Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia

INTERMEDIATE QUALITY REPORT
EU-SILC 2006 OPERATION
IN LATVIA

Riga 2007

CONTENTS

Background……...5
1. Common cross-sectional European Union indicators……5
2. Accuracy……7
2.1. Sampling design……..7
2.1.1. Type of sample design……..7
2.1.2. Sampling units……..7
2.1.3. Stratification criteria……7
2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria……...8
2.1.5. Sample selection schemes……..……..8
2.1.6. Sample distribution over time……..9
2.1.7. Renewal of sample: Rotational groups……9
2.1.8. Weightings……...9
2.1.8.1. Design factor……...9
2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments……10
2.1.8.3. Adjustments to external data (level, variables used and sources)……10
2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weights……10
2.1.9. Substitutions……...11
2.2. Sampling errors……11
2.2.1. Standard error and effective sample size……11
2.3. Non-sampling errors……..12
2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors……..12
2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors……...13
2.3.2.1. Measurement errors……13
2.3.2.2. Processing errors……15
2.3.3. Non-response errors……...15
2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size……15
2.3.3.2. Unit non-response…….……..16
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)……17
2.3.3.4. Distribution of substituted units……..19
2.3.3.5. Item non-response……...19
2.4. Mode of data collection……...21
2.5. Interview duration……...22
3. Comparability……22
3.1. Basic concepts and definitions……22
3.1.1. The reference population……22
3.1.2. The private household definition……22
3.1.3. The household membership……...22
3.1.4. The income reference period……..23

3.1.5. The period of taxes on income and social contributions……23
3.1.6. The reference period for taxes on wealth……...23
3.1.7. The lag between the income reference period and current variables…….23
3.1.8. The total duration of the data collection of the sample……..23
3.1.9. Basic information on activity status during the income reference period……..…23
3.2. Components of income……..24
3.2.1.1. Total household gross income…… 24
3.2.1.2 Total disposable household income…… 24
3.2.1.3. Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits……..24
3.2.1.4. Total disposable household income, before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits……..24
3.2.1.5. Imputed rent……... 24
3.2.1.6. Income from rental property and land…… 24
3.2.1.7. Family/children-related allowances……..24
3.2.1.8. Social exclusion payments not elsewhere classified…….24
3.2.1.9. Housing allowances…… 25
3.2.1.10. Regular inter-household cash transfers received…… 25
3.2.1.11. Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business…25
3.2.1.12. Interest paid on mortgages……. 25
3.2.1.13. Income received by people aged under 16……. 25
3.2.1.14. Regular taxes on wealth…… 25
3.2.1.15. Regular inter-household transfers paid……. 25
3.2.1.16. Tax on income and social contributions…… 25
3.2.1.17. Repayments and tax adjustments……... 25
3.2.1.18. Cash or near-cash employee income…… 25
3.2.1.19. Non-cash employee income……... 26
3.2.1.20. Employers' social contributions…… 26
3.2.1.21. Cash profits or losses from self-employment (including royalties)……26
3.2.1.22. Value of goods produced for own consumption…… 27
3.2.1.23. Unemployment benefits…… 27
3.2.1.24. Old-age benefits…… 27
3.2.1.25. Survivors' benefits…… 27
3.2.1.26. Sickness benefits……27
3.2.1.27. Disability benefits…… 27
3.2.1.28. Education related allowances…….27
3.2.1.29. Gross monthly earnings for employees…… 27
3.2.2. The source of collecting income variables……... 28
3.2.3. The form in which income target variables at component level were obtained……. 28
3.2.4. The method used for obtaining income target variables in required form……..... 28

4. Coherence……..……28
4.1. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who receive income from each ‘income component’, with external sources……29
4.2. Comparison of other target variables with external sources…….30

Background

2006 was the second year, when EU-SILC is carried out in Latvia. The Latvian EU-SILC survey is an annual survey with a four-year rotational panel and has been carried out as independent survey, covering both cross-section and longitudinal primary target variables and also secondary target variables by single operation.

1. Common cross-sectional European Union indicators

Table 1.1. Laeken indicators and other indicators

Indicator	**Value**
Primary Laeken indicators of social cohesion	
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Total	23
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Male	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Female	25
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-17 total	26
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-64 total	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-64 male	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 0-64 female	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+ total	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+ male	20
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+ female	25
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-64 total	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-64 male	20
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-64 female	21
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-24 total	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-24 male	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18-24 female	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 25-49 total	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 25-49 male	18
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 25-49 female	19
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 50-64 total	26
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 50-64 male	26
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 50-64 female	26
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 65+ total	30
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 65+ male	17
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 65+ female	36
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, at work total	11
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, at work male	10
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, at work female	12
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, not at work total	37
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, not at work male	37
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, not at work female	38
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, unemployed total	64
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, unemployed male	72
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, unemployed female	55
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, retired total	35
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, retired male	26
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, retired female	39
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, other inactive total	30
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, other inactive male	31

Indicator	**Value**
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 18+, other inactive female	30
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: No dependent children	25
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single total	55
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single male	49
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single female	58
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single <65 years	42
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single 65+	69
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults no children, <65 years	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults no children, 65+	16
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: All households with dependent children	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Single parent	40
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults 1 dependent child	15
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults 2 dependent children	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: 2 adults 3+ dependent children	52
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Owner or rent-free	22
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers: Tenant	30
S80/S20 income quintile share ratio	7.9
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: Total	25
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: Male	29
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: Female	23
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 0-17	29
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18+ total	24
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18+ male	29
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18+ female	21
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18-64 total	30
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 18-64 male	32
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 16-64 female	29
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 65+ total	16
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 65+ male	15
Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap: 65+ female	16
Secondary Laeken indicators of social cohesion	
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers	40
At-risk-of-poverty rate before transfers including old-age and survivors` benefits	28
Gini coefficient	39
Other indicators	
Mean equivalised disposable income. LVL	2 249

The calculation of gender pay gap is based on other sources than EU-SILC. Wage statistics is used for calculating gender pay gap.

2. Accuracy

2.1. Sampling Design

In Latvia stratified two-stage sampling design was used for EU-SILC survey. At the first stage systematic sampling of the primary sampling units (Population Census counting areas) had been selected. At the second stage simple random sampling had been made to select secondary sampling units (addresses). The stratification had been made depending on degree of urbanization of area. The code of administrative territories was used for stratifying.

Table 2.1. Sampling design information

Stratum	1st stage	2nd stage	
	PSU's	SSU's	households
1	362	2217	2256
2	178	1024	1072
3	190	1114	1142
4	200	1501	1548
All	**930**	**5856**	**6018**

2.1.1. Type of sample design

Stratified two-stage sampling was used for EU-SILC survey in Latvia. Systematic sampling with inclusion probabilities proportional to unit size had been carried out at the first stage and simple random sampling had been carried out at the second stage.

2.1.2. Sampling units

The Population Census counting areas were used as primary sampling units (PSU's) at the first stage. In general, all territory of Latvia is covered in lists of population counting areas. PSU's were selected by systematic sampling with inclusion probabilities proportional to population size (number of households) of PSU's.

Addresses were used as secondary sampling units (SSU's). Simple random sampling was used to select SSU's from PSU's selected at first sampling stage. In Latvia several households can be registered in one address. All households and individuals living in the selected address were included in EU-SILC survey.

2.1.3. Stratification criteria

The stratification was made depending on degree of urbanization of area. Riga (the capital city), six largest towns, other towns and rural areas forms four strata. The code of administrative territories was used for stratifying. The stratum is identified in the variable DB050.

2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria

According to the Regulation (EC) No 1553/2005 of European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 amending Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 concerning Community statistics on income and living conditions (EU-SILC), Annex II in Latvia the minimum effective sample size was 3 750 households. The total gross sample size (number of households) has been made by analysing available resources and considering the output of the survey. The non-response rate was estimated by using the results of EU-SILC survey in 2005. To compensate the non-response it was decided to select 5 856 addresses. In Latvia more than one household can live in one address. Therefore, there were 6 018 households living in the selected addresses. In case if it was not possible to contact the selected address (f.e. address cannot be located, it was not possible to contact any person living in the address or the address was inaccessible) it was assumed that one household is living in selected address.

The response rates differ very much in each stratum. For this reason addresses were not included with probabilities proportional to stratum size, but the initial sample size was proportional to population size of each stratum. The initial sample size was adjusted according to response rates in each stratum to get the final sample size in each stratum. R_h is the number of persons aged 16 and over living in stratum *h* as at the beginning of 2006. n_h is number of respondents (aged 16 and over) of the stratum *h* and n_h / R_h is the sampling fraction in the corresponding stratum.

Table 2.2. Sampling fractions in the corresponding stratum

Stratum	R_h	n_h	n_h / R_h
1	574742	2 914	0.0051
2	311628	1 652	0.0053
3	333771	1 690	0.0051
4	556014	2 815	0.0051

2.1.5. Sample selection schemes

In the first stage 930 Population Census counting areas (PSU's) were selected by systematic sampling with inclusion probabilities proportional to their population size.

Simple random sampling without replacement was used to select 5 856 addresses (SSU's) in sampled PSU's. Non-proportional allocation was used to select SSU's.

2.1.6. Sample distribution over time

Sample distribution over time was not used because EU-SILC survey is organized on annual basis. The number of households successfully interviewed in each month of fieldwork is shown below in *Table 2.3.*

Table 2.3. Sample distribution over time

Month	Number of households	% of surveyed households	Cumulative % of surveyed households
March	63	1.5	1.5
April	617	14.3	15.8
May	869	20.1	35.9
June	978	22.7	58.6
July	903	20.9	79.5
August	55	1.3	80.8
September	550	12.7	93.5
October	255	5.9	99.4
November	2	0.0	99.5
Not specified	23	0.5	100

2.1.7. Renewal of sample: rotational groups

Latvia applies rotational panel where the sample is divided into four sub-samples. Each of them is representing whole population. Every year one of rotation group rotates out (is being dropped) and the new one is added to the sample.

2.1.8. Weightings

2.1.8.1. Design factor

The design weights (DB080) for addresses were calculated according the sample design:

$$DB080 = \frac{1}{prob\_adr};$$

$$prob\_adr = \frac{\text{hhpsupop} \cdot psustrat \cdot adrpsus}{hhstrpop \cdot adrp\,\text{sup}},$$

where ***prob_adr*** - inclusion probabilities of addresses;

hhpsupop - a number of households in each strata's each PSU of all population;

psustrat - a number of the PSU's in each strata of sample;

adrpsus - a number of addresses in each strata's each PSU of sample;

hhstrpop - a number of households in each strata of all population;

adrpsup - a number of addresses in each strata's each PSU of population.

The inclusion probability of the household and the individual is equal to the inclusion probability of the address. The design weights were adjusted for outliers (extremely high design weights) at the address level.

2.1.8.2. Non–response adjustments

The design weights adjusted for outliers $desig1\_w$ were adjusted for non-response (in household level) in each primary sampling unit (PSU) with correction coefficients k2_k3 and k4:

$$k2\_k3 = \frac{samplpsu \cdot \text{cov}\_sum}{restppsu \cdot resp};$$

$$nonrespw = k2\_k3 \cdot desig1\_w;$$

$$k4 = \frac{m1}{m2};$$

$$nonr\_w = nonrespw \cdot k4,$$

where ***samplpsu*** - a number of households in each PSU of sample;

cov_sum – a number of households useful for survey in each PSU of sample;

restppsu - a number of households in each PSU of sample, which belong to target population;

resp – a number of responded households in each PSU of sample;

m1 – a number of addresses in sample, which have at least one responded household;

m2 – a number of responded households in sample.

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

Cross-sectional weights were calibrated on basis of demographic data by breaking it down by degree of urbanization (three groups — Riga, 6 large towns and others), 11 age groups (16-20; 21-25; 26-30; 31-35; 36-40; 41-45; 46-50; 51-55; 56-60; 61-65; 66+) and sex. Another variable was demographic data by 6 regions of Latvia. Separately were calibrated cross-sectional weights for children, we used demographic data by each of age from 0 to 15. The final household weights were used both for households and for individuals.

2.1.8.4. Final cross-sectional weights

The final cross-sectional weights DB090 were calculated as the product of the design factor, non-response adjustment factor and calibration factor:

$$DB090 = nonr\_w \cdot g,$$

where **g** - g-weights of the regression estimator.

2.1.9. Substitutions

No substitution was used.

2.2. Sampling errors

2.2.1. Standard error and effective sample size

- **At-risk-of poverty rate and mean equivalised disposable income**

It was assumed that at-risk-of poverty rate is similar to ratio of two totals (ignoring that threshold is estimate from sample). Standard error and design effect for at-risk-of poverty rate were estimated as standard error and design effect for ratio. Standard error was estimated by using *jackknife* method. The correction of finite population at PSU level was applied for variance estimate in each stratum. The same methodology was used for estimating standard error and design effect for mean equivalised disposable income.

- **Gini coefficient**

Linearization was applied for *Gini* coefficient. Standard error for *Gini* coefficient was estimated as standard error for total of linearized variable. Standard error was estimated by using *jackknife* method. The correction of finite population at PSU level was applied to variance estimate in each stratum.

- **Design effect**

Design effect was calculated as ratio of the variance for sampling design used in EU-SILC and the variance for simple random sampling of households.

- **Software**

The variance estimates and design effect were computed by using the software SUDAAN and SPSS.

Table 2.4. Estimates, the standard error and design effect for common cross–sectional EU indicators

Indicator	Value	Achieved sample size	Standard error	Design effect	Effective sample size
At-risk-of-poverty rate after social transfers	23.1	4315	0.72	1.20	3 599
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits	39.7	4315	0.81	0.97	4 448
At-risk-of-poverty rate before all transfers	27.8	4315	0.97	1.21	3 557
Gini coefficient	39.2	4315	0.87	-	-
Mean equivalised disposable income	2248.9	4315	54.04	2.4	1 797

2.3. Non-sampling errors

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

Two sampling frames are built for each sampling stage. At the first stage counting areas from the list of Population Census 2000 are used as sampling frame. All territory of Latvia was divided in small territories (smaller than NUTS4) during the Population Census 2000. The list contains information about the number of households in each counting area.

At the second stage sampling frame is built from The Population Register, statistical register of dwellings and statistical register of households.

Second stage sampling frame was built by using the copy of Population Register given at the beginning of year 2005. Both statistical register of dwellings and statistical register of households was updated by using the Population Register. Thus the time lag between last update of the registers and the moment of actual EU-SILC survey sampling was 10 months.

The over-coverage relates either to misclassified units that are in fact out of scope, or to units that do not exist in practice (i.e. address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)). Overall, over-coverage rate of total amount of addresses included in EU-SILC survey was 4 % (241 from 6 018 addresses).

Table 2.5. Distribution of over coverage

Type of over-coverage	Number of addresses	Proportion of the over-coverage by type, (%)
Address does not exist (DB120=231)	11	6.4
Non - residential address (DB120=232)	112	65.1
Address is unoccupied (DB120=233)	18	10.5
Address is not principal residence (DB120=234)	31	18.0
Total	**172**	**100**

There are 69 addresses, which are not identified by over-coverage reason; those were addresses of households, which were surveyed in previous year.

The level of under-coverage is not estimated.

2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

The same as in EU-SILC 2005 operation 3 types of questionnaires were developed for EU-SILC 2006 operation: Household Register (to collect demographic information about all household members), Household Questionnaire (to collect all information related to household – dwelling costs, housing conditions, income components received at household level etc.), Personal Questionnaire (to collect all needed information for each household member aged 16 and over in previous calendar year) and Household List (additional document to record all necessary information about household member for tracing purposes and for linkage with data from administrative registers). The household members' first, second names, contact addresses, phone numbers (fixed and mobile phone numbers) and personal identification codes were recorded in Household List. The Blaise CAPI applications as well as the paper questionnaires of EU-SILC survey were available in Latvian and in Russian (the language of the largest ethnic minority in Latvia).

The interviewers of CSB carried out the fieldwork of EU-SILC survey. For the field staff was organised a 2 days intensive training session. The aims of the training were to introduce fieldwork stuff with methodology of EU-SILC survey, to instruct interviewers for accurate fieldwork execution of the survey and give them information to motivate respondents for participation in the survey. Special emphasis was put on training to work with laptop computers and using Blaise data entry application. Several tests (including practical interview to fill EU-SILC questionnaires) were developed to check interviewers' knowledge after training session.

To increase response rates several steps had been made to introduce Latvian residents with EU-SILC survey before starting fieldwork. Press release had been prepared, several publications had been made in state and regional newspapers to provide publicity of EU-SILC survey. Introduction letter with EU-SILC booklet was sent to selected address to establish first contact with household before interview.

Measurement errors had been detected by analysing Interviewer's reports, by organizing discussions with interviewers after fieldwork execution and by logical checks and verification of received data. Overall, the topic of EU-SILC survey was sensitive and important for respondents. Therefore, the respondent's attitude to the survey was quite different. Part of respondents had shown distrust to governmental institutions and expressed disbelief in improvement of living conditions in Latvia. Other part of respondent was very optimistic. They saw importance of EU-SILC survey to identify socio economical situation. In many cases the respondent's strong attitude

burdened the interview process because people were speaking a lot about living conditions and quality of life in general and not answering the questions. Several problems have been identified in Interviewer's reports:

- many reference periods were confusing for respondents during interview process because they couldn't focus on particular time period;
- respondents couldn't identify themselves to any particular socio-economical status (f. e. woman in child care leave, unpaid family worker assisting in agricultural production);
- old people had difficulties to tell the year when highest level of education was attained and answer questions on last job;
- many respondents were not willing to tell truth amounts of income components;
- many respondents couldn't tell annual income amounts and housing costs;
- question related to household's ability to keep home adequately warm was not understandable;
- meaning of subjective rent (the potential monthly market price for non-tenants or for persons renting the dwelling at reduced price) was not understandable;
- housing costs are becoming more sensitive, it is suspected that respondents are tended higher amounts of housing costs than it's actually paid (it is because of removal regulation of maximum rent amount in denationalised houses and municipality houses – before there was maximal rent amount in these houses was regulated by government, but now they have free market prices);
- old professions (during Soviet time or even before soviet occupation) did not correspond to the current ISCO-88 classification;
- some non-citizens felt offended by question related to citizenship;
- questions about health and social participation is not convenient to the respondents.

Interviewers were also complaining about length of questionnaire covering too much information. It is very difficult to collect information on income components without use of administrative records. It worth to notice that thanks to use of CAPI were discovered less problems related with wrong skips from the question to question in EU-SILC 2006 operation in comparison with EU-SILC 2005 operation. Interviewers mentioned several advantages of using laptops: interviewing becomes

easier, many mistakes are avoided, laptops increase respect among respondents, interviewing with laptops is more prestige and also more convenient. Disadvantages of laptop are that recharging during making interviews is very difficult (respondents are not willing to allow to recharge PC), it is heavy to carry the laptops all the time and antenna of laptops is too fragile.

The errors possible to correct without respondent's assistance were corrected offhand. In cases if additional information from respondent was needed the questionnaire had been returned Interviewer Section, which contacted respondent or interviewer afterwards.

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

In 2006 processing system of EU-SILC data has become less time consuming as it was in 2005. It is related with introduction of CAPI by using *Blaise* program. It has to be noted that year of 2006 was first year when laptops have been used in social surveys of CSB and EU-SILC was one of the first surveys where CAPI system was used for carrying out survey. Overall, interviewers adopted computer skills very fast but in several cases for interviewers were needed additional explanations about marking answers by using CAPI. Although laptops were given to all interviewers, part of them made interviews by using paper questionnaires.

Overall *Blaise* program has been designed successfully and it worked stable, except case when one interviewer lost data of full questionnaire sets about 19 households during the process of sending data from laptop to central server. Data on these households couldn't be renewed and there are unknown reasons why data have been lost. Remarkable number of logical checks as well as part of personal data from previous year of the survey (2005) has been introduced into the program. Nevertheless, it has noted that program had one defect: time registration have not been considered completely in cases when household data have been corrected, revised or supplemented for several times and in cases when interview was made by using PAPI.

Data have been transformed from *Blaise* to MS ACCESS (modified version of application of 2005), where initial database has been analysed and corrected. Compliance of the database with *Eurostat* requirements has been checked with SAS program.

2.3.3. Non-response errors

2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size

4315 households interviews were accepted for the database and used for analysis.

There are 9 071 persons 16 years and older who are members of households for which the interview is accepted for the database, and who completed a personal interview.

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

The final response rates were calculated according to formulas given by Eurostat:

- Household non-response rate *NRh* = 22.1
- Individual non-response rate *NRp =1.4*
- Overall non-response rate **NRp =23.3*

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)

Table 2.6. Distribution of households by 'record of contact at address' (DB120) for each rotational group

	Rotational group 1		**Rotational group 2**		**Rotational group 3**		**Rotational group 4**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Total (DB120 = 11 to 23)	**962**	**100**	**1 153**	**100**	**1 417**	**100**	**2 255**	**100**	**5 787**	**100**
Address contacted (DB120 = 11)	929	96.6	1 125	97.6	1 384	97.7	2 027	89.9	5 465	94.4
Address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	33	3.4	28	2.4	33	2.3	228	10.1	322	5.6
Total address non-contacted (DB120 = 21 to 23)	**33**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**33**	**100**	**228**	**100**	**322**	**100**
Address cannot be located (DB120 = 21)	8	24.2	3	10.7	0	0	12	5.3	23	7.1
Address unable to access (DB120 = 22)	1	3.0	0	0	1	3.0	56	24.6	58	18.0
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principal residence (DB120 = 23)	24	72.7	25	89.3	32	97.0	160	70.2	**241**	**74.8**

It should be noticed, that 212 addresses have not been used and there is no information about them and data about 19 households were lost.

Table 2.7. Distribution of addresses contacted by 'household questionnaire result' and by 'household interview acceptance' for each rotational group

	Rotational group 1		**Rotational group 2**		**Rotational group 3**		**Rotational group 4**		**Total**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Total (DB130 = 11 to 24)	**928**	**100**	**1 124**	**100**	**1 383**	**100**	**2 026**	**100**	**5 461**	**100**
Household questionnaire completed (DB130 = 11)	793	85.5	944	84.0	1 153	83.4	1 429	70.5	4 319	79.1
Interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	135	14.5	180	16.0	230	16.6	597	29.5	1 142	20.9
Total interview not completed (DB130 = 21 to 24)	**135**	**100**	**180**	**100**	**230**	**100**	**597**	**100**	**1 142**	**100**
Refusal to co-operate (DB130 = 21)	53	39.3	74	41.1	102	44.3	278	46.6	507	44.4
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork (DB130 = 22)	71	52.6	95	52.8	117	50.9	264	44.2	547	47.9
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity, etc) (DB130 = 23)	7	5.2	5	2.8	3	1.3	21	3.5	36	3.2
Other (DB130 = 24)	4	3.0	6	3.3	8	3.5	34	5.7	52	4.6
Household questionnaire completed (DB135 = 1 to 2)	**793**	**100**	**944**	**100**	**1 153**	**100**	**1 429**	**100**	**4 319**	**100**
Interview accepted to database (DB135 = 1)	793	100	942	99.8	1151	99.8	1429	100	4 315	99.9
Interview rejected (DB135 = 2)	0	0	2	0.2	2	0.2	0	0	4	0.1

It should be noticed, that 231 addresses have not been used and there is no information about them.

2.3.3.4. Distribution of substituted units

Substitution was not used.

2.3.3.5. Item non-response

The tables below show the amount following information on each income component at personal and at household level:

- percentage of persons/households having received an amount of income (other than 0),
- percentage of persons/households having received an income but with no information about amount of the received income have been obtained from the questionnaire (missing value);
- percentage of persons/households providing partial information about income variable in the questionnaire (responding part of questions related to income amounts)

Table 2.8. Distribution of item non-response for income variables collected at household level

Income variable	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values (before imputation)	% of households with partial information (before imputation)
Total disposable household income	99.4	0.3	53.0
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits	98.5	0.4	53.2
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits	88.3	0.4	34.2
Net income components at household level			
Income from rental of a property or land	1.2	0	0
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business	1.9	9.6	1.2
Family/Children related allowances	31.1	0	0.6
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	5.4	1.7	0
Housing allowances	4.4	1.0	0
Regular inter-household cash transfer received	10.8	1.3	0
Income received by people aged under 16	1.3	0	0
Regular taxes on wealth	52.3	3.7	0
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid	10.7	2.6	0
Repayments/receipts for tax adjustment	11.3	2.0	0.4

Table 2.9. Distribution of item non-response for income variables collected at personal level

Income variable	% of persons 16+ having received an amount	% of persons 16+ with missing values (before imputation)	% of persons 16+ with partial information (before imputation)
Net income components at personal level			
Employee cash or near cash income	50.4	1.4	0.4
Non-cash employee income	0.8	100	0
Contributions to individual private pension plans	0.8	8.5	0
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment	4.8	4.4	0
Pension from individual private plans	0	0	0
Unemployment benefits	2.1	4.1	3.1
Old-age benefits	32.0	2.9	89.1
Survivor's benefits	1.1	0	0
Sickness benefits	4.3	4.9	0
Disability benefits	3.5	0.6	0.3
Education-related benefits	1.7	1.3	0

Missing values of income components were filled by using imputation methods. Multiple imputation method in combination with Hot Deck method was chosen for imputation of missing values in EU-SILC survey. The main principle of the Hot Deck method is to use the current data (donors) to provide imputed values for records with missing values.

Before imputation data of households was divided in similar groups by type of dwelling, year the dwelling was built and number of rooms in dwelling. Data of individuals were divided in similar groups by sex, person's family status and person's social status. After this distribution we obtained all groups of households and persons with similar income level. This factor improved imputation results.

At the end of September according to the signed agreement first time was received from State Social Insurance Agency (SSIA) micro-data files regarding pensions and benefits paid to EU-SILC 2006 respondents (during 2005). Discrepancies were discovered in both data sources during comparison process of data from EU-SILC 2006 operation and SSIA micro-data files for 2005. The main tendency is that in EU-SILC survey respondents have overestimated amount of received pension The results of methodological survey carried out within grant project "EU-SILC: Net/gross/net conversion for income data in Latvia" regarding cash and near cash income (PY010N) are indicating the same. The most realistic explanation could be that respondents indicated current amount of old-age benefits which was higher at the time of interview instead of old-age benefits received in income reference period (2005)). This tendency has impact on total disposable income (HY020) and Laeken indicators. Therefore it was decided to substitute old-age

benefits data collected during EU-SILC survey with data from SSIA. According to our opinion such revision of the database was needed to provide comparability of data in next EU-SILC operations when data from administrative registers (including data from SSIA) will be used.

Almost all values of old-age benefits received by the respondents (except pensions paid by other countries and service pensions) were substituted with records from State Social Insurance Agency (SSIA).

As SSIA delivered gross amounts of old-age pension then it was needed to use data on taxes from State Revenue Service for calculating net amounts of old-age pensions.

2.4. Mode of data collection

Table 2.10. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by Data status (RB250) and rotational group
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS AGED 16 AND OVER (RB245 = 1)

	Total	RB250 = 11	RB250 = 12	RB250 = 13	RB250 = 21	RB250 = 22	RB250 = 23	RB250 = 31	RB250 = 32	RB250 = 33
Total	**9 203**	6 407	0	2 664	1	0	43	72	15	1
%	**100**	69.6	0	28.9	0.0	0	0.5	0.8	0.2	0.0
Rotational group 1	**1 695**	1 170	0	502	1	0	7	13	1	1
%	**100**	69.0	0	29.6	0.1	0	0.4	0.8	0.1	0.1
Rotational group 2	**2 035**	1 420	0	586	0	0	11	12	6	0
%	**100**	69.8	0	28.8	0	0	0.5	0.6	0.3	0
Rotational group 3	**2 454**	1 711	0	704	0	0	13	23	3	0
%	**100**	69.7	0	28.7	0	0	0.5	0.9	0.1	0
Rotational group 4	**3 019**	2 106	0	872	0	0	12	24	5	0
%	**100**	69.8	0	28.9	0	0	0.4	0.8	0.2	0

Table 2.11. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over by Type of interview (RB260) and rotational group
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS AGED 16 AND OVER ((RB245 = 1) and (RB250 = 11 or 13))

	Total	RB260 = 1	RB260 = 2	RB260 = 3	RB260 = 4	RB260 = 5
Total	**9 066**	1 132	6 931	394	8	601
%	**100**	12.5	76.5	4.3	0.1	6.6
Rotational group 1	**1 672**	284	1201	84	1	102
%	**100**	17.0	71.8	5.0	0.1	6.1
Rotational group 2	**2 004**	197	1 533	119	0	155
%	**100**	9.8	76.5	5.9	0	7.7
Rotational group 3	**2 412**	307	1 822	113	0	170
%	**100**	12.7	75.5	4.7	0	7.0
Rotational group 4	**2 978**	344	2375	78	7	174
%	**100**	11.6	79.8	2.6	0.2	5.8

It should be noticed, that for 5 household members aged 16 and over value in "Type of interview" (RB260) is missing.

2.5. Interview duration

Mean duration of household interview: 12 minutes and 47 seconds.

Mean interview duration per household: 38 minutes and 26 seconds.

Thus, mean interview duration per household is lower than the one-hour limit set in Regulation No 1177/2003.

It should be noticed that information about duration of households interview was available only for 28% of households and 28% of household member aged 16 and over.

3. Comparability

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions

Overall, there are no differences between national interpretations of EU-SILC basic definitions and concepts and common standards set up in Commission regulations and doc. EU-SILC 065/04. Special attention has been paid on definition of household member during data collection of EU-SILC survey in 2006. Most typical cases faced by interviewers in previous years of EU-SILC survey have been described more comprehensively according to common definitions (see 3.1.3.).

3.1.1. The reference population

There were no divergences from common definition. Persons living in private households within national territory were the reference population of EU-SILC survey.

3.1.2. The private household definition

There were no divergences from common definition.

3.1.3. The household membership

There were no divergences from common definition. Due to the complexity of household membership several practical and comprehensive explanations based on concrete cases (examples) were given to interviewers. After entering European Union many Latvian residents goes to work abroad but at the same time they are keeping ties with family and plan to return home after some time period (which very often is unspecified). The previous experience of EU-SILC survey and other surveys has shown that this situation occurs in many Latvian households. Therefore, it was very important do provide more detailed and strict explanations in which cases person working abroad should be considered a household member.

Other typical case is youngsters who are moving from rural areas to towns for study purposes. Mostly they are living in towns for study time and go back home in holidays. In this situation proper identification of household membership is very important. Thus person is identified to proper household and he/she is neither excluded from EU-SILC survey nor double counted. In the situation described above for absent persons (who moved out abroad or study in another location) it was prescribed to follow 2 criteria: 1) if person has another private address and 2) how long is person's actual and planed length of absence.

3.1.4. The income reference period

There were no divergences from common definition. In Latvia the income reference period is previous calendar year (2005).

3.1.5. The period of taxes on income and social insurance contributions

According to the Commission Regulation (EC) No 676/2006 of 2 May 2006 amending Regulation (EC) No 1980/2003 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning Community statistics on income and living conditions (EU-SILC) as regards definitions and updated definitions Latvia is authorized to not deliver any gross income data before 2007. Thus, no data on income tax and on social contributions was collected.

3.1.6. The reference period for taxes on wealth

See 3.1.4.

3.1.7. The lag between the income reference period and current variables

The lag between end of income reference period and current variables is from 3 to 11 months.

3.1.8. The total duration of the data collection of the sample

Fieldwork (data collection) started in March 2006 and lasted till November 2006. The gross sample size has been increased (additional sampling has been made) during the fieldwork and Interviewer Service has to survey more addresses than it was planned before (so exceeding the planned length of data collection).

3.1.9. Basic information on activity status during the income reference period

There were no divergences from common definitions.

3.2. Components of income

Classification of net income components in national EU-SILC survey is made according to description of doc. EU-SILC 065/04 with exception of income from self-employment (see 3.2.21). As Latvia has derogation to collect gross income components from 2007, there are only net income components collected in 2006.

3.2.1.1 Total household gross income

As Latvia has derogation to collect gross income components from 2007, the values are not recorded.

3.2..1.2. Total disposable household income

There are no divergences from common standards. Total disposable household income was calculated by using only net income components.

3.2.1.3. Total disposable household income, before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits

See 3.2.1.2.

3.2.1.4. Total disposable household income, before social transfers including old age and survivor's benefits

See 3.2.1.2.

3.2.1.5. Imputed rent

The variable is not filled. Latvia has not developed model to calculate imputed rent. Only subjective rent was collected in 2006.

3.2.1.6. Income from rental property and land

There are no divergences from common standards. Only net income component was collected.

3.2.1.7. Family/children-related allowances

There are no divergences from common standards. Only net income component is recorded although it's not taxable income in Latvia.

3.2.1.8. Social exclusion payments not elsewhere classified

See 3.2.1.7.

3.2.1.9. Housing allowances

See 3.2.1.7.

3.2.1.10. Regular inter-household cash transfers received

See 3.2.1.7.

3.2.1.11. Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business

See 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.12. Interest paid on mortgages

The value was not recorded, as it's mandatory to collect this variable from 2007.

3.2.1.13. Income received by people aged under 16

There are no divergences from common standards. Basically there are included wages and salaries received during holidays or out of school time. Only net income component was collected.

3.2.1.14. Regular taxes on wealth

There are no divergences from common standards. Taxes on land and real estate are included in this variable.

3.2.1.15. Regular inter-household transfers paid

See 3.2.1.7.

3.2.1.16. Tax on income and social contributions

This variable is not recorded as Latvia has derogation to collect it from 2007.

3.2.1.17. Repayments and tax adjustments

See 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.18. Cash or near-cash employee income

See 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.19. Non-cash employee income

Only non-cash employee income from use of company car for personal purposes was collected in 2006. According to Latvian situation method based on system analyses model has been chosen for calculating employee non-cash income from use company car for personal purposes. Components for calculating monetary value of this non-cash employee have been included in questionnaires and collected directly from respondents: class of the car, year of the car make, total amount of kilometres driven by company car in previous calendar year (2005), annual amount of kilometres driven by the vehicle for private use, company car user's occupation, coverage of car related costs made by employer: fuel, car's technical inspection, tire purchase (i.e. did the employer pay bills for fuel purchasing, car's technical inspection, tire purchase), restrictions of use of company car (i.e. if employer created restrictions to employee for use of private care for personal purposes). It was assumed that employer covered all costs related to use of company car for the employee's personal use.

3.2.1.20. Employers' social contributions

The value was not recorded, as it's mandatory to collect this variable from 2007.

3.2.1.21. Cash profits or losses from self-employment (including royalties)

The net income and losses from self-employment are collected in 2 components: 1) net income or losses from agricultural production and 2) net income or losses of the rest self-employment activities (except income from agricultural production). Both net income components were asked to each household member in age of 16 years and over (in income reference period) in Personal Questionnaire. Respondents were asked to tell net amount of self-employment income they had for personal use (incl. making private savings) or losses from self-employment activities during income reference period. There were additional questions about net self-employment income from agricultural production included in Household Questionnaire. In Household Questionnaire income from agricultural self-employment was collected in the same way as in Household Budget Survey (HBS). Household member responsible for agricultural production was asked to calculate all income components and expenditures related with agricultural production the household had during income reference period. Thus, all self-employment income from agricultural production was counted to responsible household member and amount self-employment income was agricultural profit minus expenditures related to production.

Comparison results of collected agricultural self-employment income values in Personal Questionnaires from all household members eligible for personal interview and values collected in

Household Questionnaire from household respondent responsible for agricultural production didn't shown significant differences. As the income values collected in Personal Questionnaires corresponds to common EU-SILC methodology then it was decided to use values collected in Personal Questionnaires.

Only net income components were collected in 2006. The gross value was not collected, as it's mandatory to collect this variable from 2007.

3.2.1.22. Value of goods produced for own consumption

The value is not recorded.

3.2.1.23. Unemployment benefits

See 3.2.1.7.

3.2.1.24. Old-age benefits

There are no divergences from common standards. Only net old-age benefit components were collected in 2006. Almost all values of old-age benefits (except pensions paid by other countries and service pensions) were substituted with records from State Social Insurance Agency (SSIA).

3.2.1.25. Survivors' benefits

See 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.26. Sickness benefits

See 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.27. Disability benefits

See 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.28. Education related allowances

See 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.29. Gross monthly earnings for employees

Value is not recorded as Latvia uses wage statistics for calculating gender pay gap.

3.2.2. The source of collecting income variables

Interviews were used for collecting income variables. Household income variables (such as imputed rent, income from rental property and land, family/ children related allowances, housing allowances etc.) were collected from household respondent, which is responsible for issues related to dwelling and whole household. Exception was income from interest, dividends/ profit from capital investment. This variable together with all personal income variables (such as employee income, self-employment income, education related allowances, unemployment benefits etc.) was collected from each household member eligible for personal interview.

Since 2006 Latvia started to use data from SSIA in EU-SILC survey. This data was used for old-age benefits (see 3.2.1.24). Initially old-age benefits were collected from personal interviews. After fieldwork CSB received the data from SSIA. Both data sources (data from respondents and data from SSIA) were checked and validated. In the result it was decided to use data from SSIA in EU-SILC survey.

3.2.3. The form in which income target variables at component level were obtained

Only net income amounts (after deducting income taxes and social insurance contributions) were collected.

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

No method is used.

4. Coherence

In this section will be compared the EU-SILC data with various external data sources: the Household Budget Survey (HBS), the Labour Force Survey (LFS), wage statistics and social protection statistics.

The HBS is continuous survey of households, which has been carried out since 1995. The annual net sample size is approximately 4 thousand households. The HBS is designed to collect information on income and consumption expenditure of households. The HBS was the source of Laeken indicators until introduction of EU-SILC (in 2005).

The LFS is a continuous survey, which has been carried out according to a common EU methodology since 1995. The annual sample size is about 15.1 thousand persons aged 15 - 74. The LFS is the main source for labour market information.

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

In EU-SILC the average monthly employee cash or near cash income (PY010) was 213 LVL. In wage statistics this figure is lower – 176 LVL. Data of EU-SILC survey has been calculated for respondent, who received employee cash or near cash income (PY010) and who has been working as employee at least one month during the income reference period (PL210). The acquired results show that EU-SILC data by 21 % exceeded enterprise statistical data on average labour income amount in 2005. The higher estimates from EU-SILC are due to the fact that in EU-SILC the average wages and salaries are calculated for persons receiving income, whereas in wage statistics the unit of enumeration is the job. Thus, in EU-SILC all employee income is counted into one variable (income from main job, second, third etc.), whereas in wage statistics, the wages from second, third etc. job are counted separately. It should be also taken into account that wage statistics is based on the information provided by the employers and for a certain cases it corresponds to part of wages from which have been deducted taxes (information about informal employee income might be left behind).

Table 4.1. presents the number of persons receiving income components in EU-SILC, HBS and in additional external sources. It should be taken into account that in HBS part of income components are obtained only at the household level and for this reason comparisons are made only among those income components, which are obtained in the same way as in EU-SILC. Besides, definitions of income components can vary between sources and for that reason only the components for which sufficiently comparable definitions are presented in the table below.

Table 4.1. Number of persons receiving several income components in 2005

EU-SILC target variable	EU-SILC	HBS	Other sources
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010)	1 009 232	969 322	906 626[1]
Old-age benefits (PY100)	481 753	478 062	475 623[2]
Survivor's benefits (PY110)	18 222	21 631	27 616[3]
Disability benefits (PY130)	65 763	62 420	73 574[4]

[1] Wage statistics
[2] At the end of year. Social protection statistics (the State Social Insurance Agency) data
[3] At the end of year. Social protection statistics (the State Social Insurance Agency data, recipients all age groups, including persons aged below 16 years.
[4] At the end of year. Social protection statistics (the State Social Insurance Agency) data

In EU-SILC and in HBS the number of people receiving employee income is almost the same. In EU-SILC the number of people receiving employee income is by 103 thousand higher than in the

wage statistics. It is not unexpected that unofficial work relationships are not included in wage statistics. Comparing data on employees net wage in the main job (table 4.2.) we can see that EU-SILC data lightly better represent employees with comparatively higher wages and salaries (above LVL 200 per month). When we compare data on monthly wages below LVL 81, it necessary to take into account that only full time employment is recorded in LFS and in EU-SILC such separation is not always possible.

Table 4.2. Employees' monthly net wages in the main job

	EU-SILC 2006	**LFS 2006[1]**
Employees	**100**	**100**
Of which by wage (in LVL):		
under 81,00	18.5	9.8
81.01-100.00	12.3	12.2
100.01-150.00	20.8	22.3
150.01-200.00	15.2	20.3
200.01-300.00	19.8	17.8
300.01-500.00	9.8	8.3
500.01-750.00	2.3	1.5
750.01-1000.00	0.7	0.6
1000.01 and more	0.5	0.4
Wage was not calculated	x	2.0
Wage was calculated but not paid	x	1.1
Unspecified	x	3.7

4.2. Comparison of other target variables with external sources

Important background indicator is a mean size of household. The official statistics in this area is based on the Population Census data. For the periods between the censuses it is based on calculations. According to these calculations, in 2006 the mean household size was 2.50 persons. Data on the mean size of households are given in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. Mean size of household in 2006

	Population statistics	**EU-SILC**	**HBS**
Mean size of household, persons	2.50	2.63	2.53

A comparison of data shows that such surveys as HBS and EU-SILC probably under-represent single-person households and other households with a small number of persons. The risk of failing to make contacts with these households is much higher.

[1] Main job, in age 15-74.

A comparison of the breakdown of households by the number of persons does not show any substantial differences (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4. Distribution of households by size in 2006

	EU-SILC		HBS	
	%	number of households, in thousands	%	number of households, in thousands
All households	**100**	**857**	**100**	**891**
of which by number of members:				
1 person	24.4	209	24.0	214
2 persons	28.1	241	31.1	277
3 persons	22.1	189	23.0	205
4 persons	15.9	136	14.7	131
5 persons and more	9.5	81	7.2	64

Table 4.5. Distribution of household's member by age (in per cent)

	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2006
All household members	**100**	**100**
of which by age brackets (in per cent)		
0-15	15.5	15.9
16-24	14.0	13.6
25-49	35.5	35.9
50-64	18.1	17.9
65+	16.8	16.7

Table 4.6. Distribution of households in urban and rural areas by demographical type (in per cent)

	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2006
All households	**100**	**100**
of which:		
One person	24.4	24.0
of which:		
below the age of 65	12.5	12.2
over the age of 65	11.9	11.8
couple without children	16.9	21.3
One adult with children	4.2	3.9
Couple with 1 child	8.8	11.3
Couple with 2 children	6.2	6.2
Couple with 3 and more children	1.6	1.3
Other households with children	14.8	11.5
Other households without children	23.0	20.5

Table 4.7. presents the distribution of population by ISCED level in EU-SILC and in LFS. As it can be seen, there are differences in overall distribution, but they are not substantial. It should be noted that in EU-SILC survey information of Personal Questionnaire was missing about 1.7% persons in age between 16 and 74 years. This represents 29.2 thousand persons of overall population in this age. Due to lack of personal information (P file data) about these persons in EU-SILC survey there could be differences in both data sources (EU-SILC and LFS).

Table 4.7. Distribution of population in age between 16 and 74 years by ISCED level in 2006

	EU-SILC		LFS	
	thousand of persons	**%**	**thousand of persons**	**%**
ISCED 0	5	0.3	3.1	0.2
Basic education (ISCED 1 + ISCED 2)	395	23.4	475.1	26.3
ISCED 3	809	47.9	889.1	49.1
ISCED 4	168	9.9	125.0	6.9
ISCED 5	307	18.2	310.4	17.2
ISCED 6	4	0.3	3.2	0.2
Total	**1688**	**100**	**1809.6**	**100**

Tables 4.8. – 4.10. represents socio-economic status of household member and those who are in employment. There are no significant differences between EU-SILC and data of other surveys. Emerging differences are probably related to the fact that the main activity status is entirely self-defined in EU-SILC at the time of interview, whereas in the LFS self-defined activity status refers to the last three months.

Table.4.8. Distribution of household members by socio-economic status (in per cent)

	EU-SILC 2006	**HBS 2006**
All household members	**100**	**100**
of which:		
At work	46.2	48.7
Unemployed	6.0	4.5
In retirement or early retirement	19.5	18.8
Other inactive person	28.3	28.0

Table 4.9. Distribution of population in age between 16 and 74 years by self-defined economic status in 2005

	EU-SILC		LFS	
	thousand of persons	**%**	**thousand of persons**	**%**
Working	1029	56.1	1073.0	60.4
Unemployed	108	5.9	119.7	6.7
Pupil, student	144	7.8	170.9	9.6
In retirement	423	23.0	257.9	14.5
Permanently disabled	36	1.9	55.8	3.1
Domestic task	72	3.9	60.9	3.4
Other inactive	23	1.3	38.0	2.1
Total	**1835**	**100**	**1776.3**	**100**

Table 4.10. Status of employed population in the main job

	EU-SILC	HBS	LFS
Age	**16+**	**15-74**	**15-74**
All employed	**100,0**	**100,0**	**100,0**
Employees (workers)	93.8	89.8	88.4
Employers (owners)	2.4	2.5	3.4
Self-employed	3.2	7.4	6.7
Unpaid person who helps another member of the family in enterprise or private practice, craft or farm work	0.6	0.3	1.5

Table 4.11. presents the share of households by the type of dwelling. The differences between the two data sources are small.

Table 4.11. Distribution of households by the type of dwelling in 2006

	EU-SILC	HBS
Detached house	23.3	24.9
Semi-detached house or terraced house	5.6	5.8
Apartment or flat	70.8	68.9
Other kind of accommodation	0.3	0.5
Total	**100**	**100**