



EU-SILC 2008 in Estonia: Final Quality Report

Tallinn 2010

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
1. COMMON LONGITUDINAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS BASED ON THE LONGITUDINAL COMPONENT OF EU-SILC	3
2.1. Sample design	3
2.1.1. Type of sampling design	3
2.1.2. Sampling units	3
2.1.3. Stratification and sub-stratification criteria	4
2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria	4
2.1.5. Sample selection schemes	4
2.1.6. Sample distribution over time	4
2.1.7. Renewal of sample: Rotation groups	4
2.1.8. Weightings	4
2.1.9. Substitution	6
2.2. Sampling errors	6
2.3. Non-sampling errors	9
2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors	9
2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors	9
2.3.3. Non-response errors	16
2.4. Mode of data collection	22
2.5. Imputation procedure	23
2.5.1. Imputation for within-household non-response	23
2.5.2. Imputed rent	24
2.5.3. Company cars	24
2.5.4. Value of goods produced for own consumption	24
2.5.5. Imputation of income variables	24
3. COMPARABILITY	33
3.1. Basic concepts and definitions	33
3.2. Components of income	33
3.2.1. Differences between the national definitions and standard EU-SILC definitions	33
3.2.2. The source or procedure used for the collection of income variables	33
3.2.3. The form in which income variables at component level have been obtained	33
3.2.4. The method used for obtaining income target variables in the required form	33
3.3. Tracing rules	33
4. COHERENCE	33
4.1. Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who receive income from each 'income component', with external sources	34
4.2. Comparison of other target variables with external sources	37

INTRODUCTION

The EU-SILC survey in Estonia started in 2004. In the first year, a sample of 6000 households was selected for the survey. These households were randomly divided into four rotational groups. According to the original rotational scheme, one of the groups was to be dropped in 2005 and another in 2006, but due to lower than expected response rate, it was decided to keep all the rotational groups in the sample. New sub-samples were introduced into the survey in 2005 and 2006. In 2007 two rotational groups from the 2004 initial sample were dropped and a new subsample was introduced. Two remaining rotational groups from 2004 were dropped in 2008. Thus the 2008 sample structure is as originally planned: it consists of four rotational groups (one from each year 2005-2008). In longitudinal dimension, sample contains three panels:

- 4-year panel (rotation group 5, i.e. DB075=5) started in 2005;
- 3-year panel (rotation group 6, i.e. DB075=6) started in 2006;
- 2-year panel (rotation group 7, i.e. DB075=7) started in 2007;

New part introduced in 2008 constitutes rotational group 8 (DB075=8).

Report follows as much as possible recommendations of two documents: Regulation No 28/2004 as regards the detailed content of intermediate and final quality reports and Technical document on intermediate and final quality reports (EU-SILC 132/04).

Report is compiled by Erika Taidre and Julia Aru, Statistics Estonia.

1. COMMON LONGITUDINAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS BASED ON THE LONGITUDINAL COMPONENT OF EU-SILC

At persistent at-risk-of-poverty rate by gender and age (%)

This indicator is computed as the percentage of the population living in households where the equivalised disposable income was below the 60% threshold for the current year and at least two out of the preceding three years.

Table 1.1. At persistent at-risk-of-poverty rate by gender and age, 2008

Age groups	Total	Males	Females
Total	13,6	10,1	16,5
Less than 18 years	13,5	11,6	15,3
From 18 to 24 years	7,1	10,8	3,5
From 18 to 64 years	10,6	10,4	10,8
18 years or over	13,6	9,8	16,8
From 25 to 49 years	8,3	7,7	9,0
From 50 to 64 years	16,3	16,8	16,0
65 years or over	24,5	6,2	34,0

2.1. Sample design

In sections 2.1.1 to 2.1.7 we describe the sample design of first wave of each rotational group. Sample design has stayed the same in all years, so we describe it only once.

2.1.1. Type of sampling design

The design used is one-stage stratified unequal probability sampling of households, with a household selected with probability proportional to the number of persons aged 14+ in it. It is because a sample

of persons aged 14+ (so called address-persons) is selected first with equal probabilities within strata, and then the household of the selected person is identified, and all eligible persons in the household are interviewed. Stratification is done by geographical region (see 2.1.3).

2.1.2. Sampling units

One stage sampling design was used. Households are regarded as sampling units although selection was made using the sample of address-persons.

2.1.3. Stratification and sub-stratification criteria

Geographical stratification was used. The counties (and capital Tallinn) were grouped into three strata by the population size:

1. big counties: Tallinn, Harju (excluding Tallinn), Ida-Viru, Lääne-Viru, Pärnu, Tartu;
2. small counties: Jõgeva, Järva, Lääne, Põlva, Rapla, Saare, Valga, Viljandi, Võru;
3. Hiiu County formed a separate stratum as the smallest county with the population size times smaller of the next smallest.

2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria

Inclusion probabilities of address-persons in different strata and years are shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Stratification of the new part of the sample by counties, Estonian EU-SILC

Stratum h	Counties	Sampling fraction, %			
		2005	2006	2007	2008
Large	Tallinn, Harju, Ida-Viru, Lääne-Viru, Pärnu, Tartu	0.07	0.17	0.17	0.17
Small	Jõgeva, Järva, Lääne, Põlva, Rapla, Saare, Valga, Viljandi, Võru	0.13	0.32	0.31	0.31
Hiiu	Hiiu	0.36	0.91	0.85	0.89

2.1.5. Sample selection schemes

Systematic sampling of address-persons in each stratum separately. For households this procedure results in unequal probability sampling with inclusion probabilities proportional to household size (number of persons aged 14+ in it).

2.1.6. Sample distribution over time

Fixed income reference period was used and therefore the sample was not principally divided into months or weeks. Although for the convenience of fieldwork administration, the sample was distributed along the fieldwork period. Table 2.2 shows allocation of new part and longitudinal part of the sample into months of fieldwork period in different years. This allocation is prior to the start of fieldwork and actual month of interview may be different. The table also shows changes in official fieldwork period in 2005-2008.

Table 2.2. Allocation of sample into months, 2005 – 2008

Year	New part						Longitudinal part					
	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July
2005			25%	25%	25%	25%			25%	25%	25%	25%
2006		25%	25%	25%	25%			25%	26%	26%	23%	
2007		35%	29%	36%	0%			26%	26%	26%	21%	
2008	34%	33%	33%	0%			27%	27%	27%	19%		

For the households in longitudinal part, the survey month was chosen as close as possible to the month the household was interviewed in preceding year.

In every year, there are ca 4-6% of households that are interviewed after the official end of fieldwork period, due to lack of interviewers in some areas.

2.1.7. Renewal of sample: Rotation groups

The sample consists of four rotational groups (one from each year 2005-2008). In longitudinal dimension, sample contains three panels:

- 4-year panel (rotation group 5, i.e. DB075=5) started in 2005;
- 3-year panel (rotation group 6, i.e. DB075=6) started in 2006;
- 2-year panel (rotation group 7, i.e. DB075=7) started in 2007;

New part introduced in 2008 constitutes rotational group 8 (DB075=8).

2.1.8. Weightings

Weighting scheme was generally in line with documents V. Verma „EU-SILC weighting procedures: an outline” and J.-M. Museux „Weighting and estimation for the EU-SILC rotational design”.

Longitudinal database of 2008 contains three subsamples of households:

S4	Households introduced into the survey in 2005 and their split-offs. Year 2008 is their fourth year in the survey.
S3	Households introduced into the survey in 2006 and their split-offs. Year 2008 is their third year in the survey.
S2	Households introduced into the survey in 2007 and their split-offs. Year 2008 is their second year in the survey.

2.1.8.1. Design factor

Design weights DB080 are defined only for the first year of each sub-sample.

Computation of design weights draws on following considerations resulting from the sampling design: Inclusion probabilities for a household depend on how many possibilities are there to reach this household. As address persons are used and inclusion probabilities are equal for all members aged 14+ of the household, the inclusion probability of a household is proportional to selection probability of an address-person in his stratum and to the number of members aged 14+ in the household. Accordingly, design weights for households are calculated as

$$d_h = \frac{N_g}{n_g p_h}$$

where n_g is the number of address-persons selected in stratum g , N_g is the number of persons aged 14+ in stratum g as stated in the Population Register (PR) at the moment of sample selection and p_h is household size, i.e. number of persons aged 14+ in the household.

Design weights can be calculated for both responded and non-responded. For non-responders, p_h is the number of persons aged 14+ registered to the address of address-person according to the Population Register. If it was greater than 8, household size was stochastically imputed (with county as an auxiliary variable). A household living in one address can be handled as a cluster. Inclusion probabilities are thus equal for all members aged 14+ of the household.

2.1.8.2. Non-response adjustments

Personal base weights of 2007 are corrected for non-response for 2008 wave. This was done independently for each sub-sample s_2, s_3, s_4 . Persons and households no longer in scope in 2008 were excluded prior to the correction as they are not considered as non-response. Correction for non-response was done with the help of logistic regression model with tenure status, household equivalised income, number of children in the household, urbanization status and county of place of residence, age, gender as auxiliary variables. The model was weighted on the base weights of 2007. According to the model response probability r_i of person i for year 2008, given he/she had responded

in 2007, was estimated. Weight corrections were done according to same procedure as in 2006 and 2007.

2.1.8.3. Adjustment to external data

Calibration was performed using population data from Estonia Population Register according to sex, age-groups, county and urbanization. Persons in institutions were deducted from population figures prior to calibration.

2.1.8.4. Final longitudinal weight

The basis for calculating longitudinal weights is 2008 base weights for sub-samples corrected for non-response. There are three longitudinal sets of interest in year 2008:

- Longitudinal set of two year duration, involving data from year 2007 and 2008. Longitudinal weight to be used for this set is RB062. All sub-samples S2 and S3 and S4 contribute to this set. Base weights of S2, S3 and S4 were multiplied by a factor according to the size of a sub-sample to combine the subsamples into one set.
- Longitudinal set of three year duration, involving data from year 2006, 2007 and 2008. Longitudinal weight to be used for this set is RB063. Only sub-samples S3 and S4 contribute to this set. Base weights of S3 and S4 were multiplied by a factor according to the size of a sub-sample to combine the subsamples into one set.
- Longitudinal set of four year duration, involving data from year 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. Longitudinal weight to be used for this set is RB064. Only the sub-sample S4 contributes to this set.

Children born between interviews of 2007 and 2008 and persons who moved into sample household from outside received zero weight.

2.1.8.8. Final household cross-sectional weight

Final cross-sectional households weights DB090 for years 2005-2008 were recalculated in a way to correspond only to sub-samples contributing to corresponding year in longitudinal component.

2.1.9. Substitution

No substitution has been used.

2.2. Sampling errors

The following table reports the mean, the number of observations (before and after imputations) and the standard error for different income components. Zeroes are excluded from calculations for income components, but included for total household income. Net/gross conversion is also considered as imputation. All four rotational groups are used for the table.

Standard errors were calculated using Jackknife Repeated Replication method with programs provided by Eurostat.

Table 2.3. Number of observations and standard error of different income components, 2008

Income components	Mean	Number of observations		Standard error
		Before imputation	After imputation	
Total household gross income (HY010)	182853	7 ¹	4744	2903
Total disposable household income (HY020)	152970	241	4744	2281
Total disposable household income before social transfer other than old-age and survivors' benefits (HY022)	144266	365	4744	2238
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits (HY023)	122284	450	4744	2454
Net income components at household level				
Imputed rent (HY030N)	32390	0	4565	532
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040N)	12788	73	91	2635
Family/ children related allowances (HY050N)	15274	2	1899	819
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060N)	10680	0	79	2756
Housing allowances (HY070N)	5860	0	90	770
Regular inter-household cash transfers received (HY080N)	20989	0	177	1352
Alimonies received (compulsory + voluntary) (HY081N)	523	0	113	82
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in incorporated business (HY090N)	2112	12	2206	547
Interest repayments on mortgage (HY100N)	23269	245	378	1032
Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110N)	2992	44	91	526
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120N)	478	3059	3193	19
Regular inter-household cash transfers paid (HY130N)	18689	0	173	1879
Alimonies paid (compulsory + voluntary) (HY131N)	312	0	59	66
Tax on income and social contributions, net (HY140N)	-	-	-	-
Repayments/ receipts for tax adjustment (HY145N)	-3074	1684	1993	231
Gross income components at household level				
Imputed rent (HY030G)	34381	0	4565	535
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040G)	16395	11	91	3379

¹ Number of observations before imputation for total variables is very small since these variables include sub-components that are totally imputed and also there is always some amount of net/gross conversion.

Income components	Mean	Number of observations		Standard error
		Before imputation	After imputation	
Family/ children related allowances (HY050G)	17284	1618	1899	1028
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060G)	10680	79	79	2756
Housing allowances (HY070G)	5860	85	90	770
Regular inter-household cash transfers received (HY080G)	20989	170	177	1352
Alimonies received (compulsory + voluntary) (HY081G)	523	109	113	82
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in incorporated business (HY090G)	2656	53	2206	700
Interest repayments on mortgage (HY100G)	23269	133	378	1032
Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110G)	3023	18	91	536
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120G)	478	0	3193	19
Regular inter-household cash transfers paid (HY130G)	18689	166	173	1879
Alimonies paid (compulsory + voluntary) (HY131G)	312	55	59	66
Tax on income and social contributions, gross (HY140G)	38971	0	3617	762
Net income components at personal level				
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010N)	99056	5207	6279	1263
Non-cash employee income (PY020N)	9220	823	1456	390
Company car (PY021N)	19829	0	242	638
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035N)	5308	699	783	203
Cash benefits or losses from self employment (PY050N)	20332	157	651	3851
Value of goods produced for own consumption (PY070N)	969	0	6935	20
Pension from individual private plans (PY080N)	9853	2	2	1604
Unemployment benefits (PY090N)	13218	31	89	2081
Old-age benefits (PY100N)	43838	2313	2671	204
Survivors' benefits (PY110N)	15964	103	106	1013
Sickness benefits (PY120N)	3326	609	988	239
Disability benefits (PY130N)	23312	0	747	520
Education-related benefits (PY140N)	8921	0	267	1155
Gross income components at personal level				
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010G)	122684	435	6279	1630
Non-cash employee income	11820	0	1456	500

Income components	Mean	Number of observations		Standard error
		Before imputation	After imputation	
(PY020G)				
Company car (PY021G)	25422	0	242	818
Employer's social insurance contributions (PY030G)	40052	0	5979	517
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035G)	5308	699	783	203
Cash benefits or losses from self employment (PY050G)	23149	450	709	3711
Value of goods produced for own consumption (PY070G)	969	0	6935	20
Pension from individual private plans (PY080G)	10947	0	2	1782
Unemployment benefits (PY090G)	15738	41	89	2576
Old-age benefits (PY100G)	44424	1	2671	222
Survivors' benefits (PY110G)	15968	0	106	1013
Sickness benefits (PY120G)	4264	0	988	306
Disability benefits (PY130G)	23312	732	747	520
Education-related benefits (PY140G)	8921	254	267	1155

The following table provides the same information for the equivalised disposable income broken down by sex, age groups and household size.

Table 2.4. Number of observations and standard error of mean equivalised disposable income, 2008

	Mean	Number of observations		Standard error
		Before imputation	After imputation	
Subclasses by household size				
1 household member	72297	161	998	2556
2 household member	100105	74	1445	2383
3 household members	111195	6	932	3367
4 and more	103730	0	1369	1794
Population by age group				
<25	99486	15	4502	1734
25-34	129251	18	1275	4329
35-44	105382	10	1784	2692
45-54	101609	32	2013	1815
55-64	95347	35	1339	2279
65+	68644	217	2119	1186
Population by sex				
Male	103794	124	6110	1724
Female	95090	203	6922	1075

2.3. Non-sampling errors

2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

Sampling frame for selection of the new part of the sample was the Population Register of Estonia. This is the document-based register of Estonian citizens and those having a living permission.

Records of the register are updated both in real-time and regularly from administrative sources. The register data originates from local governments, civilian registry offices, county councils, courts, Citizenship and Migration Board and other governmental organisations.

Frame error is considered to be an over-coverage error if address-person did not actually belong to target population, i.e.

- was dead;
- had moved to another county;
- stayed in an institution permanently (had been there over half a year);
- was surveyed through one of his/her household members;

All households classified under DB120=23 are considered to constitute over coverage error. The amount of this error in the new part of the sample in 2008 was 108 households, which makes the proportion of the over-coverage in the new part of the sample 4.5% and of the whole sample 1.8% (Table 2.5).

Since there is no registration law in Estonia, people do not need to show their actual addresses in the Population Register. For that reason the register contains some amount of records without any address and for some part of records the address shown is not correct. Records without an address or incomplete address were dropped out of the register before selecting the sample (for example, in 2008 2.9% of all records referring to persons aged 14+ were dropped before selecting the sample).

In the new part of the sample of 2008 there were 161 address-persons whose address in the population register was definitely wrong and no information on new address could be obtained from neighbours. According to national classification, this includes the following reasons for non-contact:

- Address-person does not live at given address, no information on new address available;
- Address-person has moved to another address, no information on new address available;
- Given address does not exist.

It does not seem reasonable to assume that these persons do not belong to target population nor constitute frame over-coverage. Above mentioned reasons for non-contact are currently classified under DB120=21.

Due to absence of registration law in Estonia, there is also some under-coverage of persons and households present in the population register. Investigations made by the Sampling Working Group of HBS in 1999 showed that on average under-coverage of addresses in the population register may reach 5-6%. Degree of under-coverage of households is much more difficult to assess, since even if a person is missing from Population Register or his/her address is incorrect or not precise enough, a household could be reached through another household member. Assuming that all persons living permanently in Estonia are registered in the Population Register and considering the amount of imprecise addresses in PR, the under-coverage of households may be at most 1-1.5%.

Table 2.5. Reasons for over-coverage in the new part of the sample, 2008

Frame error	Number of households	Proportion in the frame error (%)
Total, of which	108	100
Address person was dead	14	13.0
Address person has left Estonia	76	70.4
Address person was staying in an institution	18	16.7
Address person was surveyed through one of his/her household members	0	0.0

2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1. Measurement errors

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

The questionnaires were drawn up in 2004 following the international practices in collecting income data. Also, where possible questions from the existing surveys carried out by the Statistics Estonia

and known to be valid and reliable, were used. Pilot surveys were carried out in 2002 and 2003 with the main aim of testing the questionnaires. The results were thoroughly analysed and feedback sessions with interviewers were carried out. The questionnaires were modified accordingly for the use in the main operation.

The questionnaire has been modified every year using the experience from the previous waves of the survey. The main modifications in 2005 concerned self-employment income, child-care, change of job and different types of social insurance payments.

The main modifications in 2006 concerned employee income and self-employment income where income brackets were added to those unable or unwilling to provide a precise answer, the question on income from bank accounts was more fleshed out and income brackets were added. The questions on child-care, family benefits and unemployment benefits were also improved.

Other notable modifications in the 2006 questionnaire were as follows:

- a) Clarifying the type of work contract
- b) Making it easier for the respondent to declare their incomes by giving both month/year and gross/net options
- c) Providing intervals to report income and profit
- d) Making benefits lists more precise by listing possible benefits (unemployment and family) and thus running more accurate primary tests and improving reporting everything
- e) Breaking down non-monetary income components into separate questions and checking if their value was counted into the original reported income
- f) Removing redundant questions in use for filtering and adding new filter questions that proved necessary in the experience of previous years
- g) Clarifying self-employment income, change of job and different types of social insurance payments' questions.

The main modifications in 2007 concerned the inclusion of questions about own consumption, and those necessary for calculating imputed rent in the household questionnaire. In the personal questionnaire the most important improvements concerned the inclusion of the 'education obtained since previous interview' for the longitudinal respondents, simplifying the salary questions by giving the respondent more options for naming it in time and gross/net categories, adding questions about the use of a company car and other non-cash employee income and developing income questions for self-employed persons and entrepreneurs.

Other notable modifications in the 2007 questionnaire were as follows:

- 1) Personal ID number of household member responsible for dwelling split between owners and tenants
- 2) Adding in cost of utilities
- 3) Developing mortgage payment and interest questions
- 4) Simplifying for the respondent questions about income from rent of property or land
- 5) Updating lists of social benefits and including question about alimony paid and received
- 6) Adding in questions to filter out information on incomes, employer social contributions etc for temporary workers and entrepreneurs.

In 2008, the questions used to determine a respondent's level of education were improved. Previously a person had to choose their level of education from a long list of official names, resulting in considerable errors, especially with vocational education. In 2008 these questions were redesigned for more accuracy and less respondent-induced errors.

Other notable modifications in 2008 concerned the following variables:

- 1) Questions about managerial duties for current and last job were added
- 2) Socio-economic statuses were prefilled for respondents who had answered the personal questionnaire the previous year for the months they had already provided answers for
- 3) An additional question was added regarding pensions paid by the local government and the conscript allowance paid to young men serving time in the armed forces
- 4) The restriction in activities due to health problems was reformulated to better meet Eurostat's guidelines
- 5) Households in the panel were asked if their dwelling, its number of rooms or amount of square feet had changed since the previous year and if not the information about the dwelling was prefilled from the previous year's data to reduce respondent burden
- 6) A question concerning the condition of the dwelling was added
- 7) The ownership of the dwelling question was split so that two variables would no longer be asked in the same question, along with a new question about the type of rental contact (oral or written) for the dwelling
- 8) Questions about a household's inability to make rent, utilities, mortgage, loan or hire purchase (re)payments on time were added
- 9) Mortgage information was filtered to be asked only for the main dwelling's construction, purchase or repairs
- 10) Questions about income earned from abroad were added into the questionnaire for two years

To reduce the measurement error stemming from the data collection method, CAPI was introduced as a data collection method from 2005 operation onwards. The main source of errors in the questionnaires in the 2004 operation resulted from routing mistakes and inconsistencies between questions. CAPI eliminates the former type of error and considerably reduces the latter, as the data-entry program includes several checks. As a result, the need to make callbacks declined and the quality of the information obtained this way was increased due to a remarkably faster pace of the whole cycle.

Secondary data editing procedures were improved by getting skilled personnel to work through the logical inconsistencies with the interviewers. This was aided by secondary logical checks in SAS after the questionnaires had arrived into Statistics Estonia's databases. All the secondary testing was done during the fieldwork period which officially ended when all inconsistencies had been resolved. After the fieldwork period, tertiary data checks were run to check for longitudinal inconsistencies, such as different jobs one year and the next while the respondent claims not to have changed jobs.

In 2005, all interviewers attended a two-day training session in small groups. In 2006, the training session lasted four days and interviewers were divided into four smaller groups to allow for a more efficient learning environment. During the training sessions mistakes from the previous years were discussed, followed by a separate block about seeking out the previous waves' respondents and assigning household/personal numbers to new and split off households and their members. One whole day was dedicated to going through the questionnaires and their tough spots with the interviewers. New interviewers also underwent training of general IT skills and data-entry program specific instruction in order for them to be able to work with CAPI. Interviewers were also tested as in previous years on their factual knowledge as well as simulated interview situations.

In 2008 the training programme was conducted in 4 smaller groups of about 15 people, similarly to 2006 and 2007, with more emphasis on practical work and discussion of mistakes from previous years as in preceding interviewer trainings. All returning interviewers attended a day long training session. During the training, the EU-SILC team briefed the interviewers on all renewals in the questionnaires, discussed previous years' errors and tracing and specifics of assigning household and person numbers in the longitudinal survey. Practical work sessions were conducted in groups of five and each interviewer had to conduct a model interview regarding for a simulated situation using their laptop. At the end of the training session, each interviewer received personal feedback about their mistakes the previous year. Interviewers new to EU-SILC attended a 2 day training session, which included a thorough overview of questionnaires and practical exercises as well as all the topics covered with returning interviewers.

Overall, 53 interviewers were responsible for conducting the interviews. The household– interviewer ratio was 90 households per interviewer in 2008.

In 2007 overall, 58 interviewers were responsible for conducting the interviews. The household (gross sample) – interviewer ratio was 82 households per interviewer in 2007. The ratio was 103 households per interviewer in 2004, 90 households per interviewer in 2005, 96 households in 2006 and 82 households in 2007.

2.3.2.2. Processing errors

In 2004, the interviews were carried out using PAPI and the data was entered centrally. The data-entry program was written in Blaise and contained most of the logical checks. The checks included, but were not limited to routing checks, consistency between different answers and upper and lower bounds for income variables. The most common mistake made by the interviewers was failing to mark an answer to one or more question or sub-questions (74% of all mistakes). Other most frequent types of error were marking the answer so that the correct answer remained unclear (for example by using wrong codes) and inconsistencies between answers provided to different questions (accounting to 7% and 6% of all mistakes respectively). The questions that were most prone to mistakes were:

- 1) Enforced lack of durables (missing answers due to unclear questionnaire layout);
- 2) Family benefits (inconsistent with household composition);
- 3) Relationship between household members (implausible relationships recorded in the household matrix);
- 4) Number of years in employment (inconsistencies with the time of taking up the first job);
- 5) Limitations in daily activities for health reasons (sometimes skipped despite there being no routing);
- 6) Calendar of activities (inconsistencies with other data).

20% of all questionnaires contained one error or more. Social Statistics Department personnel checked all errors discovered in the course of data entry. Errors that could be corrected using other data in the questionnaire or external data were corrected in office. The errors that could not be solved this way were forwarded to the interviewers' network, who consulted with the interviewer and when necessary made call-backs to the household. 20% of all errors (4% of all questionnaires) were forwarded for call-backs.

Not all checks could feasibly be implemented during the data-entry; so further data cleaning was carried out at a later stage using SAS. These checks were mainly targeted to detecting extreme income values and data-entry mistakes. Finally, the Eurostat data-checks were also implemented.

In 2005, the checking of the data consisted of 3 stages: the data-entry checks during interview, additional in-office checks during fieldwork and later data cleaning.

As mentioned above, the data for 2005 operation was collected using CAPI. The data-entry program was written in Blaise and contained most of the checks. This way, most of the errors could already be corrected during the interview. The data-entry controls were of 4 major types:

- 1) Checks of consistency between different answers. These included, but were not limited to following instances:
 - a. whether a household or a person who according to other data should have received a certain type of income reported it or not (e.g. whether households with children received family benefits, employed persons received wages and so on);
 - b. whether answers provided to different non-monetary deprivation items agreed with each other;
 - c. whether the relationships in the household matrix were consistent with each other as well as with the age and sex of the household members;
 - d. whether the difference between the starting and finishing time of the interview was too short or too long and so on.

- 2) Lower and upper bounds of income variables. These checks were developed with regard to data collected in the previous wave as well as administrative information.
- 3) Tracing checks. These controls were implemented to ensure that all split-off households and new household members were assigned correct split numbers and person numbers respectively.
- 4) Checks with information from the previous year. These controls concerned demographic data, information on educational level and labour status as well as the calendar of activities.

The in-office staff promptly checked the questionnaires that were electronically transmitted to the central office. This stage included following controls:

- 1) All the errors suppressed by interviewers were activated and checked;
- 2) All remarks made by interviewers in the data entry-program were read through and where necessary relevant corrections were made.
- 3) All split-off households as well as all households from which at least one member had left were scrutinised one by one.
- 4) Demographic information in the interviewers' reports, which were still filled out on paper, was compared to the data recorded in the electronic questionnaires.
- 5) Additionally, a few questions (child care, place of residence) had to be screened due to mistakes in the data-entry program.

The third and final stage involved later in-office data cleaning. The controls implemented at this stage involved further checks of data consistency and of extreme income values and as a final step the Eurostat data-checks. The checks of data consistency were mainly concerned with non-income variables, such as education. Also extreme values for all income components as well as total income were checked.

As in 2005, the data for the 2006 operation was collected using CAPI. In case of each consistency check in the data entry programme the interviewer had to check if the situation was correct, if not, correct it, if yes, make an explanatory remark. All remarks and suppressed consistency errors were manually checked during the secondary in-office data editing procedure.

The primary data-entry consistency controls were the same as in 2005 with some additions:

- 1) Under checks of consistency between different answers. Some new checks were added for the following instances:
 - a. Whether benefits reported to have been received were logical in the age and gender dimensions. For instance student benefits for over 50 year-olds, income taxes for under 15 year-olds, maternity leave and childbirth allowances for men etc.
 - b. Whether an educational level attained was possible below a certain age.
 - c. whether reported taxes or medical benefits received were consistent with income
 - d. Membership in pension plans checked by year of birth to see if legally bound to have joined pension pillar.
 - e. Checks for correct survey area, interviewer code and personal numbers matching household numbers.
- 2) Checks for correct survey area, interviewer code and household and personal numbers matching.
- 3) Checks not allowing for occupations to be written on too general a scale for coding. (e.g. salesperson, cleaner)

As in the previous year, the in-office staff checked the questionnaires that were electronically transmitted to the central office. In addition to the previous year's controls, six new ones were added:

- 1) All category 'other' answers were gone through to see if they could be classified under one of the given options.
- 2) Additionally paid income tax was checked in-household to check for double-reporting.
- 3) Errors in coding.

- 4) Study benefits were checked by possibility of obtaining them in the school the respondent attended and legally set amounts.
- 5) Consistency between time reported working under socio-economic status and months that salary was received. Also time spent in prison.
- 6) Reported amounts of family benefits were checked compared with eligibility based on the structure of the family and benefit levels set out in legislation.

In 2006, 5685 household and 13418 personal questionnaires arrived in the Statistics Estonia base. Of them 1031 household and 2734 personal questionnaires had mistakes in them. This means that interviewers made mistakes in about a fifth of all the questionnaires: 18% of household and 20% of personal questionnaires were imperfect.

In all the materials combined a total of 5587 mistakes were registered, 4943 of those were counted as interviewers' errors. Mistakes were sent for clarification and specification for two reasons:

- 1) The situation was so indistinct that the data could not be made sense of based on existing information (such as info from previous waves, other information in the form)
- 2) The errors were repetitive and through clarification interviewers received additional training. In this case fieldwork managers were consulted separately.

All mistakes found through the secondary in-office data editing were put up in a shared excel table, and had to be clarified with the interviewer or interviewee by the end of the fieldwork period. This was done in co-operation by the EU-SILC team and the Data Gathering department's Fieldwork Managers.

The third stage of data checks was carried out similarly to the 2005 operation.

In 2007, the Blaise consistency checks underwent further extensive development, with many new logical checks creating error messages in described situations put in place.

The primary data-entry consistency controls belonged to the same 4 major types as in previous years. Some new controls included:

- 1) Under checks of consistency between different answers, whether households not in an electrical grid could have electrical appliances, or households not connected to a sewerage could have a shower etc ;
- 2) Checks for goods produced for own consumption, for instance their quantities;

The number of primary consistency errors dropped dramatically in 2007 after a special training given to interviewers about the necessity to give an explanatory remark for every consistency check that pops up in Blaise. In 2006 there had been a total of 5654 errors, in 2007 the number had fallen to 1677. There was no such training at the end of 2007, and in 2008 there was a small increase in the number of errors, totaling at 1779. Out of all the errors in 2007, 60% (998 cases) required callback and clarification with the interviewer or interviewee.

As can be seen from table 2.7, the most common types of errors in 2008 had to do with interviewers not correcting their mistakes after an error code had prompted them to do so, not making remarks when they were needed, and the use of category 'other', while a suitable category existed. In 2007 not correcting mistakes and using 'other' when unnecessary were also the most common error types. Not making remarks, however, has returned as a major problem in 2008, as it had been in 2006 before a special training devoted to the subject. This training, undergone in 2007 for all interviewers, decreased the frequency of this problem considerably, but the effect lasted for only a year.

The call-back rates usually range from 65-85%, with the use of category 'other' as a major exception. Data entry mistakes have decreased to zero thanks to the continuing development of primary logical checks in the data entry program.

Table 2.7. Interviewer errors and their processing, 2008

Type of error	Number of errors detected	Share of errors requiring a call-back
No remark explaining unusual situation	307	86%
Interviewer made an error, but did not correct it	403	58%
Interviewer's remark does not explain unusual situation	69	84%
Data not sufficient for coding	73	83%
Starting and finishing times recorded incorrectly	57	77%

Use of category Other, while a suitable category exists	337	12%
In-office checks	201	69%
Interviewer has misunderstood a question	255	44%
Data entry mistake	0	-
Not interviewers error	24	67%
Not codified	18	83%
Total	1779	

The secondary in-office data checks and tertiary checks were the same as in the previous waves.

2.3.3. Non-response errors

2.3.3.1. Achieved sample size

The following numbers are taken from the longitudinal database for the year 2008 (i.e. contains only 2-, 3- and 4-year panels of 2008, not new sample).

Table 2.8. Achieved sample size by panel

	2-year panel (rotation gr 7)	3-year panel (rotation gr 6)	4-year panel (rotation gr 5)
Number of households for which an interview is accepted for the database (DB135=1)	1386	1414	497
Number of persons 16 years or older who are members of the households for which the interview is accepted for the database, of which	3139	3332	1135
sample persons (RB100=1)	3076	3216	1081
co-residents (RB100=2)	63	116	54

2.3.3.2. Unit non-response

Table 2.9. Household wave response rate by panel

Number	Total (rotation groups 5,6 7)	2-year panel (rotation gr 7)	3-year panel (rotation gr 6)	4-year panel (rotation gr 5)
A. Number of hhs passed on to 2008 from 2007 (DB110=1,2,3,4,5,6,7,11,10)	3601	1527	1542	532
B. Number of hhs added to the sample due to spli-off (DB110=8)	125	59	55	11
C. Number of hhs out-of-scope or non-existent (DB110=3,4,5,6 or DB120=23)	32	10	14	8
D. Number of hhs with interview accepted (DB135=1)	3297	1386	1414	497

E. Number of hhs with interview accepted in 2007	3517	1526	1478	513
Wave response rate D/(A+B-C)	0,89	0,88	0,89	0,93
Achieved sample size ratio (D/E)	0,94	0,91	0,96	0,97

Table 2.10. Household longitudinal follow-up rate and follow-up ratio by panel

Number	Total (rotation groups 6 and 7)	2-year panel (rotation gr 7)	3-year panel (rotation gr 6)	4-year panel (rotation gr 5)
A. Number of hhs passed on to 2008 from 2007 (DB110=1,2,3,4,5,6,7,11,10)	3069	1527	1542	NA ²
B Number of hhs out-of-scope or non-existent among those in row A (DB110=3,4,5,6)	24	10	14	NA
C. Number of hhs to be passed on to 2009	2816	1392	1424	NA
D. Number of split-off hhs to be passed on to 2009	69	34	35	NA
Longitudinal follow-up rate C/(A-B)	0,92	0,92	0,93	NA
Follow-up ratio (C+D)/(A-B)	0,95	0,94	0,95	NA

Table 2.11. Wave response rate for persons by panel

	Total (rotation groups 5, 6, 7)	2-year panel (rotation gr 7)	3-year panel (rotation gr 6)	4-year panel (rotation gr 5)
A. Number of sample persons aged 16 and over passed on to 2008 from 2007	8306	3538	3601	1167
B. Number of persons (among those in A) belonging to households no longer in scope (DB110 = 3,4,5,6)	42	10	19	13
C. Number of persons (among those in A) no longer in scope in existing households (RB110=6 or RB120=2,3).	75	36	32	7
D. Number of sample persons completed the personal interview (RB100=1 and RB250=11 to 13).	7319	3048	3195	1076
E. Number of completed personal interviews (RB250=11 to 13)	7543	3105	3308	1130
F. Number of completed personal interviews in 2007	7985	3404	3429	1152
Wave response rate, D/(A-B-C)	0,89	0,87	0,90	0,94
Achieved sample size ratio, E/F	0,94	0,91	0,96	0,98

² Rotational group 5 will be dropped from the sample in 2009, longitudinal follow-up rate not applicable.

Since longitudinal component does not contain any other sample persons than those passed on to 2008 from 2007, **longitudinal follow-up rate for persons** coincides with wave response rate for persons. Non-responding persons in responding households have been imputed by full-record imputation and marked RB250=14, so causes of non-response are not indicated in the database.

In reporting these non-response rates we assume that all non-contacted households other than those coded as DB120=23 are in fact existing. This seems to be a reasonable assumption since codes DB120=21 and DB120=22 include the following non-contact reasons according to national classification (see the meaning of the term “address-person” in Intermediate Quality Report):

DB120=21

- Address-person does not live at given address and no information is available on new address
- Address-person has moved to another address, no information on new address available
- Given address does not exist
- Address can be located, but no contact can be made since nobody is at home

DB120=22

- The house given is located but given address can not be accessed (due to locked doors or gates, etc)
- Address of address-person can not be accessed due to poor weather conditions etc

2.3.3.3. Distribution of households by household status (DB110), by record of contact at address (DB120), by household questionnaire result (DB130) and by household interview acceptance (DB135).

	Total	DB110										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Total	3726	3405	66	6	7	19	0	61	125	0	0	37
Rotation gr 5	543	508	6	1	3	4	0	5	11	0	0	5
Rotation gr 6	1597	1462	32	3	3	8	0	20	55	0	0	14
Rotation gr 7	1586	1435	28	2	1	7	0	36	59	0	0	18

RECORD OF CONTACT AT ADDRESS

	Total	DB120				
		11	21	22	23	Missing
Total (DB110 = 2,8,9)	191	150	40	1	0	0
Rotation gr 5	17	12	5	0	0	0
Rotation gr 6	87	71	16	0	0	0
Rotation gr 7	87	67	19	1	0	0

HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE RESULT

	Total	DB130					
		11	21	22	23	24	Missing
Total (DB110=1 or DB120=11)	3555	3310	165	26	23	31	0
Rotation gr 5	520	498	14	2	2	4	0
Rotation gr 6	1533	1421	71	12	9	20	0
Rotation gr 7	1502	1391	80	12	12	7	0

HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEW ACCEPTANCE

	Total	DB135		
		1	2	Missing
Total (DB130=11)	3310	3297	13	0
Rotation gr 5	498	497	1	0
Rotation gr 6	1421	1414	7	0
Rotation gr 7	1391	1386	5	0

2.3.3.4. Distribution of persons by membership status (RB110)

MEMBERSHIP STATUS

	Total	Current household members				No current household members			Missing
		RB110=1	=2	=3	=4	RB110=5	=6	=7	
Total	9357	8750	80	169	84	204	43	27	0
Rotation gr 5	1361	1299	4	16	7	22	6	7	0
Rotation gr 6	4086	3797	43	81	44	94	17	10	0
Rotation gr 7	3910	3654	33	72	33	88	20	10	0

MOVED TO

	Total	RB120			
		1	2	3	4
Total	204	163	11	30	0
Rotation gr 5	22	20	0	2	0
Rotation gr 6	94	74	7	13	0
Rotation gr 7	88	69	4	15	0

2.3.3.5. Item non-response

The following tables show the amount of item non-response for income variables (among households whose interview was accepted for the database):

- percentage of persons/households having received an amount (other than 0),
- percentage of households for which no information for appropriate income variable was obtained from the questionnaire (missing values) and
- Percentage of households for which partial information (not all the questions required) for appropriate income variable was obtained from the questionnaire.

A value obtained by gross/net conversion was not considered as imputed.

Whole sample (4 rotation groups) is used for the tables (i.e. this is a copy from 2008 intermediate quality report).

Table 2.12. Distribution of item non-response, household-level variables, 2008

Income variable	% of hhs having received an amount	% of hhs with missing values (before imputation)	% of hhs with partial information (before

					imputation)	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total household gross income (HY010)	4739	99.9	50	1.1	2462	51.2
Total disposable household income (HY020)	4738	99.8	47	1.0	2564	54.1
Total disposable household income before social transfer other than old-age and survivors' benefits (HY022)	4706	99.2	122	2.6	2334	49.6
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits (HY023)	4452	93.8	286	6.4	2160	48.5
Net income components at household level						
Imputed rent (HY030N)	4604	97.0	4604	100.0	0	0.0
Income from rental of a property or land (HY040N)	91	1.9	7	7.7	0	0.0
Family/ children related allowances (HY050N)	1899	40.0	0	0.0	3	0.2
Social inclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060N)	79	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Housing allowances (HY070N)	90	1.9	5	5.6	0	0.0
Regular inter-household cash transfers received (HY080N)	177	3.7	7	4.0	0	0.0
Alimonies received, compulsory and voluntary (HY081N)	113	2.4	4	3.5	0	0.0
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in incorporated business (HY090N)	2206	46.5	2077 ³	94.2	8	0.8
Interest repayments on mortgage (HY100N)	378	8.0	133	35.2	0	0.0
Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110N)	91	1.9	27	29.7	0	0.0
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120N)	3193	67.3	134	4.2	0	0.0
Regular inter-household cash transfers paid (HY130N)	173	3.6	7	4.0	0	0.0
Alimonies paid, compulsory and voluntary (HY131N)	59	1.2	4	6.8	0	0.0
Tax on income and social contributions, net (HY140N) ⁴	0	0.0	0	-	0	-
Repayments/ receipts for tax adjustment (HY145N)	1993	42.0	257	12.9	43	2.2
Gross income components at household level						
Imputed rent (HY030G)	4604	97.0	4604	100.0	0.0	100.0

³ Of which 2055 are such that the only capital income of household is dividends from Estonian banks, and these are imputed based on the interval provided by respondent.

⁴ Tax on income is not collected. This variable is fully computed at Statistics Estonia based on person's and household's income and taxes paid. Computed values is assumed to be gross, net values are set to zeroes in the database.

Income from rental of a property or land (HY040G)	91	1.9	7	7.7	0	0.0
Family/ children related allowances (HY050G)	1899	40.0	0	0.0	3	0.2
Social inclusion not elsewhere classified (HY060G)	79	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Housing allowances (HY070G)	90	1.9	5	5.6	0	0.0
Regular inter-household cash transfers received (HY080G)	177	3.7	7	4.0	0	0.0
Alimonies received, compulsory and voluntary (HY081G)	113	2.4	4	3.5	0	0.0
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in incorporated business (HY090G)	2206	46.5	2077	94.2	17	0.8
Interest repayments on mortgage (HY100G)	378	8.0	133	35.2	0	0.0
Income received by people aged under 16 (HY110G)	91	1.9	27	29.7	0	0.0
Regular taxes on wealth (HY120G)	3193	67.3	134	4.2	0	0.0
Regular inter-household cash transfers paid (HY130G)	173	3.6	7	4.0	0	0.0
Alimonies paid, compulsory and voluntary (HY131G)	59	1.2	4	6.8	0	0.0
Tax on income and social contributions, gross (HY140G)	3560	75.0	3560	100.0	0	0.0

Table 2.13. Distribution of item non-response, person-level variables, 2008

Income variable	% of persons 16+ having received an amount		% of persons with missing values (before imputation)		% of persons with partial information (before imputation)	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Net income components at personal level						
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010N)	6279	57.9	515	8.2	37	0.6
Non-cash employee income (PY020N)	1456	13.4	421	28.9	221	15.1
Company car (PY021N) ⁵	242	2.2	242	100.0	0	0.0
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035N)	783	7.2	83	10.6	0	0.0
Cash benefits or losses from self employment (PY050N)	706	6.5	89	12.6	3	0.4
Value of goods produced by own-consumption (PY070N)	6935	6.4	6935	100.0	0	0.0
Pension from individual private plans (PY080N)	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unemployment benefits (PY090N)	89	0.8	9	10.1	0	0.0
Old-age benefits (PY100N)	2671	24.6	53	2.0	3	0.1
Survivor's benefits (PY110N)	106	1.0	3	2.8	0	0.0

⁵ Non-cash income from company car is not collected from respondent, but imputed as the number of months a company car was used multiplied by 2000.

Sickness benefits (PY120N)	988	9.1	379	38.4	0	0.0
Disability benefits (PY130N)	747	6.9	15	2.0	0	0.0
Education-related benefits (PY140N)	267	2.5	13	4.9	0	0.0
Gross income components at personal level						
Employee cash or near cash income (PY010G)	6279	57.9	515	8.2	37	0.7
Non-cash employee income (PY020G)	1456	13.4	421	28.9	221	15.1
Company car (PY021G)	242	2.2	242	100.0	0	0.0
Employer's social insurance contributions (PY030G)	5979	55.1	5979	100.0	0	0.0
Contributions to individual private pension plans (PY035G)	783	7.2	83	10.6	1	0.1
Cash benefits or losses from self employment (PY050G)	706	6.5	89	12.6	3	0.4
Value of goods produced by own-consumption (PY070G)	6935	6.4	6935	100.0	0	0.0
Pension from individual private plans (PY080G)	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unemployment benefits (PY090G)	89	0.8	9	10.1	0	0.0
Old-age benefits (PY100G)	2671	24.6	53	2.0	3	0.1
Survivor's benefits (PY110G)	106	1.0	3	2.8	0	0.0
Sickness benefits (PY120G)	988	9.1	379	38.4	0	0.0
Disability benefits (PY130G)	747	6.9	15	2.0	0	0.0
Education-related benefits (PY140G)	267	2.5	13	4.9	0	0.0

2.4. Mode of data collection

Table 2.14. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over in responded households by data status (RB250), 2008

HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 16+ (RB245=1 to 3)

	Total	RB250=11	=12	=13	=14	=21	=22	=23	=31	=32	=33
Total	7606	7543	0	0	63	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 5	1135	1130	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 6	3332	3308	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 7	3139	3105	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0

SAMPLE PERSONS 16+ (RB245= 1 to 3 and RB100=1)

	Total	RB250=11	=12	=13	=14	=21	=22	=23	=31	=32	=33
Total	7373	7319	0	0	54	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 5	1081	1076	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 6	3216	3195	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 7	3076	3048	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0

CO-RESIDENTS 16+ (RB245= 1 to 3 and RB100=2)

	Total	RB250=11	=12	=13	=14	=21	=22	=23	=31	=32	=33
Total	233	224	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 5	54	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 6	116	113	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotation gr 7	63	57	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2.15. Distribution of household members aged 16 and over in responded households by type of Interview (RB260), 2008

HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS 16+ (RB245= 1 to 3) and RB250= 11 or 13

	Total	RB260=1	=2	=3	=4	=5	Missing
Total	7543	196	6297	16	1	1033	0
Rotation gr 5	1130	28	946	2	0	154	0
Rotation gr 6	3308	72	2751	4	1	480	0
Rotation gr 7	3105	96	2600	10	0	399	0

SAMPLE PERSONS MEMBERS 16+ (RB245= 1 to 3, RB100=1) and RB250= 11 or 13

	Total	RB260=1	=2	=3	=4	=5	Missing
Total	7319	193	6126	15	1	984	0
Rotation gr 5	1076	28	908	2	0	138	0
Rotation gr 6	3195	72	2656	4	1	462	0
Rotation gr 7	3048	93	2562	9	0	384	0

CO-RESIDENTS 16+ (RB245= 1 to 3, RB100=2) and RB250= 11 or 13

	Total	RB260=1	=2	=3	=4	=5	Missing
Total	224	3	171	1	49	224	0
Rotation gr 5	54	0	38	0	16	54	0
Rotation gr 6	113	0	95	0	18	113	0
Rotation gr 7	57	3	38	1	15	57	0

2.5. Imputation procedure

2.5.1. Imputation for within-household non-response

Data of non-responding persons in responding households was imputed by full record imputation. A donor for imputation was the nearest neighbour as defined by distance function. Distance function used was the sum of absolute values of differences between the values for non-responding persons and responding persons. Variables used in distance function were: household size, usage of car in hh, usage of personal computer in hh, whether hh receives family related benefits, whether hh can get 5000 kr in case of sudden need, geographical location, household cope (relevance of auxiliary variables was controlled by logistic regression for response status). Variables were accounted for with different weight. In case there were several persons with equal distance, donor was selected randomly among them.

Variables copied from the donor are income variables in P-file (PY-variables).

2.5.2. Imputed rent

For calculating imputed rent the following method was used, worked out by E.-M.-Tiit in 2006. Based on registered prices of dwellings in the Real Estate data-base (REDB) regression models predicting the price of m² of dwelling by its location, type, size and quality were built. For 2008 EU-SILC the Real Estate data of year 2007 was used. For houses and flats two different regression models were built:

Price of m² of flat = - 6829.8 + 2883.2*county + 4261.4*village+ 2716.9*quality - 703.6*rooms

Price of m² of house = -2413.4 + 3189.0*county + 3950.6*village + 2015.8*quality – 32.97*area

For calculating imputed rents the estimated price of the dwelling and the rate of 12-month EURIBOR (average of the 9 last years), which was 3.373% in 2007 was used:

Rent per year = price of m²*area of dwelling * 0.03373

2.5.3. Company cars

In the personal questionnaire, each employee was requested to report whether he or she had an option to use a company car for private ends during the previous calendar year or not. Those reporting the use were further asked to indicate the number of months the car was used, as well as the make, model and year of issue of the car. Since there is no reliable information on used care prices in Estonia, the construction of depreciation model was not possible and the conversion using tax rules was used instead. For each person reporting a benefit from the company car, the special benefit tax paid by the employer on the use of the car is recorded.

2.5.4. Value of goods produced for own consumption

Variable PY070N was calculated in 5 steps:

1. Questionnaire included questions on the amount of different goods produced for own consumption, but answers included many missing values. In most cases respondents provided an interval if they didn't know the exact value. So, as the first step, exact amounts of goods were imputed with hot-deck method within given intervals.
2. Prices of goods were derived from Household Budget survey.
3. Total value of goods produced for own consumption was calculated using amounts and prices above.
4. Production costs were deducted from total value above (using index derived from Household Budget Survey).
5. Resulting value was equally divided between all household members.

2.5.5. Imputation of income variables

Where possible, data from previous years was used for imputation. Data of 2007 was used only if household or person received particular kind of income in 2007 and analysis showed that these two incomes are sufficiently closely related. If analysis indicated no correlation between the incomes of 2007 and 2008, values were not used in imputation.

Details on the number of values forwarded from 2007 to 2008 are given in Table 2.16.

If missing value could not be imputed with data from previous year, the following methods were used:

- Logical deduction of value, based on other data in questionnaire;
- Imputation with median or average, when only single values were missing;
- When exact value was missing but respondent provided an interval, the values were imputed with hot-deck method or random regression with IweWare within this interval;

- Random regression with IVEware;

For some income variables having highly skewed distribution, imputation was conducted on the log-scale. In general, empirical bounds of values present in the dataset were used in IVEware to bound imputed values. For some income components, amount per month was imputed and then converted into amount per year.

If an income component was collected only net, then missing net values were imputed and then converted to gross using net/gross conversion algorithm, where necessary. Respectively, if an income component was collected only gross, then a gross value was imputed and then converted to net.

For income components, where respondent could choose whether to provide a value net or gross (PY010, PY050 etc), gross values were converted to net prior to imputation. Missing values are thus imputed as net.

Net/gross and gross/net conversion algorithms were based on local tax system.

Following table provides numbers of values imputed for each income component by method of imputation. Numbers are given for the full sample of 2008, i.e. including new sub-sample.

Table 2.16. Percentage of imputed cases by income component in national questionnaire, 2008

Code	Description	National code	Description	Total number of persons/ households having received an amount	No of values from previous year	No of imputed values and method of imputation	Comments
NET INCOME COMPONENTS ON PERSONAL LEVEL							
PY010N	Employee cash or near cash income	HA5	Interval of H01N	6233	0	48 (Random regression)	
		H01N	Net wages in a year	6233	85	371 (Random regression within given interval)	Amount per month
		H07B	Total amount of additional payments that had not been taken into consideration in net wages	1177	0	42 (Random regression)	
PY020N	Non-cash employee income	H21A2	Approximate value of motor fuel compensated by employer	180	2	29 (Random regression)	
		H21B2	Approximate value of use of public transportation compensated by employer	114	5	36 (Random regression)	
		H21C2	Approximate value of food at work received free or at a reduced price	362	17	107 (Random regression)	
		H21D2	Approximate value of using company housing free of charge or on favorable terms	55	4	33 (Random regression)	
		H21N2	Approximate value of housing costs compensated by employer	9	0	8 (Random regression)	
		H21E2	Approximate value of (mobile) phone or postal services compensated by employer	413	14	38 (Random regression)	
		H21F2	Approximate value of health services compensated by employer	201	0	74 (Random regression)	
		H21G2	Approximate value of training not related to work but compensated by employer	25	0	7 (Random regression)	
		H21H2	Approximate value of sporting possibilities free of charge or at reduced prices	302	9	65 (Random regression)	

Code	Description	National code	Description	Total number of persons/ households having received an amount	No of values from previous year	No of imputed values and method of imputation	Comments
		H21I2	Approximate value of holiday trip paid by employer	53	0	15 (Random regression)	
		H21J2	Approximate value of foodstuffs	64	0	19 (Random regression)	
		H21K2	Approximate value of leasing or loan at reduced interest rate	7	0	5 (Random regression)	
		H21L2	Approximate value of use of equipment and/or other tools (e.g. power saw, lawnmower, etc.)	119	0	32 (Random regression)	
		H21M2	Approximate value of other non-cash income from labour	15	0	4 (median)	
		H18, H20	Number of months a company car was used	See PY021N			
PY021N	Company car	H18	Possibility to use company car	6233	4	4 (logical deduction)	
		H20	Number of months a company car was used	239	0	2 (logical deduction)	
PY035N	Contributions to individual private pension plans	HK2	Payments made into the 3rd pillar of pension insurance	674	18	55 (Random regression)	
		HK5	Payments made to the collecting insurance	122	0	4 (median)	
PY050N	Cash benefits or losses from self employment	H27N	Amount of loss from self-employment	44	0	10 (Random regression)	
		HC1	Interval of H28N	171	0	9 (Random regression)	
		H28N	Net profit from self-employment	171	0	56 (Random regression within given interval)	
		H35B	Net amount of royalties, remuneration or payment under contract for creative or scientific work	50	0	2 (Random regression)	Amount per month
		H46A2	Income from private provision of fee-charging services to other persons or households	273	0	24 (Random regression)	

Code	Description	National code	Description	Total number of persons/ households having received an amount	No of values from previous year	No of imputed values and method of imputation	Comments
		H46B2	Income from the sale of own-produced consumer goods (e.g. handicrafts, souvenirs, etc.)	19	0	3 (median)	
		H46C2	Income from the sale of own-produced foodstuffs (e.g. pies, waffles, shashlik, etc.)	5	0	1 (median)	
		H46D2	Income from intermediate commercial transactions	10	0	2 (median)	
		H46E2	Income from agricultural or forestry activities	156	0	5 (Random regression)	
		H46F2	Income from other unregistered self-employment	3	0	0	
PY080N	Pension from individual private plans	HK3A	Payments from the 3rd pillar of pension insurance	1	0	0	
		HK6A	Payments from collecting insurance	1	0	0	
PY090N	Unemployment benefits	H55A	Amount of unemployment benefit or any other benefits relating to unemployment	50	0	5 (Random regression)	Amount per month
		HF6A	Amount of unemployment benefits paid by Estonian Unemployment Insurance Fund	26	0	4(Random regression)	Amount per month
		HF	Amount of redundancy payment in 2006 and/or 2007	28	0	1 (logical deduction)	
PY100N	Old-age	H51A	Amount of old-age benefits	2655	22	19 (Random regression)	Amount per month

Code	Description	National code	Description	Total number of persons/ households having received an amount	No of values from previous year	No of imputed values and method of imputation	Comments
	benefits	H52A	Amount of pension for incapacity for work or any other benefits relating to disability	1042	6	5 (Random regression)	Amount per month
		HF_P	Lump-sum benefits upon retirement from employer	7	0	2 (mean)	
		HF10	Did You receive an one-off benefit paid by the city of Tallinn to pensioners	515	0	1 (logical deduction)	
PY110N	Survivors' benefits	H53A	Amount of survivors' pension or any other benefits relating to the loss of a provider	112	2	1 (median)	Amount per month
		HF10	Did You receive an one-off benefit paid by the city of Tallinn to pensioners	See PY100N			
PY120N	Sickness benefits	H54A	Amount of sickness benefits or any other benefits relating to health	978	95	274 (Random regression)	Amount per day
PY130N	Disability benefits	H52A	Amount of pension for incapacity for work or any other benefits relating to disability	See PY100N			
		HF10	Did You receive an one-off benefit paid by the city of Tallinn to pensioners	See PY100N			
PY140N	Education-related benefits	H57A2	Amount of state stipendium	8	0	0	
		H57G2	Education allowance	261	0	11 (Random regression)	
NET INCOME COMPONENTS ON HOUSEHOLD LEVEL							
HY040N	Income from rental of a property or land	D09N	Net income from rental of property	91	2	5 (Random regression)	

Code	Description	National code	Description	Total number of persons/ households having received an amount	No of values from previous year	No of imputed values and method of imputation	Comments
HY050N	Family/ children related allowances	D11B	Parental benefit received in the previous calendar year	264	0	9 (logical deduction)	
		D11C	Total amount of other benefits received in the previous calendar year	1900	0	0	
		D11D	Maternity leave benefits	103	0	3 (logical deduction)	
		D11E	Net adoption allowance received last year	3	0	0	
HY060N	Social inclusion not elsewhere classified	H58A2	Amount of other support/benefit/pension not mentioned above	34	0	0	
		H58B2	Amount of other support/benefit/pension not mentioned above	0	0	0	
		HF8A	The net amount of conscript's benefit in the previous calendar year	46	0	5 (Random regression)	
HY070N	Housing allowances	D03A	Amount of subsistence benefit	90	0	5 (Random regression)	Log-scale
HY080N	Regular inter-household cash transfers received	D16A	Amount of regular payments from other households	65	0	3 (Random regression)	
		DA2A	Total alimony received previous calendar year	See HY081N			
HY081N	Alimonies received (compulsory + voluntary)	DA2A	Total alimony received previous calendar year	113	1	3 (Random regression)	
HY090N	Interest, dividends, profit	H49B2	Interest income from securities (shares, bonds)	10	0	5 (Random regression)	

Code	Description	National code	Description	Total number of persons/ households having received an amount	No of values from previous year	No of imputed values and method of imputation	Comments
	from capital investments in incorporated business	H49C2	Dividend income from securities (i.e. shares, bonds)	80	4	15 (Random regression)	
		HE2	Interest income from deposits in a bank – interval	3969	0	142 (Random regression)	
		HE1A	Interest income from deposits in a bank – amount	3969	0	3876 (hot-deck within a given interval)	
HY100N	Interest repayments on mortgage	D08E_A	Mortgage interest paid last year	378	0	124	When interest is not reported, details about mortgage are requested and interest is deducted analytically
HY110N	Income received by people aged under 16	D19A	Income received by children aged 16 or less	37	0	1 (median)	
HY120N	Regular taxes on wealth	D10A	Amount of tax on land or any other property tax paid	3195	63	71 (Random regression)	Log-scale
HY130N	Regular inter-household cash transfers paid	D14A	Amount of regular payments to other households	119	0	3 (Random regression)	
		DA1A	Total alimony paid previous calendar year	See HY131N			
HY131N	Alimonies paid (compulsory + voluntary)	DA1A	Total alimony paid previous calendar year	59	2	2 (logical deduction)	
HY145N	Repayments/receipts fro tax	H64A	Income tax return for the income received in the previous year	2379	90	240 (Random regression)	Log-scale

Code	Description	National code	Description	Total number of persons/ households having received an amount	No of values from previous year	No of imputed values and method of imputation	Comments
	adjustment	H63	Additional amount of tax paid on income in the previous calendar year	101	0	20 (Random regression)	log-scale

3. COMPARABILITY

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions

There were no changes in basic concepts and definitions from the first wave.

3.2. Components of income

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

From 2006, Estonia began to calculate imputed rent and HY100 (interest repayments on mortgage). For imputed rent we use the user cost method which is a nationally developed calculation method. For HY100 we use standard Eurostat definitions but there is a great deal of imputation involved in the actual data assembly.

There were no changes in the source or procedure used for the collection of other income variables from 2006.

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

There were no changes in the source or procedure used for the collection of income variables from the first wave.

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

There were no changes in the form in which income variables at component level have been collected from the first wave.

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

There were no changes in the source or procedure used for the collection of income variables from the first wave.

3.3. Tracing rules

There were no differences between the national tracing rules and the standard EU-SILC tracing rules.

4. COHERENCE

This section will compare the longitudinal EU-SILC data to various external sources, including the *National Accounts* (NA), the *Household Budget Survey* (HBS), the *Labour Force Survey* (LFS), the *Safety survey*, wage statistics and social protection statistics.

The HBS is a continuous survey of households, which has been carried out since 1996. The yearly sample size was approximately 4500 households. The HBS is designed to collect information on income and expenditure of households. Data on income is gathered using a diary, where a household records all income received during one month. The HBS was the source of Laeken indicators up until EU-SILC. A comparison with HBS is not possible between 2008-2009 as the HBS underwent a redesign in this period and no fieldwork was carried out.

The LFS is a continuous survey, which has been carried out according to the common EU methodology since 1995. The yearly sample size is about 12,000 working aged persons. From 2006 LFS was switched fully into CAPI with face-to-face interviews. The LFS is the main source for labour market information.

The Safety survey sample size was about 7300 persons. Data was gathered from November 2008 to May 2009 using to conduct face to face interviews with a laptop (CAPI) and self-filled questionnaires (CAS).

Wage statistics have in their current form been continuously calculated since 1992. All enterprises employing 50 persons or more are obliged to provide data. A sample is drawn from smaller enterprises. Wage data is used to calculate hourly and monthly wages, both gross and net, as well as labour costs. All figures have been converted into full-time units.

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

In the following paragraphs, EU-SILC income data is compared component by component between the waves 2007 and 2008 and to income data from administrative sources for income years 2006 and 2007. Table 4.1 presents the comparisons by total amounts received/spent and Table 4.2 by number of recipients.

As illustrated in table 4.1, the total cash incomes from employment indicate a rise of about 22% in incomes from 2006 to 2007. (In Estonia, the income reference year is one year behind the survey year so the 2008 survey gives us annual incomes for 2007, and the 2007 survey gave us the incomes of 2006) The wage statistics figures show a similar increase although the incomes reported through wage statistics by companies indicate systematically lower total wage incomes. The under-representation is around 13%, aka wage statistics incomes make up 87% of the total wage incomes reported by wage-earners themselves. This can partly be due to unreported wages paid to temporary employees, or failing to report other cash benefits by companies and also from PY010 containing a wider set of income components than the definition for wage statistics. Wage statistics also refer to the full-time equivalent of income and exclude part-time work contracts; unofficial work relationships are also excluded. In EU-SILC data both are included. The data concerning wage statistics comes from in-house sources, not administrative registers.

The numbers of recipients (table 4.2) for PY010G also have a comparability problem because in wage statistics the number of recipients is calculated in full time units and not actual persons.

Table 4.1. Total amounts of income components by source of information (in kroons), income years 2006 and 2007

Income component	2006		2007	
	EU-SILC	Administrative sources*	EU-SILC	Administrative sources*
Cash or near-cash employee income (PY010N)	56,063,250	47,124,543	68,405,162	59,452,036
Old-age benefits (PY100G)	10,800,000	10,908,510	12,900,000	12,704,570
Gross survivor's benefits (PY110G)	108,054	173,32	141,000	195,680
Disability benefits (PY130G)	1,321,145	1,969,140	1,539,193	2,411,970

* Wage statistics in the case of PY010 and administrative sources for other variables.

Variable PY100G demonstrates a pretty good fit between survey data and administrative data, with slight fluctuations between under- or over-reporting in EU-SILC. EU-SILC also includes pension benefits received from abroad, which tend to be higher than national benefits. There are, however, very few people in the sample that receive pensions from abroad. The Estonian state at the same time pays old age benefits to its citizens residing abroad while the EU-SILC survey does not have people currently living abroad in its sample.

Another condition to be considered is that the administrative data includes the institutionalised population whereas the EU-SILC survey does not include institutionalised people in its sample—e.g. hospitalized, in retirement homes and imprisoned people. This difference influences old-age and disability benefits especially.

Survivors' benefits are usually paid to a household as a whole. The administrative figure indicates significant and systematic underestimation in EU-SILC both in total amounts and number of recipients. This is most likely due to the very small amounts of survivors' benefits, and some benefits included, such as the funeral allowance, not being separately asked in the questionnaire. Respondents hardly ever think to report the funeral allowance when asked to report any 'other' benefits and survivors' benefits are probably reported incorrectly and forgotten to report when they are not a significant source of income for the household.

Disability benefits too are underreported in EU-SILC, although the number of recipients is not very different from what administrative accounts indicate. EU-SILC reports a larger number of recipients which is probably due to the fact that administrative records count the number of disability benefit recipients eligible for the benefit at a fixed moment in time (January first of the following year) but in EU-SILC everyone that has received the benefit at any time in the previous year is counted as a recipient.

The difference in total amounts paid is to a small extent related to the fact that disability benefits paid to people in retirement age have been added to the old-age benefits. But for the most part disability benefits, often small amounts, are not sufficiently captured by the survey. This is further indicated by the fact that the administrative records number should be somewhat lower than the survey's result since administrative information includes only disability and early retirement benefits. The numbers of recipients for care allowances and economic integration of the handicapped are not included for administrative records in Table 4.2, whereas the amounts received by them are included in Table 4.1.

Table 4.2. Number of recipients of income components by source of information, income years 2006 and 2007

Income component	2006		2007	
	EU-SILC	Other sources*	EU-SILC	Other sources*
Cash or near-cash employee income (PY010N)	666,494	518,593	690,633	543,060
Old-age benefits (PY100G)	287,568	291,580	289,604	293,640
Survivor's benefits (PY110G)	8,482	9,537	8,846	14,032
Disability benefits (PY130G)	66,379	65,477	66,024	70,498

* Wage statistics in the case of PY010 and administrative sources for other variables.

Table 4.3 compares the mean and number of recipients of most income components in EU-SILC 2008 to the estimates from the 2007 operation. Changes that emerge are, in general, in line with what could be expected. Much like the previous year, 2008 was a year of considerable economic growth and increase in real salaries in Estonia. It should be noted that the fieldwork period ended in July, just before the beginning of the economic crisis and that the 2008 data actually refers to the incomes of 2007. EU-SILC in Estonia collects the respondent's annual income from the previous calendar year. Within a year the average salary increased by 18%, while the increase in wage receivers was more modest – 4%. At the same time, the number of people receiving unemployment benefits went down by 15% as many discouraged workers found employment and unemployment levels reached record lows. Administrative data confirms the survey results. The increase in the mean of PY090N has to do with a new unemployment benefit attached to one's earlier salary which is considerably lower than the fixed unemployment allowance—more people become eligible for this new unemployment benefit every year as it is dependent on the time a person has worked before losing their job. The effect of this benefit is pulling up the mean of PY090 each year.

Most income components show an increase from 2007 to 2008 in line with the rising salaries. Benefits also went up due to small increases in benefit rates, even though the number of recipients fell, for instance with sickness and disability benefits and family and education-related allowances. Benefits from self-employment decreased considerably and the number of entrepreneurs also fell. This has to do with sample fluctuations- there are very few self-employed people in the sample and fluctuations in their business dealings have a big effect on variable PY050. The number of entrepreneurs seems to fluctuate between survey years, which also hints to a relatively big pool of short-lived businesses.

Table 4.3. Mean (EEK-s) and number of recipients of income components in EU-SILC 2007 and 2008

	Mean		Number of recipients	
	2007	2008	2007	2008
<i>Individual level components</i>				
PY010N	84117	99056	666,494	690573
PY020N	8676	9219	162,593	172318
PY035N	5,111	5308	84,401	92736
PY050N	36,000	20331	60,224	51762
PY090N	10,566	13218	10,836	9189
PY100N	37,409	43838	287,568	289604
PY110N	12,739	15964	8,482	8846
PY120N	3,261	3326	102,774	100303
PY130N	19,903	23312	66,379	66024
PY140N	10,092	8921	22,284	19675
<i>Household level components</i>				
HY040N	11,290	12788	5,726	7720
HY050N	12,498	15274	185,502	182718
HY070N	4,295	5859	11,790	10000
HY080N	15,138	20989	28,870	23703
HY090N	1,519	2112	238,307	289877
HY110N	4,473	2991	6,092	6763
HY120N	430	477	356,151	348412
HY130N	14,728	18689	33,360	20927
HY145N	-2,455	-3074	213,965	228958
HY010	155,991	183157		
HY020	130,759	153603		
HY022	125,883	147552		
HY023	130,453	152713		

Household level variables reflect changes in line with personal level variables.

For HY040N the small increase in the total amount is in line with more people obtaining an income from renting out their property or land. Rent prices were on the rise in 2007 (to which the income belongs) so it is logical that the amount of income earned from renting out property would increase and since the market was growing, more people would rent out their property.

Family allowances have increased, in compliance with increases of national benefit levels, most notably the parental benefit which is tied to incomes. Larger parental benefits and more people becoming eligible for larger sums along with rising incomes amounted for a noticeable increase in the overall amount despite the fall in numbers of recipients (which may well be due to sample fluctuations).

The average amount of housing allowances has increased while the amount of recipient households has decreased. This must have been due to a small increase in the local level benefit in some local municipalities. Less people receiving the benefit probably has to do with rising income levels, making some people on the borderline ineligible.

The number of households receiving and paying transfers from other households has decreased while the sums paid have increased. This might have something to do with people having greater financial possibilities for helping their relatives with larger sums than before.

An increase in income collected through HY090 reflects a positive situation on the financial markets, with more people investing and larger returns that have to do with overall economic growth. Less people had to pay taxes on wealth, but the amount went up only a bit and has not changed substantially. More people are having to pay tax but on smaller sums.

The drop in incomes earned by people aged under 16, despite the small increase in overall recipients, is difficult to explain. Perhaps children worked for a smaller period of time, for instance one month during the summer vacation instead of two, because they could rely on more money from their households thanks to increased household incomes. Since the questionnaire does not specify how long the child worked and doing what, it is not possible to venture more than a guess.

Total household income increased by approximately 17% in 2007. The increases stem from the higher wages and other income components, most of which have gone up considerably.

4.2. Comparison of other target variables with external sources

In Table 4.4 the distribution of population aged 16-74 derived from EU-SILC and LFS is compared between survey years 2005-2008.

The differences between the two data sources are not great but the LFS indicates a slightly better educated populace than EU-SILC. There are more people with post secondary education and less people with secondary or lower education. Given that the questions used in the two surveys are identical, this must be due to sample fluctuations.

Table 4.4. Distribution of population aged 16-74 by ISCED level, based on the cross-sectional EU-SILC and the LFS, 2005-2008

ISCED level	2005		2006		2007		2008	
	EU-SILC	LFS	EU-SILC	LFS	EU-SILC	LFS	EU-SILC	LFS
0 Pre-primary education	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.5	0,6	0,5	0.5	0.4
1 Primary education	5.4	3.1	4.8	4.1	4.2	3,5	6.5	3.3
2 Lower secondary education	18.3	17.5	18.7	18.2	18.6	17,9	22.4	18.3
3 (Upper) secondary education	43.0	44.8	43.0	44.5	44.1	45,8	47.2	44.8
4 Post-secondary non tertiary education	7.6	8.7	7.6	5.5	7.1	5,2	2.6	5.2
5 First stage of tertiary education	24.6	25.1	24.9	26.8	24.9	26,8	20.6	27.8
6 Second stage of tertiary education	...*	0.6	0,3	0.4	(0,4)**	(0,3)**	(0.2)**	(0.2)**
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Very unreliable estimate, based on less than 20 sample observations

** Unreliable estimate, based on 35-44 sample observations.

Table 4.5 presents the longitudinal comparison of population aged 16 or over by most frequent current activity status in EU-SILC, HBS and the Safety survey.

The differences that can be observed between the in EU-SILC and HBS data sources are relatively minor with the exceptions of students, domestic workers and people in the "other inactive" category. This indicates that domestic workers are frequently reported as "other inactive" in HBS.

Comparing the EU-SILC and Safety survey results from 2008 two facts should be noted. Firstly, the Safety survey was carried out from November 2008 - May 2009, meaning that the results are not strictly for 2008, as are those of EU-SILC, whose fieldwork period ranged from February to July 2008. Secondly the Safety survey falls well into the time of the world economic crisis, whereas EU-SILC is still fully reflective of the times of the economic boom. In this context, the figures show a remarkably great similarity of the socio-economic composition of the populace. The main difference is firstly the share of the unemployed, of whom there are almost 5% more in the Safety survey- a trend also reflected in administrative statistics of unemployment. Secondly, EU-SILC demonstrates a greater share of the population as in retirement. This difference of 6% points is probably caused by sampling.

Table 4.5. Distribution of population aged 16 and over by self-defined activity status based on longitudinal EU-SILC, the HBS and Safety survey, 2005-2008

Activity status	2005		2006		2007		2008	
	EU-SILC	HBS	EU-SILC	HBS	EU-SILC	HBS	EU-SILC	Safety survey
Working full-time	51.3	51.1	52.9	50.6	54.2	50.8	53.5	53.8
Working part-time	3.9	3.2	3.6	3.3	3.9	3.2	3.8	4.4
Unemployed	5.8	5.2	4.3	3.9	3.2	2.8	3.1	7.9
Pupil, student	9.0	9.7	8.8	10.7	8.8	12.3	8.7	9.5
In retirement	22.6	21.5	21.8	22.0	21.7	21.5	21.6	15.4
Permanently disabled	3.5	4.3	3.7	4.2	3.7	4.1	3.7	4.0
Fulfilling domestic tasks and care responsibilities	3.9	3.4	4.7	1.5	4.4	1.5	4.6	4.3
Other inactive	...*	1.6	...*	3.6	(0.0)*	3.4	(0.2)*	(0.7)*
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.6	99.2	100

* Extremely unreliable estimate, based on less than 20 sample observations