban, 7) Lemesos Rural, 8) Pafos Urban, 9) Pafos Rural.

2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria

According to the Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 Article 9, the minimum effective sample size for Cyprus is 3250 households and 7500 persons aged 16 or over. As the sample is based on a rotational design of 4 replications with a rotation of one replication per year, the selection of one new sub-sample was required. More specifically, for 2008 one sub-sample of 2007 survey was dropped (R3), and a new sub-sample (R7) was separately selected in the same manner as in 2005, so as to represent the whole population. Due to the non-response of 2007 survey and the number of non existent or not successfully contacted addresses, the initial sample of 2008 survey was 3.853 households. The status of our sample for the 2008 round in each rotational group is as follows:

	Total	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7
Status of sample	3.853	895	883	910	907	1.153

dropped   new

---

[1] Ammochostos Urban is an area not under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

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

Table 2.1.4.1 : Population and sample distribution

DISTRICT	N			n		
	NO. OF HOUSEHOLDS - CENSUS & EAC			DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE		
	TOTAL	URBAN	RURAL	TOTAL	URBAN	RURAL
TOTAL	301.049	204.456	96.593	3.853	2.612	1.241
LEFKOSIA	115.192	88.685	26.507	1.516	1.123	393
AMMOCHOSTOS	17.574	0	17.574	209	0	209
LARNAKA	48.787	29.279	19.508	640	394	246
LEMESOS	80.742	62.463	18.279	1.075	840	235
PAFOS	38.754	24.029	14.725	413	255	158

For the data collection 20 interviewers were appointed, 8 in Lefkosia district, 4 in Larnaka/ Ammochostos, 6 in Lemesos and 2 in Pafos. The sampled households were grouped as much as possible in small areas so as to minimise travelling expenses. Each interviewer had to visit on average 15 households per week.

The 2008 sample results are shown in the table below:

Table 2.1.4.2 : Sample size

Addresses in initial sample	**3.853**
Addresses used for the survey	3.673
Addresses out of scope	180
Addresses used	**3.673**
Addresses successfully contacted	3.664
Addresses not successfully contacted	9
Addresses successfully contacted	**3.664**
Household questionnaire completed	3.355
Refusal to cooperate	239
Entire household away for the duration of fieldwork	18
Household unable to respond	40
Other reasons for not completing the Household questionnaire	12
Household questionnaire completed	**3.355**
Interviews accepted for database	3.355
Interviews rejected for database	0

The 180 addresses that were out of scope of the survey correspond to vacant accommodation, or buildings used as secondary residences or for business purposes, or demolished housing units. Furthermore, 9 addresses were not successfully contacted. Out of the 3.664 addresses successfully contacted, 3.355 households completed the Household questionnaire and were all accepted for the database. Thus, the achieved sample size was 3.355 households, 10.025 persons in total and 8.090 persons aged 16 or over.

2.1.5. Sample selection schemes
The sample was selected from each stratum with simple random sampling.

2.1.6. Sample distribution over time
Table 2.1.6.1 that follows gives an overview of the cumulative sample development during the fieldwork period from the 17th of March 2008 to the 31st of July 2008.

Table 2.1.6.1 : Sample distribution over time

Period	Addresses in initial sample	Addresses out of scope	Addresses used	Addresses not successfully contacted	Non-response	Household Questionnaire Completed
17/03 – 31/03	537	24	513	0	32	481
17/03 – 15/04	1.040	56	984	0	55	929
17/03 – 30/04	1.442	71	1.371	2	85	1.284
17/03 – 15/05	2.032	94	1.938	3	139	1.796
17/03 – 31/05	2.605	122	2.483	5	171	2.307
17/03 – 15/06	3.226	150	3.076	6	225	2.845
17/03 – 30/06	3.744	171	3.573	8	288	3.277
17/03 – 15/07	3.816	179	3.637	9	304	3.324
17/03 – 31/07	3.853	180	3.673	9	309	3.355

2.1.7. Renewal of sample: rotational groups
The sample in the first round was divided in 4 sub-samples as it was based on a rotational design of 4 replications with a rotation of one replication per year. Each sub-sample was separately selected so as to represent the whole population. Every year one sub-sample is going to be dropped and substituted by a new one. Thus for 2008 one specific sub-sample, pre-selected from 2005 (R3), was dropped and substituted by a new one (R7). The new sub-sample was also separately selected, so as to represent the whole population.

The size of each Rotational Group for the 2008 survey is shown in Table 2.1.7.1:

Table 2.1.7.1: Size of the Rotational Groups

	Total	R4	R5	R6	R7
Addresses in initial sample	3.853	883	910	907	1.153
Household Questionnaire completed	3.355	819	851	845	840
Interviews Accepted for database	3.355	819	851	845	840

2.1.8. Weightings

2.1.8.1. Design factor

The methodology that was used for the computation of the weights of the survey is the one proposed in Doc. EU-SILC 065/05. For a household in panel 7 (R7) – panel 7 replaced panel 3 of the first the second and the third wave - the design weight is the inverse of its inclusion probability that is the probability belonging to the selected sample of households:

$$DB080_i = \frac{1}{\pi_i} = \frac{1}{\frac{n_i}{4N_i}} = \frac{4N_i}{n_i}, \qquad i=1,\ldots,9$$

π_i = the probability of a household to be selected from stratum i
n_i = the sample size of stratum i
N_i = the total number of households in the sampling frame of stratum i

For households in panels 4, 5 and 6 the household design weights were calculated by following the methodology proposed by Eurostat in Doc. 065/05. The general steps followed were:

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

2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments (for panel 7)

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

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

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

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

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

The next step is to combine the entire sample (panels 4 – 7) and apply the calibration procedure. The target of the calibration procedure is to improve the accuracy of the estimated household and personal weights by using external known information. Eurostat recommends an *"integrative" calibration*. The idea is to use calibration variables defined at both household and individual level. The individual variables are aggregated at the household level by calculating household totals such as the number of male/female in the household, the number of persons aged 16 and over etc. After that, calibration is done at the household level using the household variables and the individual variables in their aggregate form.

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

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

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

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

2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weight

The final cross-sectional weights were calculated as described above, i.e. using DB080 after non-response adjustment as the initial weight for panel 7 and base weights adjusted for non-response due to attrition for panels 4 – 6. The calibration methods were then applied on the total sample.

2.1.9. Substitutions

No substitution procedures were applied.

2.1.9.1. Method of selection of substitutes

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

2.2. Sampling errors

2.2.1. Standard error and effective sample size

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

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

Let i denote the selected household

Let k denote the member of the household

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

$$\hat{T} = \sum_{h=1}^{9} \sum_{i} \sum_{k} w_{hik} t_{hik} \qquad (1)$$

Where $\hat{T}$ is the estimate of T

     w_{hik} is the weight of the kth member of household i in the hth stratum

     t_{hik} is the value of the variable of interest of kth member in household i

        in the hth stratum

Variance estimation

The objective is to estimate or approximate precision of the estimator under consideration. Suppose the total of a variable of interest is T and our estimate $\hat{T}$ is defined by (1).

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

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

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

The estimator of the **Total** is $\hat{T}_h = \sum_{i} \sum_{k} w_{hik} t_{hik} \;.$

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

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

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

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

and $f_h = n_h / N_h$

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	**Total**	**16,3**	**0,4**	**2,5**	**1,25**	**10.025**	**7.994**
	0 - 17	13,6	0,9	6,4	1,43	2.250	1.569
	18 - 24	11,3	1,2	10,2	1,50	1.166	776
	25 - 49	10,6	0,6	5,8	1,52	3.260	2.148
	50 - 64	12,4	0,8	6,5	1,06	1.885	1.775
	65+	49,0	1,4	2,9	1,00	1.464	1.460
	18+	17,1	0,5	2,7	1,22	7.775	6.389
	18 - 64	11,2	0,5	4,0	1,38	6.311	4.567
Male	**Total**	**14,1**	**0,6**	**3,9**	**1,28**	**4.821**	**3.766**
	18 - 24	10,1	1,5	15,3	1,44	586	407
	25 - 49	9,0	0,8	9,2	1,58	1.491	946
	50 - 64	9,7	1,1	11,2	1,15	905	788
	65+	43,5	2,0	4,7	0,97	686	707
	18+	14,4	0,6	4,4	1,23	3.668	2.977
	18 - 64	9,4	0,6	6,5	1,44	2.982	2.077
Female	**Total**	**18,5**	**0,6**	**3,3**	**1,24**	**5.204**	**4.190**
	18 - 24	12,4	1,7	13,7	1,55	580	374
	25 - 49	12,3	0,9	7,4	1,48	1.769	1.197
	50 - 64	15,0	1,2	8,0	1,02	980	966
	65+	53,8	2,0	3,6	1,03	778	753
	18+	19,7	0,7	3,5	1,21	4.107	3.389
	18 - 64	13,0	0,7	5,2	1,35	3.329	2.470

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

			Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Age 18+	**Total**	**Total**	**17,0**	**0,5**	**2,7**	**1,21**	**7.775**	**6.431**
		Male	14,2	0,6	4,4	1,22	3.615	2.970
		Female	19,7	0,7	3,5	1,20	4.041	3.365
	At work	**Total**	**6,4**	**0,4**	**6,7**	**1,41**	**4.278**	**3.038**
		Male	6,1	0,6	9,3	1,48	2.329	1.576
		Female	6,7	0,6	9,5	1,33	1.949	1.468
	Not at work	**Total**	**33,1**	**0,9**	**2,8**	**1,17**	**3.378**	**2.892**
		Male	32,4	1,5	4,5	1,14	1.286	1.128
		Female	33,5	1,2	3,5	1,18	2.092	1.767
		Unemployed	**Total**	**30,6**	**4,6**	**15,0**	**1,53**	**135**	**88**
			Male	38,4	7,9	20,5	1,49	51	34
			Female	26,0	5,6	21,5	1,57	84	53
		Retired	**Total**	**49,8**	**1,4**	**2,8**	**1,02**	**1.554**	**1.519**
			Male	47,2	2,0	4,3	1,00	725	726
			Female	52,0	1,9	3,7	1,05	829	790
		Other inactive	**Total**	**19,8**	**1,1**	**5,8**	**1,34**	**1.689**	**1.259**
			Male	14,3	1,8	12,9	1,42	510	358
			Female	22,4	1,4	6,4	1,32	1.179	896

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

			Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
All hh no dep. children	**Total**		**25,2**	**0,7**	**3,0**	**1,09**	**3.773**	**3.461**
	1 person hh	Total	41,7	2,3	5,6	1,24	526	425
	2 adults no dep. children	both 0 - 64	12,8	1,2	9,1	0,98	842	861
		at least one 65+	50,2	1,6	3,1	0,96	1.162	1.217
	Other hh no dep. children		8,2	0,8	9,8	1,19	1.243	1.042
All hh with dep. children	**Total**		**11,2**	**0,5**	**4,3**	**1,50**	**6.252**	**4.179**
	Single parent	At least 1 dep. child	31,5	3,0	9,7	1,40	255	182
	2 adults	1 dep. child	9,9	1,2	12,1	1,68	804	479
		2 dep. children	10,1	0,7	7,1	1,71	1.820	1.067
		3+ dep. children	19,7	1,5	7,4	1,02	1.590	1.567
	Other hh with dep. children		5,0	0,7	14,2	1,35	1.783	1.318

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

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Age 0+	**Total**	**16,3**	**0,4**	**2,5**	**1,25**	**10.025**	**7.994**
	Owner or rent free	14,6	0,4	2,7	1,12	9.288	8.263
	Tenant	30,2	1,8	5,9	1,75	737	422

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

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
All hh no dep. children	WI=0	51,1	2,5	5,0	1,01	492	488
	0<WI<1	9,2	0,8	9,1	1,20	1.289	1.078
	WI=1	10,4	1,0	10,0	1,25	1.031	827
All hh with dep. children	WI=0	70,0	4,6	6,6	1,31	123	94
	0<WI<0.5	37,2	3,4	9,1	1,40	330	236
	0.5<=WI<1	17,9	0,9	5,3	1,54	2.609	1.694
	WI=1	2,0	0,3	13,4	1,29	3.188	2.481

2.2.1.6 Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	**At-risk-of-poverty rate (40% of median)**	**3,1**	**0,2**	**5,8**	**1,09**	**10.025**	**9.223**
	At-risk-of-poverty rate (50% of median)	**8,1**	**0,3**	**3,6**	**1,13**	**10.025**	**8.840**
	At-risk-of poverty rate (70% of median)	**22,9**	**0,5**	**2,1**	**1,28**	**10.025**	**7.838**

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

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	**Total**	**29,3**	**0,5**	**1,8**	**1,29**	**10.025**	**7.759**
	0 - 17	21,0	1,0	4,8	1,38	2.250	1.633
	18+	31,7	0,6	1,9	1,28	7.775	6.079
	18 - 64	21,6	0,6	2,7	1,37	6.311	4.593
	65+	86,2	1,1	1,2	1,20	1.464	1.224
Male	18+	28,5	0,8	2,9	1,29	3.668	2.843
	18 - 64	19,0	0,8	4,3	1,42	2.982	2.101
	65+	83,7	1,7	2,0	1,15	686	595
Female	18+	34,7	0,8	2,4	1,27	4.107	3.224
	18 - 64	24,1	0,9	3,5	1,34	3.329	2.481
	65+	88,2	1,4	1,6	1,25	778	624

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

		Value	Standard Error	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Total	**Total**	**21,6**	**0,5**	**2,1**	**1,28**	**10.025**	**7.838**
	0 - 17	20,3	1,0	4,9	1,38	2.250	1.633
	18+	22,0	0,5	2,4	1,26	7.775	6.190
	18 - 64	16,4	0,5	3,2	1,38	6.311	4.567
	65+	52,6	1,4	2,7	1,01	1.464	1.444
Male	18+	19,3	0,7	3,7	1,28	3.668	2.877
	18 - 64	14,7	0,7	5,0	1,42	2.982	2.094
	65+	46,5	2,1	4,5	0,98	686	700
Female	18+	24,6	0,8	3,1	1,25	4.107	3.299
	18 - 64	18,1	0,8	4,2	1,35	3.329	2.464
	65+	57,8	2,0	3,4	1,04	778	745

2.2.1.9 Mean equivalised disposable income per person (CYP)

	Value	Standard Error	Design Effect	Actual Sample Size	Effective Sample Size
Mean equivalised disposable income	10.980	86,0	1,20	10.025	8.326

2.3. Non-sampling errors

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

The list of households from the 2001 Census of Population was used as sampling frame with a supplementary list of newly constructed houses (built after 2001 up to 2007). The Statistical Service of Cyprus was provided by the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (E.A.C.) with a list of domestic electricity consumers, which contained all the new connections of electricity between 2001 and 2007. The E.A.C. distinguishes domestic consumers from other consumers (e.g. industrial etc). It has been established that each domestic electricity consumer registered by the E.A.C. corresponds to the statistical definition of a housing unit. Each of these new electricity meter connections represented one new household.

Coverage problems encountered were:

1. The frame of the 2001 Census of Population was somehow outdated and as a result some housing units were found to be empty or to be used for other purposes other than housing.

2. Some houses included in the E.A.C. list were used as secondary residence, so they were out of scope of the survey.

3. Some houses listed by the E.A.C. were impossible to be located due to incomplete information regarding their addresses.

4. Housing units built during 2008 were not included in our sampling frame.

2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

Possible sources of measurement errors are the questionnaire (design, content and wording), the method of data collection, the interviewers and the respondents.

The questionnaire for EU-SILC was developed on the basis of the EU-SILC Doc. 065 and Doc. 055. It was further developed after the pilot survey which was carried out during the period 14/06/2004 to 23/07/2004. Even though, the questionnaire was well tested and despite the fact that this was the 4th wave of the survey, some questions were still difficult to be answered with precision. Difficulties due to memory lapses were encountered in questions regarding income from interests, dividends and shares (HY 090). Furthermore, difficulties were also encountered in distinguishing the various benefits and pensions.

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

In order to reduce interviewer effects a two week training session for all the interviewers and an extra week training for newly recruited interviewers (i.e. those working for the first time in EU-SILC), was organised at the head offices of the Statistical Service. The training was conducted by permanent staff, Statistics Officers responsible for the EU-SILC survey. The aim of the training was to ensure that all interviewers were uniformly trained both in regard to the content of the questionnaire, as well as their behaviour during the interview. The extra week training for the newcomers focused mainly on the terminology of the survey giving as well general information on the previous round of the survey. In this way the newcomers were able to follow the other interviewers who worked the year before in the survey. In the second week where all interviewers were together, the training mainly focused on refreshing the terminology used in the questionnaire and on the understanding of new terminology used for the first time

in the questionnaire (e.g. Over-indebtedness and financial exclusion module). Main emphasis was given on difficult definitions and on explaining the various public benefits as well as the importance of the accuracy of the information collected. On the third week the interviewers had intensive sessions on working with their laptops and the electronic questionnaires in the environment of BLAISE. An interviewer manual was prepared explaining each and every single question of the questionnaire as well as their respective possible answers.

Apart from the 20 interviewers the training sessions were also attended by 5 supervisors. Each one of them was responsible for a group of 4 interviewers. During the fieldwork period the supervisor had meetings with each one of the interviewers in his/her group at least once a week. During these meetings, apart from discussing problems or questions raised during the week, the supervisors also collected (from the interviewers´ laptops) all completed questionnaires. Their main duty during the data collection period was to examine the interviewers' work and refer back to them for inconsistencies or for problems identified in connection with terminology. Furthermore the supervisors had to double check some of the answers with respondents either by telephone or by personally visiting the household in question, especially in the case of unusual answers or missing data. Additionally from 2nd wave onwards, data for households in the survey for 2 years or more were further checked based on the data from previous years.

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

Processing errors were reduced because of CAPI and the implementation of validation and consistency checks during the data collection phase (BLAISE software). The processing errors were further reduced as the questionnaires were edited and coded by the supervisors prior to finalising the data files for processing. The coding requested was minimal, i.e. occupation (2 digits ISCO), economic activity (2 digits NACE) and country of birth; and was carried out using drop down lists.

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

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

2.3.3. Non-response errors

2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size

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

Table 2.3.3.1.1 : Sample Size and Accepted Interviews

	Total	R4	R5	R6	R7
Persons 16 years and over	8.090	1.993	2.046	2.077	1.974
Number of accepted personal questionnaires	8.090	1.993	2.046	2.077	1.974
Accepted household interviews	3.335	819	851	845	840

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

Household non-response rates (NRh)

DB120 is the record of contact at the address

DB130 is the household questionnaire result

DB135 is the household interview acceptance result

*For the new rotational group, i.e. **panel 7 (R7)**:*

Address contact rate:

$$Ra=\frac{\sum[DB120=11]}{\sum[DB120=all]-\sum[DB120=23]}=\frac{964}{1153-180}=0,9908$$

Proportion of complete household interviews accepted for the database:

$$Rh=\frac{\sum[DB135=1]}{\sum[DB130=all]}=\frac{840}{964}=0,8714$$

Household non-response rate:

NRh=(1-(Ra*Rh))*100=13,662%

*For the **total sample***:

Address contact rate:

$$\text{Ra} = \frac{\sum[DB120 = 11]}{\sum[DB120 = all] - \sum[DB120 = 23]} = \frac{3664}{3853 - 180} = 0,9975$$

Proportion of complete household interviews accepted for the database:

$$\text{Rh} = \frac{\sum[DB135 = 1]}{\sum[DB130 = all]} = \frac{3355}{3664} = 0,9157$$

Household non-response rate:

NRh=(1-(Ra*Rh))*100=8,659%

Individual non-response rates (NRp)

RB245 is the respondent status

RB250 is the data status

*For the new rotational group, i.e. **panel 7 (R7)***:

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

$$\text{Rp} = \frac{\sum[RB250 = 11 + 12 + 13 + 14^{(1)}]}{\sum[RB245 = 1 + 2 + 3]} = \frac{1974}{1974} = 1$$

Individual non-response rate:

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

*For the **total sample***:

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

$$\text{Rp} = \frac{\sum[RB250 = 11 + 12 + 13 + 14^{(1)}]}{\sum[RB245 = 1 + 2 + 3]} = \frac{8090}{8090} = 1$$

[1]This code corresponds to individuals for whom the information was completed from full record imputation (15 cases).

Individual non-response rate:

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

Overall individual non-response rates (NRp)*

*For the new rotational group, i.e. **panel 7 (R7)**:*

* NRp=(1-(Ra*Rh*Rp))*100=13,662%

*For the **total sample**:*

* NRp=(1-(Ra*Rh*Rp))*100=8,659%

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

Table 2.3.3.3.1 : Distribution of DB120

DB120 – Contact at address	Total	R4	R5	R6	R7
Address contacted (11)	3.664	883	910	907	964
Address cannot be located (21)	9	0	0	0	9
Address unable to access (22)	0	0	0	0	0
Address does not exist or empty etc. (23)	180	0	0	0	180
Total	**3.853**	**883**	**910**	**907**	**1.153**

Table 2.3.3.3.2 : Distribution of DB130

DB130 – Household questionnaire result	Total	R4	R5	R6	R7
Household questionnaire completed (11)	3.355	819	851	845	840
Refusal to co-operate (21)	239	47	38	52	102
Entire household temporarily away (22)	18	7	6	3	2
Household unable to respond (23)	40	10	15	7	8
Other reasons (24)	12	0	0	0	12
Total	**3.664**	**883**	**910**	**907**	**964**

Table 2.3.3.3.3 : Distribution of DB135

DB135 – Household interview acceptance	Total	R4	R5	R6	R7
Interview accepted for database (1)	3.355	819	851	845	840
Interview rejected (2)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3.355	819	851	845	840

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

Not applicable.

2.3.3.5. Item non-response

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

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

Item non-response	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values (before imputation)	% of households with partial information (before imputation)
Total household gross income HY010	100,0	0,0	2,4
Total disposable household income HY020	100,0	0,0	0,4
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits HY022	99,5	0,1	0,4
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits HY023	90,0	0,1	0,4
Imputed rent HY030G	91,8	na	na
Income from rental of a property or land HY040G	8,9	0,0	0,0
Family/children related allowances HY050G	50,1	0,0	0,0
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified HY060G	0,7	0,0	0,0
Housing allowances HY070G	1,9	0,0	0,0
Regular inter-household cash transfer received HY080G	8,3	0,0	0,0
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment in unincorporated business HY090G	11,1	0,0	0,0
Interest repayments on mortgage HY100G	13,6	0,0	0,0
Income received by people aged under 16 HY110G	0,0	0,0	0,0
Regular taxes on wealth HY120G	61,2	0,0	0,0
Regular inter household cash transfer paid HY130G	11,5	0,0	0,0
Tax on income and social contributions HY140G	75,1	0,8	2,3

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

Item non-response	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	% of persons with missing values (before imputation)	% of persons with partial information (before imputation)
Employee cash or near cash income PY010G	50,3	0,3	1,6
Non-cash employee income PY020G	7,3	0,0	0,0
Company car PY021G	1,4	0,0	0,0
Employer´s social insurance contribution PY030G	45,9	0,0	0,0
Contributions to individual private pension plans PY035G	0,4	0,0	0,0
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment PY050G	12,2	0,2	0,2
Value of goods produced by own consumption PY070G	0,5	0,0	0,0
Pension from individual private plans PY080G	0,6	0,0	0,0
Unemployment benefits PY090G	3,6	0,3	0,0
Old-age benefits PY100G	21,2	0,0	0,4
Survivor benefits PY110G	1,0	0,0	0,0
Sickness benefits PY120G	0,9	0,0	0,0
Disability benefits PY130G	2,5	0,0	0,0
Education-related allowances PY140G	6,4	0,0	0,0

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

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

Table 2.3.3.6: Indicator sample size and non-response

Indicator	Actual Sample Size	Missing values	Remarks	Individual non-response
Mean equivalised disposable income	10.025	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by age and gender	10.025	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by most frequent activity and gender	7.775	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by household type	10.025	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate: one person household	526	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate: household with 2 adults and 2 dependent children	1.820	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by accommodation tenure status	10.025	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate by work intensity of the household	9.062	0	963 persons belonged to households without any member aged 16 to 64 years or households composed solely of students	0
Dispersion around the risk of poverty threshold (ARPT 40%)	10.025	0	-	0
Dispersion around the risk of poverty threshold (ARPT 50%)	10.025	0	-	0
Dispersion around the risk of poverty threshold (ARPT 70%)	10.025	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate before all social transfers including old age/survivor's pensions by age and gender	10.025	0	-	0
Risk of poverty rate before all social transfers except old age/survivor's pensions by age and gender	10.025	0	-	0
Relative median at risk of poverty gap by age and gender	1.822	0	-	0
S80/S20 quintile share ratio	10.025	0	-	0
Gini coefficient	10.025	0	-	0
Gender pay gap	NA	NA	NA	NA

2.4. Mode of data collection

The mode of data collection for EU-SILC survey was CAPI. PAPI was only used in the extreme case of a technical problem with the interviewer's laptop. Proxy interviews occurred mainly for persons serving as national guards or for students fully supported by their parents and temporarily away; both of these categories were considered to be members of their parents' households. The following tables present the distribution of individuals aged 16 or over by data status and type of interview.

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

RB250 Data status	Total		R4		R5		R6		R7	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total	8.090	100	1.993	100	2.046	100	2.077	100	1.974	100
information completed only from interview (11)	8.075	99,8	1.988	99,8	2.041	99,8	2.072	99,8	1.974	100
information completed from full record imputation (14)	15	0,2	5	0,2	5	0,2	5	0,2	0	0,0
individual unable to respond and no proxy possible (21)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
refusal to co-operate (23)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
person temporarily away and no proxy possible (31)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
no contact for other reasons (32)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
information not completed: reason unknown (33)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0

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

RB260 Type of interview	Total		R4		R5		R6		R7	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total	8.075[(1)]	100	1.988	100	2.041	100	2.072	100	1.974	100
face to face interview-PAPI (1)	11	0,1	0	0,0	3	0,2	3	0,1	5	0,3
face to face interview-CAPI (2)	6.676	82,7	1.671	84,1	1.676	82,1	1.672	80,7	1.657	83,9
proxy interview (5)	1.388	17,2	317	15,9	362	17,7	397	19,2	312	15,8

[(1)] The total number of individuals aged 16 and over is 8.090. The information for 15 of these individuals was completed from full record imputation.

2.5. Interview duration

The mean household interview duration was approximately 49 minutes and was calculated as the sum of the duration of all household interviews plus the sum of the duration of all personal interviews, divided by the number of household questionnaires completed and accepted for the database.

3. COMPARABILITY

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions

Reference population

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

Private household definition

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

Household membership

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

Income reference period(s) used

For EU-SILC 2008 the income reference period was 2007.

The period for taxes on income and social insurance contributions

The period for taxes payments/refunds and social insurance contributions was 2007. Tax refunds received during 2007 referred to income received in previous years.

Reference period for taxes on wealth

The reference period for taxes on wealth was 2007.

The lag between the income reference period and current variables

Since EU-SILC 2008 was carried out during the middle of March and the end of July 2008, the time lag between the income reference period and current variables varied between 3 to 7 months.

Total duration of the data collection of the sample

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

Basic information on activity status during the income reference period

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

3.2. Components of income

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. COHERENCE

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

In the tables that follow, we compare the results on income components between EU-SILC 2005, EU-SILC 2006, EU-SILC 2007 and EU-SILC 2008 at both household and personal level. More specifically in the two tables that follow the percentages of households and persons having received an amount on specific income target variables, as well as their mean value per household are presented.

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

Another difference that occurred between the first survey and the other three surveys at household level, corresponded to "social exclusion not elsewhere classified" (HY060G). This is mainly due to the fact that during 2005 interviewers did not record benefits as detailed as during 2006.

In EU-SILC 2007 and 2008, PY020G corresponds to the variable Non-cash employee income, whereas in EU-SILC 2006 and 2005 it corresponded to the variable Company car. In EU-SILC 2007 and 2008 Company car corresponds to PY021G.

In general the survey results reflect the improvement in the economy of Cyprus between 2007 (EU-SILC 2008), 2006 (EU-SILC 2007), 2005 (EU-SILC 2006) and 2004 (EU-SILC 2005). Compensation of employees and imputed wages and salaries of self-employed increased by 5,6% from 2004 to 2005, by 6,1% from 2005 to 2006 and by 6,6% from 2006 to 2007 (National Accounts). Furthermore, earnings of the employees increase every six months (July and December) automatically based on the cost of leaving allowance.

Table 4.1.1: Comparison between EU-SILC 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 for all income target variables at household level

Income target variable	EU-SILC							
	2005		2006		2007		2008	
	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)	% of households having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)
Total household gross income HY010	100,0	18.239	100,0	19.981	100,0	22.166	100,0	22.596
Total disposable household income HY020	100,0	16.338	100,0	17.907	100,0	19.907	100,0	20.244
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits HY022	98,9	15.342	99,4	16.774	99,2	18.673	99,5	19.076
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits HY023	89,5	13.273	90,7	14.521	90,0	15.888	90,0	16.318
Imputed rent HY030G	-	-	-	-	91,8	3.393	91,8	3.569
Income from rental of a property or land HY040G	8,3	341	8,9	392	9,6	462	8,9	391
Family/children related allowances HY050G	54,9	350	70,4	370	51,8	351	50,1	351
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified HY060G	3,0	68	1,1	28	0,9	22	0,7	15
Housing allowances HY070G	2,9	84	2,8	92	2,7	84	1,9	71
Regular inter-household cash transfer received HY080G	7,1	172	8,5	209	8,1	175	8,3	212
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investment in unincorporated business HY090G	7,1	219	11,1	333	12,6	448	11,1	289
Interest repayments on mortgage HY100G	-	-	-	-	14,7	299	13,6	292
Regular taxes on wealth HY120G	60,4	28	58,6	27	56,0	27	61,2	31
Regular inter household cash transfer paid HY130G	10,7	223	13,2	264	11,9	232	11,5	229
Tax on income and social contributions HY140G	74,3	1.651	75,0	1.783	75,5	1.999	75,1	2.092

Table 4.1.2: Comparison between EU-SILC 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 for all income target variables at individual level

Income target variable	EU-SILC							
	2005		**2006**		**2007**		**2008**	
	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	Mean (weighted) income per household (CY £)
Employee cash or near cash income PY010G	51,1	12.091	51,8	13.269	51,2	14.344	50,3	14.622
Non-cash employee income PY020G	-	-	-	-	7,1	120	7,3	130
Company car PY021G	1,0	41	1,8	45	1,6	49	1,4	44
Employer´s social insurance contribution PY030G	-	-	-	-	45,8	1.792	45,9	1.875
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment PY050G	9,5	2.263	10,3	2.290	11,3	2.473	12,2	2.978
Value of goods produced by own consumption PY070G	-	-	-	-	1,0	11	1,0	4
Unemployment benefits PY090G	3,6	169	3,8	249	3,7	314	3,6	213
Old-age benefits PY100G	18,4	2.021	19,6	2.233	20,1	2.807	21,2	2.791
Survivor benefits PY110G	1,0	94	0,9	76	0,9	87	1,0	102
Sickness benefits PY120G	1,1	23	1,0	19	0,8	24	0,9	29
Disability benefits PY130G	1,6	120	1,9	164	2,5	208	2,5	235
Education-related allowances PY140G	5,1	182	5,0	211	6,2	232	6,4	253

The next table presents the labour force participation rates as they were recorded by Labour Force Survey 2008 and EU-SILC 2008. There is one main methodological difference between the two surveys, for LFS students studying abroad or national guards (compulsory army service) are not considered to be part of the population, whereas they are part of the EU-SILC population. Thus, the totals as well as the rates of the ages 16-24 are not comparable. The rest of the results up to the age of 59 fit very well. EU-SILC seems to underestimate the rates for persons aged 60 years and over, but this is understandable since LFS is the core survey with main objective to collect information on employment.

Table 4.1.3: Comparison between Labour Force Survey 2008 and EU-SILC 2008 for the labour force participation rates

Age Groups	Total		Males		Females	
	LFS	EU-SILC	LFS	EU-SILC	LFS	EU-SILC
16 - 19	13,5	7,4	15,7	7,2	11,7	7,7
20 - 24	69,7	46,7	70,6	40,7	69,0	52,5
25 - 29	85,9	81,4	87,4	81,9	84,5	80,9
30 - 34	91,5	92,5	97,1	97,7	85,9	87,2
35 - 39	87,1	90,4	95,8	96,5	78,8	84,5
40 - 44	87,3	88,7	95,6	98,7	79,4	79,2
45 - 49	85,4	84,8	95,8	96,1	75,0	73,3
50 - 54	80,7	79,6	92,8	93,7	68,8	65,8
55 - 59	68,4	68,1	85,0	84,3	52,4	52,4
60 - 64	42,2	38,7	58,1	58,1	27,4	20,6
65+	12,3	6,3	21,4	11,3	4,5	2,1
Total	**64,2**	**60,4**	**73,1**	**67,5**	**55,8**	**53,5**