

Final Quality Report

EU-SILC 2006

**National Statistics Office (NSO)
Malta**

Contents

1. Common longitudinal European Union indicators based on the longitudinal component of EU-SILC	4
2. Accuracy	7
2.1 Sample design	7
2.1.1 Type of sampling	7
2.1.2 Sampling units	8
2.1.3 Stratification and sub-stratification criteria	8
2.1.4 Sample size	8
2.1.5 Sample selection schemes	8
2.1.6 Sample distribution over time	8
2.1.7 Renovation of sample: Rotational groups	8
2.1.8 Weightings	9
2.1.8.1 Design Weights	9
2.1.8.2 Non-response adjustments	10
2.1.8.3 Adjustments to external data	10
2.1.8.4 Final longitudinal weight	10
2.1.9 Substitutions	11
2.2 Sampling errors	11
2.3 Non-sampling errors	15
2.3.1 Sampling frame and coverage errors	15
2.3.2 Measurement and processing errors	15
2.3.2.1 Measurement errors	15
2.3.2.2 Processing errors	16
2.3.3 Non-response errors	17
2.3.3.1 Achieved sample size	17
2.3.3.2 Unit non-response	17
2.3.3.3 Distribution of households by households status, record of contact at address, household questionnaire result and household interview acceptance	20
2.3.3.4 Distribution of persons by membership status	21
2.3.3.5 Item non-response	22
2.4 Mode of data collection	24
2.5 Imputation procedure	25
2.6 Imputed rent	25
2.7 Company cars	25
3. Comparability	26
3.1 Basic concepts and definitions	26
3.2 Components of income	27
3.2.1 Differences between the national definition and standard EU-SILC definitions	27
3.2.2 The source or procedure used for the collection of income variables	28
3.2.3 The form in which income variables at component level have been obtained	29
3.2.4 The method used for obtaining income target variables in the required form	29
3.3 Tracing rules	30

4. Coherence	30
4.1 Comparison of income target variables and number of persons who receive income from each 'income component', with external sources	30
4.2 Other comments	30
4.3 Revisions	30

1. Common longitudinal European Union indicators based on the longitudinal component of EU-SILC

The common longitudinal EU indicators cannot be computed at this point in time since this is only the 2nd wave of EU-SILC. Instead the common cross-sectional EU indicators are presented here.

Primary Laeken indicators of social cohesion (cross-sectional indicators)

At-risk-of poverty rate after transfers

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by age and gender

%		Age			
		Total (0+)	0-17	18-64	65+
Sex	Total	14	18	11	19
	Male	13	-	10	20
	Female	14	-	12	19

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by most frequent activity status and gender

%		Most frequent activity status					
		Total (16+)	'At work'	'Not at work'			
			Total 'at work'	Total 'not at work'	Unemployed	Retired	Other inactive
Sex	Total	13	4	20	41	21	18
	Male	12	6	24	43	22	17
	Female	14	2	18	33	18	18

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by household type

Household Type		%	
All households with no dependent children	Total	12	
	1 person households	Total	20
		M	19
		F	20
		age < 65 yrs	23
		age 65+	17
2 adults no dependent children	both age < 65 yrs	12	

		at least one age 65+	24
	Other households with no dependent children		4
All households with dependent children	Total		15
	Single parent	at least 1 dependent child	38
	2 adults	1 dependent child	15
		2 dependent children	16
		3+ dependent children	25
Other households with dependent children		7	

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by tenure status and gender

Tenure status	Sex	%
Total	Total	14
Owner or rent-free	Total	13
Tenant	Total	18

- ‘At-risk-of poverty threshold’ (illustrative values)

		At-risk-of-poverty threshold (illustrative values)
1 person household	NAC	2252
2 adults 2 dependant children	NAC	4729

Inequality of income distribution S80/S20 income quintile share ratio

- Ratio of total income received by the 20% of the country’s population with the highest income (top quintile) to that received by the 20% of the country’s population with the lowest income (lowest quintile)

S80/S20 income quintile ratio	4
-------------------------------	---

Relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap by gender and selected age group

- Difference between the median income of persons below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold and the at-risk-of-poverty threshold, expressed as a percentage of the at-risk-of-poverty threshold

		%	Age			
			Total (0+)	0-17	18-64	65+
Sex	Total	19	18	19	22	
	Male	20	-	19	22	
	Female	19	-	19	21	

Secondary Laeken Indicators of social cohesion (cross-sectional indicators)

Dispersion around the risk-of-poverty threshold

- The share of persons with an income below 40%, 50% and 70% national median income

		%	Dispersion around the at-risk-of-poverty threshold		
			40% of median	50% of median	70% of median
Sex	Total	4	8	23	
	Male	4	7	21	
	Female	4	8	24	

At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a moment in time

This indicator shall be provided from 2007 as requested by Eurostat.

At-risk-of-poverty rate before transfers

- At-risk-of-poverty rate where income is the 'equivalised disposable income before social transfers except old-age and survivors' benefits'

		%	Age			
			Total (0+)	0-17	18-64	65+
Sex	Total	21	28	18	24	
	Male	20	-	17	24	
	Female	22	-	20	24	

- At-risk-of-poverty rate where income is the 'equivalised disposable income before social transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits'

		Age			
		Total (0+)	0-17	18-64	65+
Sex	Total	33	30	25	80
	Male	30	-	22	79
	Female	36	-	28	82

Inequality of income distribution: Gini Coefficient

- The relationship of cumulative shares of the population arranged according to the level of income, to the cumulative share of the total income received by them)

Gini coefficient	27
------------------	----

Other Indicators (cross-sectional indicators)

Equivalised disposable income

The median equivalised disposable income was Lm 3752.81 (national currency).

The gender pay gap

The gender pay gap was not calculated from EU-SILC for Malta.

2. Accuracy

2.1 Sample design

2.1.1 Type of sampling

For Malta, 2006 marked the second year in which EU-SILC was carried out. Thus it was necessary to keep three of the four panels from EU-SILC 2005 and add another panel containing new households.

The sampling design adopted for the new panel involved simple random sampling of dwellings from the Census of Population & Housing 2005 database, which served as the sampling frame for this survey. Consequently, these dwellings have served as the best possible proxy to the household population that were targeted for this survey.

2.1.2 Sampling units

As stated above, the sampling frame for the Maltese EU-SILC was the database obtained from the Census of Population & Housing 2005. First, a sample of households was obtained from this register. All the persons living in the selected households were then interviewed for this survey in order to obtain information at personal level.

2.1.3 Stratification and sub-stratification criteria

Stratification was not used as part of the sampling design.

2.1.4 Sample size

As from 2004, all participating countries were obliged, by regulation, to meet specific minimum effective sample sizes of households and eligible persons (persons aged 16+). The established minimum sample size for Malta's cross-sectional component was 3,000 households corresponding to at least 7,000 persons aged 16 and over.

The gross sample size (as selected by simple random sampling) for Malta was 4,136 households. Of these, 269 households were ineligible households that could not be located, households that did not actually exist, non-residential addresses, permanently vacant dwellings and institutional households (e.g. elderly homes). Consequently, a total of 3,867 households were approached for the interview.

2.1.5 Sample selection schemes

The sampling design used for the EU-SILC survey involved just one stage, where simple random sampling was used to select a sample of households from the Census of Population & Housing 2005 database.

2.1.6 Sample distribution over time

The survey was carried out over a period of four months, and the sample was shared approximately equally between these months.

2.1.7 Renovation of sample: Rotational groups

Malta has adapted a 4-year rotational design as recommended by Eurostat. Such a design is a balanced combination between the two 'extreme' options of selecting independent samples from year to year and using a long-term panel extending over 4 years.

Rotational groups were used for the first time in this year's survey, being the second year EU-SILC was carried out. However, even though not directly effecting fieldwork in the first year of survey (which only contained a cross-sectional

component), groundwork on establishing the rotational design had to be carried out in the first year.

The simple rotational design used in Malta involved selecting four, equally sized simple random samples out of the total sample of dwellings that participated in the 2005 survey. The four sub-samples were labeled as panels 1 to 4. Thus, the second year of the survey would involve re-interviewing respondents from panels 2, 3 and 4 and replacing panel 1 by a new sample of households. This corresponds to the ‘linear’ rotation pattern recommended by Eurostat which will enable both a cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis.

The selection of these panels in Malta has been accomplished under a different methodology than as recommended by Eurostat. This is due to the fact that the initial four panels were selected after the completion of data collection, rather than at the survey design stage. Thus, upon completion of fieldwork, the total sample was split into two sub-samples made up of responding and non-responding households. Each of the two sub-samples was split into four equal simple random samples.

Panel 1 was formed by combining the first sub-sample from the responding households with the first sub-sample from the non-responding households. The same procedure was repeated for the creation of panels 2, 3 and 4. This resulted in four equally sized panels with an equal response rate in each.

It has been decided to adapt this methodology in order to guarantee an adequate sample of households within every panel, even after sample attrition over time.

Thus in 2006 one of the panels was dropped and replaced by a new sample of households. Households from the remaining three panels were retained for re-interviewing.

2.1.8 Weightings

The following is an account of the weighting procedure for the longitudinal datasets:

2.1.8.1 Design Weights

The design weights (DB080) for the households in the 2005 panels were calculated by taking the inverse probability of selection of these households when selected for the first time in 2005, i.e.,

$$DB080_{05} = \frac{N_h}{n_e} = \frac{\text{no. of hholds in population (derived from census)}}{\text{no. of eligible hholds}},$$

such that the sum of all design weights of all eligible households amounted to the size of the target household population in 2005 (sampling frame of households).

The same design weights calculated for the 2005 households were attached to the households in the overlapping panel in the 2006 wave. Split households were given the same design weight of their parent household. The total sum of weights for 2006 was then normalised and inflated so that their total equalled that of the total households in 2005 as well. This way, it was possible for us to project all responses for the 2006 households in the overlapping panels onto the original sampling frame in 2005.

2.1.8.2 Non-response adjustments

Non-response adjustments were then made for each rotational group. This was done using post-stratification weighting basing on main household demographics as calculated for the target population. The main 2 variables that were used in order to create the strata were household size and district (NUTS 2).

2.1.8.3 Adjustments to external data

Household data was calibrated further (using CALMAR software) by applying the logit method to minimise further all biases related to non-response. Variables used in the calibration exercise were tenure status, sex, 10-year age groups, household type and district.

2.1.8.4 Final longitudinal weight

Since sample selection followed an integrated design in which all household members were interviewed in the participating households, weighting was done at household level. The resulting household weights were then attached to all members within the household.

- **Personal base weight RB060:**

Household data in every rotational group, that had already been corrected for non-response, was then inflated to reflect the total number of households in 2005. Every rotational group was then calibrated using a number of auxiliary variables both at household level (e.g. households size, tenure status, district, household type) and personal level (sex, age group). Calibration for was done using CALMAR. These weights were then attached to all 2005 respondent individuals in the R-file to obtain RB060 – with a total count of nearly three times that of the total individual population in 2005.

The same mechanism was then applied in order to attach the base weights for the overlapping sample of individuals that participated in 2006, which totalled nearly three fourths of the total sum of base weights as calculated for 2005. However, household members with RB110 = 3, 5, 6 or 7 (moved into from outside sample, moved out, died or not in register) were given a zero weight.

- **Longitudinal weight RB062:**

This weight was attached to all persons that were interviewed for the second time in 2006 and served in order to infer the 2006 overlapping population on 2005. The household design weights as calculated for 2005 served as basis for the construction of these weights. In fact, these weights were first corrected for non-response and attrition during the 2006 survey. These ‘corrected’ weights were then deflated so that their sum amounted to three fourths of the total household population in 2005. These weights were then calibrated (using Calmar) and attached to all eligible persons in the R-file (RB060₀₆ > 0) to obtain RB062.

2.1.9 Substitutions

No substitutions were made.

2.2 Sampling errors

The following refer to the cross-sectional component:

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by age and gender

Age	Sex	Value	Absolute sampling error	Relative sampling error %	Sample size (persons)
Total (0+)	Total	14	0.7	4.8	10274
	Male	13	0.9	6.9	5080
	Female	14	0.9	6.6	5194
0-17	Total	18	1.6	8.6	2281
18-24	Total	7	1.6	21.7	1031
	Male	7	2.1	31.2	542
	Female	8	2.3	30.1	489
25-49	Total	11	1.1	9.6	3219
	Male	11	1.5	13.9	1596
	Female	12	1.6	13.1	1623
50-64	Total	13	1.4	10.8	2187
	Male	11	1.9	16.4	1075
	Female	14	2.0	14.2	1112
65+	Total	20	2.0	9.7	1556
	Male	22	3.1	14.2	677
	Female	19	2.6	13.3	879
18+	Total	13	0.7	5.7	7993
	Male	12	1.0	8.4	3890
	Female	13	1.0	7.7	4103
18-64	Total	11	0.8	6.8	6437
	Male	10	1.0	10.1	3213
	Female	12	1.1	9.2	3224

0-64	Total	13	0.7	5.4	8718
	Male	12	1.0	7.8	4403
	Female	13	1.0	7.5	4315

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by most frequent activity status, age and gender

Age	Most frequent activity status	Sex	Value	Absolute sampling error	Relative sampling error %	Sample size (persons)
16+	Total	Total	13	0.7	5.6	8278
		Male	12	1.0	8.3	4038
		Female	13	1.0	7.6	4240
	Of which: 'At work'	Total	4	0.7	14.9	3634
		Male	6	0.9	15.8	2493
		Female	2	0.7	43.4	1141
	Of which: 'Not at work'	Total	20	1.1	5.7	4644
		Male	23	2.1	9.0	1545
		Female	18	1.3	7.4	3099
...	...Of which: Unemployed	Total	39	6.1	15.7	242
		Male	42	7.1	17.0	179
		Female	28	11.0	38.7	63
	...Of which: Retired	Total	21	2.2	10.5	1288
		Male	22	2.6	11.9	950
		Female	18	4.0	22.7	338
	...Of which: Other inactive	Total	18	1.3	7.4	3114
		Male	17	3.6	20.8	416
		Female	18	1.4	8.0	2698

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by household type

Household Type		Value	Absolute sampling error	Relative sampling error %	Sample size (persons)	
All households with no dependant children	Total	12	1.0	7.7	4451	
	1 person hh	Total	20	3.3	16.7	540
		M	19	5.8	31.0	169
		F	21	4.1	19.7	371
		age < 65 yrs	23	5.5	24.2	216
		age 65+	17	4.1	23.5	324
	2 adults no dep. childr.	both age < 65 yrs	12	2.2	18.0	810
		at least one age 65+	26	2.7	10.2	1016
	Other hh no dep. childr.		5	0.9	19.5	2085
All	Total	15	0.9	6.1	5823	

households with dependant children	Single parent	at least 1 dep. child	40	6.7	17.0	197
	2 adults	1 dep. child	15	2.2	14.3	1011
		2 dep. children	16	1.6	10.1	1988
		3+ dep. children	25	2.8	11.2	893
Other hh with dep. childr.			7	1.2	17.1	1734

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by tenure status, age and gender

Tenure status	Value	Absolute sampling error	Relative sampling error %	Sample size (persons)
Total	14	0.7	4.8	10274
Owner or rent-free	13	0.7	5.4	8553
Tenant	18	1.8	9.8	1721

- ‘At-risk-of poverty rates’ (after social transfers) broken down by household type and work intensity

Household type	Work intensity	Value	Absolute sampling error	Relative sampling error %	Sample size (persons)
All households with no dependant children	$WI = 0$	37	3.2	8.7	838
	$0 < WI < 1$	3	0.8	26.8	1792
	$WI = 1$	1	0.6	69.4	852
All households with dependent children	$WI = 0$	72	4.2	5.8	424
	$0 < WI < 0.5$	24	4.5	18.4	340
	$0.5 \leq WI < 1$	13	1.1	8.3	3574
	$WI = 1$	2	0.8	32.2	1483

- Income components – at household level

		Weighted mean (Lm)	Unweighted mean (Lm)	Standard error
Total household income				
Total household gross income	HY010	9265	9160	117
Total disposable household income	HY020	7731	7681	91
Total disposable household income before social transfers except old age and survivors’ benefits	HY022	7247	7183	93
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old age and survivors’ benefits	HY023	6049	5850	102
Gross income components at household level				
Income from rental of property or land	HY040G	38	40	7

Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business	HY090G	484	512	25
Family/Children related allowances	HY050G	110	118	5
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	HY060G	82	82	6
Housing allowances	HY070G	19	16	2
Regular inter-household cash transfer received	HY080G	13	15	3
Interest repayments on mortgage	HY100G	122	98	6
Income received by people aged under 16	HY110G	3	3	1
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid	HY130G	18	15	3

The means displayed in the above table are obtained by averaging over all households.

- Income components – at personal level

		Weighted mean (Lm)	Unweighted mean (Lm)	Standard error
Gross income components at personal level				
Gross employee cash or near cash income	PY010G	2491	2320	38
Gross non-cash employee income	PY020G	27	26	2
Contributions to individual private pension plans	PY035G	16	16	1
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment	PY050G	514	488	27
Pension from individual private plans	PY080G	11	11	2
Unemployment benefits	PY090G	22	20	2
Old-age benefits	PY100G	511	555	14
Survivors' benefits	PY110G	18	17	2
Sickness benefits	PY120G	14	13	1
Disability benefits	PY130G	64	67	4
Education-related allowances	PY140G	17	19	1

The means displayed in the above table are obtained by averaging over all persons aged 16+.

- Equivalised disposable income

Equivalised disposable income	Weighted mean (Lm)	Unweighted mean (Lm)	Standard error
Subclasses by household size			
1 household member	3492	3358	77
2 household members	4344	3980	66
3 household members	4430	4329	47
4 and more	4157	4105	31
Population by age group			

<25	3943	3886	39
25-34	5023	4906	86
35-44	4160	4087	72
45-54	4444	4346	61
55-64	4388	4286	63
65+	3534	3504	48
Population by sex			
Male	4153	4279	5
Female	4031	4141	6

The means displayed in the above table are obtained by averaging over all persons.

2.3 Non-sampling errors

2.3.1 Sampling frame and coverage errors

The Census of Population & Housing 2005 database was used as the sampling frame for this survey. This database was preferred to the Water Services database, which was used in the previous year's survey.

The Census of Population & Housing was conducted in 2005. The census is carried out every 10 years and is a comprehensive count of all persons living in Malta and Gozo at a particular point in time; in this case, November 2005. For this reason, it was decided that the Census database is the most comprehensive database of dwellings that could serve as a good proxy for a sampling frame of all households in Malta.

Nevertheless, the sample selected from the Census database resulted in 269 ineligible addresses that correspond to 6.5% of the initial gross sample.

2.3.2 Measurement and processing errors

2.3.2.1 Measurement errors

The main sources of measurement errors that have been identified are the following:

- **Questionnaire**

A few errors in wording and misprints in both the electronic and paper versions of the questionnaire were identified despite intensive proofreading. When these errors were identified, the interviewers were immediately informed about them. Nonetheless this does not exclude the possibility that this could have caused some misinterpretation. We are however confident that the consequences are very minimal. Note of these errors was taken so as to avoid them in subsequent years.

- **Interviewers**

A lot of effort was put into ensuring that the briefing sessions that were organized for the interviewers were as clear and informative as possible. Furthermore, interviewers were provided with notes summarizing the main issues of this survey and were encouraged to refer to the Office whenever the need for further clarification arose. In parallel the office made it a point to keep in contact with the interviewers to resolve any difficulties that may crop up. Nevertheless, there were still few instances of non-co-operative behaviour from interviewers. Auditing of households was carried out to identify and take action on such problems with immediate effect.

- **Respondents**

Respondents' cooperation was reasonably good and resulted in a response rate of 90.4%. Nevertheless, a number of difficulties were encountered here. The burden on respondents is an ever-increasing problem due to Malta's small size and the considerable number of surveys that require the public's co-operation. In this context, there were occasions where permission to conduct telephone interviews was given in an attempt to minimize the burden and thus increase the response. Furthermore, the quality of response must be understood in the context of issues such as unwillingness of respondents to answer correctly (or even answer) certain questions on income and living conditions due to sensitivity of subject. Despite many efforts that were spent in order to minimise the number of proxy personal interviews, a considerable number of proxy interviews had to be made in order to minimise the household non-response.

2.3.2.2 Processing errors

- **Data collection and data entry**

The vast majority of fieldwork was carried out through CAPI (computer assisted personal interviewing) by means of laptops. The data entry program used during data collection contained automatic validations that ensured that certain responses were within reasonable ranges and made logical sense when compared to previous related responses. In some cases, interviewers were given the option to suppress a validation so as to cater for exceptional cases. The program also automated the routing from a question to another thus minimizing accidental omission of questions. Consequently this system reduced considerably the processing errors related to data entry whilst speeding up the whole process.

The only problems experienced in this context were related to the fact that not all interviewers were very familiar with handling a laptop. This was catered for by organising separate training sessions to illustrate how the laptops and program work.

Furthermore, fictitious ‘test’ households were created in each laptop and interviewers were encouraged to experiment inputting data so as to be familiar with the process before interviewing actual households.

However the CAPI system did not cover the whole fieldwork. Questionnaires were printed and PAPI (paper and pencil interviewing) was used in the following instances:

- when the number of interviewers at a given time outnumbered the number of laptops
- in case of technical problems in laptops interrupting surveys

The PAPI alternative was used in these cases so as to avoid creating delays in the fieldwork.

2.3.3 Non-response errors

2.3.3.1 Achieved sample size

The number of households for which an interview was accepted for the database are as follows:

- wave 2005: 2613
- wave 2006: 2365

This corresponds to 6246 (in wave 2005) and 5584 (in wave 2006) persons aged 16 years or older who completed a personal interview.

The distributions of sample persons and co-residents are as follows:

Sample person or co-resident: wave 2005

	Frequency	Percent
Sample person	6491	83.4
Co-resident	1289	16.6
Total	7780	100.0

Sample person or co-resident: wave 2006

	Frequency	Percent
Sample person	5786	82.7
Co-resident	1210	17.3
Total	6996	100.0

2.3.3.2 Unit non-response

The following rates are computed according to Eurostat definitions for the cross-sectional 2006 datasets.

- **Household non-response rate**

The address contact rate (R_a) is given by:

$$R_a = \frac{\sum[DB120 = 11]}{\sum[DB120 = all] - \sum[DB120 = 23]} = \frac{3867}{4136 - 104} = 0.959$$

The proportion (R_h) of complete household interviews and accepted for the database is:

$$R_h = \frac{\sum[DB135 = 1]}{\sum[DB130 = all]} = \frac{3494}{3867} = 0.904$$

The household non-response rate (NR_h) is given by:

$$NR_h = (1 - (R_a * R_h)) * 100 = (1 - (0.959 * 0.904)) * 100 = 13.3\%$$

- **Individual non-response rate**

The proportion (R_p) of complete interviews within the households accepted for the database:

$$R_p = \frac{\sum[RB250 = 11 + 12 + 13]}{\sum[RB245 = 1 + 2 + 3]} = \frac{8300}{8300} = 1$$

The individual non-response rate (NR_p) is given by:

$$NR_p = (1 - (R_p)) * 100 = (1 - (1)) * 100 = 0\%$$

The reason behind a zero individual non-response rate is that whenever a household was interviewed and one (or more) of the household members did not respond, proxy answers for these individuals were requested from responding members.

- **Overall individual non-response rate**

The overall individual non-response rate (NR_p) is given by:

$$NR_p = (1 - (R_a * R_h * R_p)) * 100 = (1 - (0.959 * 0.904 * 1)) * 100 = 13.3\%$$

For the longitudinal component:

- **Response rate for households**

- **Wave response rate**, where $t-1 = 2005$ and $t = 2006$
 $= 100 * (\text{number of households with DB135=1 and DB010=2006} / \text{number of households with DB010=2006})$
 $= 100 * (2365/2658)$
 $= 88.98\%$
- **Longitudinal follow-up rate**
 Not available since this is the 2nd wave of the longitudinal component
- **Follow-up ratio**
 Not available since this is the 2nd wave of the longitudinal component
- **Achieved sample size ratio**, where $t-1 = 2005$ and $t = 2006$
 $= \text{number of households with DB135=1 and DB010=2006} / \text{number of households with DB135=1 and DB010=2005}$
 $= 2365/2613$
 $= 0.91$
- **Response rate for persons**
 - **Wave response rate for sample persons**, where $t-1 = 2005$ and $t = 2006$
 $= 100 * (\text{number of persons with RB100=1 \& RB250=11,12,13 \& RB010=2006} / \text{number of persons with RB100=1 \& RB010=2006})$
 $= 100 * (5565/5786)$
 $= 96.18\%$
 - **Wave response rate for co-residents**, where $t-1 = 2005$ and $t = 2006$
 $= 100 * (\text{number of persons with RB100=2 \& RB250=11,12,13 \& RB010=2006} / \text{number of persons with RB100=2 \& RB010=2006})$
 $= 100 * (19/1210)$
 $= 1.57\%$
 - **Longitudinal follow-up rate**
 $= 100 * (\text{number of persons with RB100=1 \& RB250=11,12,13 \& RB010=2006} / \text{number of persons with RB100=1 \& RB110<5 \& RB010=2006})$
 $= 100 * (5565/5687)$
 $= 97.9\%$
 - **Achieved sample size ratio**
 $= \text{number of persons with RB250=11,12,13 \& RB010=2006} / \text{number of persons RB250=11,12,13 \& RB010=2005}$
 $= 5584/6246$
 $= 0.89$
 - **Response rate for non-sample persons**

= number of persons aged 16+ and with RB100=2 & RB250=11,12,13 & RB010=2006 / number of persons aged 16+ and with RB100=2 & RB010=2006
 =19/19
 =1

2.3.3.3 Distribution of households by households status, record of contact at address, household questionnaire result and household interview acceptance

Household status: wave 2005

	Frequency	Percent
New address added to the sample this wave or first wave	3846	100.0

Contact at address: wave 2005

	Frequency	Percent
Address contacted	3511	91.3
Address cannot be located	151	3.9
Address unable to access	146	3.8
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principle residence	38	1.0
Total	3846	100.0

Household questionnaire result: wave 2005

	Frequency	Percentage of total	Percentage of sub-total
Household questionnaire completed	2613	67.9	74.4
Refusal to co-operate	386	10.0	11.0
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork	129	3.4	3.7
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity...)	71	1.8	2.0
Other reasons	312	8.1	8.9
Sub-total	3511	91.3	100.0
Not applicable (DB120 not = 11 or DB110 not = 1)	335	8.7	
Total	3846	100.0	

Household interview acceptance: wave 2005

	Frequency	Percent
Interview accepted for database	2613	67.9
Not applicable (DB130 not = 11)	1233	32.1
Total	3846	100.0

Household status: wave 2006

	Frequency	Percent
At the same address as last interview	2507	94.3
Entire household moved to a private household within the country	27	1.0

Entire household moved to a collective household or institution within the country	2	0.1
Household moved outside the country	2	0.1
Entire household died	3	0.1
Household unable to access (due for example to climatic conditions)	50	1.9
Split-off household	45	1.7
Lost household (no information on record on what happened to the household)	22	0.8
Total	2658	100.0

Contact at address: wave 2006

	Frequency	Percentage of total	Percentage of sub-total
Address contacted	57	2.1	79.2
Address cannot be located	14	0.5	19.4
Address does not exist or is non-residential address or is unoccupied or not principle residence	1	0.0	1.4
Sub-total	72	2.7	100.0
Not applicable (DB110 not = 2, 8 or 9)	2586	97.3	
Total	2658	100.0	

Household questionnaire result: wave 2006

	Frequency	Percentage of total	Percentage of sub-total
Household questionnaire completed	2365	89.0	92.2
Refusal to co-operate	153	5.8	6.0
Entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork	11	0.4	0.4
Household unable to respond (illness, incapacity...)	13	0.5	0.5
Other reasons	22	0.8	0.9
Sub-total	2564	96.5	100.0
Not applicable (DB120 not = 11 or DB110 not = 1)	94	3.5	
Total	2658	100.0	

Household interview acceptance: wave 2006

	Frequency	Percent
Interview accepted for database	2365	89.0
Not applicable (DB130 not = 11)	293	11.0
Total	2658	100.0

2.3.3.4 Distribution of persons by membership status

Membership status: wave 2005

	Frequency	Percent
Was in this household in previous waves or current household member	7780	100.0

Membership status: wave 2006

	Frequency	Percent
Was in this household in previous waves or current household member	6766	96.7
Moved into this household from another sample household since previous way	27	0.4
Moved into this household from outside sample since previous wave	55	0.8
Newly born into this household since last wave	45	0.6
Moved out since previous wave or last interview if not contacted in previous wave	79	1.1
Died	24	0.3
Total	6996	100.0

2.3.3.5 Item non-response

The following tables summarize item non-response for income variables as collected in the cross-sectional component:

		Households having a positive amount		Households having a negative amount		Of which (before imputation)...					
						Full Information		Partial Information		Missing values	
		No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%**	No.	%**	No.	%**
Total household income											
Total household gross income	HY010	3,491	99.9	3	0.1	2,658	76.1	829	23.7	7	0.2
Total disposable household income	HY020	3,489	99.9	5	0.1	1,160	33.2	2,327	66.6	7	0.2
Total disposable household income before social transfers except old age and survivors' benefits	HY022	3,485	99.7	9	0.3	1,165	33.3	2,291	65.5	43	1.2
Total disposable household income before social transfers including old age and survivors' benefits	HY023	3,474	99.4	20	0.6	1,165	33.3	2,182	62.4	147	4.2
Gross income components at household level											
Income from rental of property or land	HY040G	149	4.3	0	0.0	144	96.6	0	0.0	5	3.4
Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in	HY090G	3,493	100.0	0	0.0	3,002	85.9	0	0.0	491	14.1

unincorporated business											
Family/Children related allowances	HY050G	980	28.0	0	0.0	980	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Social exclusion not elsewhere classified	HY060G	788	22.6	0	0.0	788	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Housing allowances	HY070G	166	4.8	0	0.0	157	94.6	0	0.0	9	5.4
Regular inter-household cash transfer received	HY080G	36	1.0	0	0.0	32	88.9	0	0.0	4	11.1
Interest repayments on mortgage	HY100G	430	12.3	0	0.0	424	98.6	0	0.0	6	1.4
Income received by people aged under 16	HY110G	22	0.6	0	0.0	21	95.5	0	0.0	1	4.5
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid	HY130G	57	1.6	0	0.0	52	91.2	0	0.0	5	8.8

Note:

* percentages are out of the total number of households for which the interview was accepted for the database i.e. 3,494

** percentages are out of the total number of households having received an amount (positive or negative) for that household income variable

		Persons 16+ having a positive amount		Persons 16+ having a negative amount		Of which (before imputation)...					
						Full Information		Partial Information		Missing values	
		No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%**	No.	%**	No.	%**
Gross income components at personal level											
Gross employee cash or near cash income	PY010G	3,363	40.5	0	0.0	3,124	92.9	0	0.0	239	7.1
Gross non-cash employee income	PY020G	162	2.0	0	0.0	162	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Contributions to individual private pension plans	PY035G	335	4.0	0	0.0	325	97.0	0	0.0	10	3.0
Cash benefits or losses from self-employment	PY050G	492	5.9	11	0.1	287	57.1	153	30.4	63	12.5
Pension from individual private plans	PY080G	45	0.5	0	0.0	44	97.8	0	0.0	1	2.2
Unemployment	PY090G	174	2.1	0	0.0	174	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

benefits											
Old-age benefits	PY100G	1,692	20.4	0	0.0	1,692	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Survivors' benefits	PY110G	63	0.8	0	0.0	63	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sickness benefits	PY120G	561	6.8	0	0.0	561	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Disability benefits	PY130G	295	3.6	0	0.0	295	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Education-related allowances	PY140G	347	4.2	0	0.0	339	97.7	0	0.0	8	2.3

Note:

* percentages are out of the total number of respondents (aged 16+) for which the interview was accepted for the database i.e. 8,300

** percentages are out of the total number of respondents (aged 16+) having received an amount (positive or negative) for that household income variable

2.4 Mode of data collection

The following is a distribution of the sample cases (persons aged 16 and over) according to type of interview for each wave of the longitudinal component:

Type of Interview: wave 2005

	Sample persons (16+)		
	Count	% of total	% of sub-total
Face to face interview - PAPI	505	8.1	8.1
Face to face interview - CAPI	3883	62.2	62.6
Proxy interview	1814	29.0	29.2
Sub-total	6202	99.3	100.0
Missing	44	0.7	
Total	6246	100.0	

Type of Interview: wave 2006

	Sample persons (16+)			Co-residents (16+)			Total		
	Count	% of total	% of sub-total	Count	% of total	% of sub-total	Count	% of total	% of sub-total
Face to face interview - CAPI	3613	64.9	65.5	14	73.7	73.7	3627	65.0	65.5
Proxy interview	1902	34.2	34.5	5	26.3	26.3	1907	34.2	34.5
Sub-total	5515	99.1	100.0	19	100.0	100.0	5534	99.1	100.0
Missing	50	0.9		0	0.0		50	0.9	
Total	5565	100.0		19	100.0		5584	100.0	

All information was completed only from interviews i.e. no registers were used. Interviewees who could not be present during the interview were asked to leave appropriate documentation related to their income (e.g. payslips, tax returns, etc.) with the person who was responding on their behalf. This served to minimize the errors committed during the proxy interviewing stage. Moreover, many of the income components (mainly social benefits) have been taken from registers – this has helped to further reduce considerably many of the errors related to under-reporting of income that may be attributed to proxy interviews.

2.5 Imputation procedure

Item-non response in essential variables was tackled through estimations by means of auxiliary variables and the use of register information where available.

Given the nature of the questionnaire's content, a certain amount of item non-response was expected in questions related to income. Consequently one of the preventive measures taken whilst compiling the questionnaire was to include some questions giving respondents a possibility to select one of a number of income brackets so as to give an indication of the amount. This alternative was only offered as an option when respondents showed reluctance to answer a particular income-related question. Once a particular bracket was selected, the amount was then estimated to be equal to the mean value for that income bracket. The questions for which ranges were offered were those on tax adjustments, income from self-employment, income from interests and dividends and profit from property rental.

Missing income for employees who only gave information on the amount of tax paid was estimated using the tax band register.

2.6 Imputed rent

Since data on imputed rent will only be mandatory as from 2007, Malta has not collected information on this variable as yet.

2.7 Company cars

Insurance registers were used to estimate the non-cash employee income component related to the provision of a company car, van or other vehicle that was available for private use. The value can be estimated if the vehicle's make, model and year of registration are known. In fact these variables were collected through the SILC questionnaire.

3. Comparability

The following sections highlight any minor departures in definitions of national concepts from standard EU-SILC concepts. However, as much as possible, and for the sake of comparability, we have ensured that most national concepts coincide with EU-SILC concepts.

3.1 Basic concepts and definitions

Reference population

No departure from the common definition i.e. the reference population is composed of all private households and their current members residing in Malta at the time of data collection. Persons living in institutions are excluded from the target population.

Private household definition

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

Household membership

A person is a household member if s/he is usually resident in that particular dwelling and shares in household expenses. Persons who are temporarily absent for reasons of holiday, travel, work, health, education or similar are included as long as the persons do not intend to stay away for more than 6 months.

Income reference period

The income reference period was calendar year 2005.

Tax on income and social insurance contributions reference period

The tax on income and social insurance contributions reference period was the same as the income reference period i.e. calendar year 2005.

Taxes on wealth reference period

The variable on regular taxes on wealth is not applicable for Malta.

Lag between income reference period and current variables

The data collection was carried out between 1st June and 24th October 2006. Thus the lag between income reference period and current variables spans between 5 and 10

months, depending on the date of interview for each household. We did not succeed in limiting the interval to 8 months due to practical problems in data collection.

Total duration of data collection of the sample

As mentioned above, data collection was carried out between 1st June and 24th October 2006. Consequently the total duration of data collection of the sample exceeded 4 months in the case of 2 households only.

Basic information on activities status during the income reference period

This information was collected through the inclusion of a question in the questionnaire that requested the respondents' activity status for every month of the income reference period i.e. calendar year 2005.

3.2 Components of income

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

For the following income components, the same definitions as standard EU-SILC were used:

- Total household gross income
- Total disposable household income
- Total disposable household income before social transfers except old-age and survivors' benefits
- Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivors' benefits
- Income from rental of property or land
- Family/children related allowances
- Social exclusion not elsewhere classified
- Housing allowances
- Regular inter-household cash transfer received
- Interest, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business
- Interest paid on mortgage
- Income received by people aged under 16
- Regular inter-household cash transfer paid
- Tax on income and social insurance contributions
- Employee cash or near cash income
- Non-cash employee income (in 2006 this only incorporated company car)
- Cash benefits or losses from self-employment (including royalties)
- Unemployment benefits
- Old-age benefits
- Survivors' benefits

- Sickness benefits
- Disability benefits
- Education-related allowances

The following income components have not been collected for reasons specified below:

Imputed rent

Since data on imputed rent will only be mandatory as from 2007, Malta has not collected information on this variable as yet.

Regular taxes on wealth

The variable on regular taxes on wealth is not applicable for Malta.

Employers' social insurance contributions

Since data on employers' social insurance contributions will only be recorded from 2007 (depending on a feasibility study), Malta has not collected information on this variable as yet.

Repayments/receipts for tax adjustments

Since Malta has collected a combination of gross and net values for income components, the tax adjustments are included under the variable on tax on income and social contributions.

Value of goods for own consumption

Since data on goods for own consumption will only be mandatory as from 2007, Malta has not collected information on this variable as yet.

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

All information was collected from interviews. However, this year the NSO obtained the SABS database (System of Social Assistance and Benefits) from the Ministry for Family and Social Solidarity (MFSS), covering the same reference period as EU-SILC. This database contains details of all persons receiving some form of social benefit at micro-level. Benefits and social assistance were provided broken down by individual benefit as defined by the MFSS and these were then merged by the NSO according to Eurostat definitions.

An exercise was carried out to check the feasibility of using the SABS database as an alternative to the data collected through interviews. This was possible by using the ID

number of each respondent to link the SABS database to data collected from EU-SILC. It was concluded that SABS data is more reliable due to the fact that a certain amount of bias exists in data collected from respondents; for example under-reporting due to the fact the respondents forget to include small amounts received through benefits. In future EU-SILC surveys the SABS database will be used as the source for data on benefits in favour of data collected through interviews.

Social benefits that will be obtained from the SABS database are:

- PY090G – unemployment benefits
- PY100G – old-age benefits
- PY110G – survivor’s benefits
- PY120G – sickness benefits
- PY130G – disability benefits
- HY050G – family / children related allowances
- HY060G – social exclusion not elsewhere classified

PY140G, education related-allowances, is the only variable not available in the SABS database, so this will continue to be collected from interviews.

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

Information on income was collected through a number of sub-questions for each income component as follows:

1. Number of payments during the 12 months
2. Gross income at each payment
3. Net income at each payment
4. Tax paid per payment received
5. National Insurance paid per payment received

Preceding these sub-divisions was a note specifying that the income reference period was 2005, and a description of the specific income component being treated in each question. A response was expected only for one of sub-divisions 2 (gross income at each payment) and 3 (net income at each payment). Preference for the collection of information on gross income (rather than net) was expressed during briefing sessions for interviewers and was also implied through the choice of ordering of the sub-questions mentioned above.

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

As stated previously, it was stressed during briefing sessions that collection of gross rather than net income was preferred. However, in some cases only the net income was available from the household. In order to convert these values, a table was obtained from the Department of Inland Revenue showing gross income values

corresponding to net income values. In this way the relevant gross value for income could be obtained.

3.3 Tracing rules

The EU-SILC tracing rules have been implemented in the tracing procedure. In an attempt to facilitate this procedure the questionnaire incorporates a question that asks about the intention or expectation to move house in the 12 months following the interview.

4. Coherence

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

The variables collected from EU-SILC were compared to a number of other data for benchmarking purposes. This data was mainly collected by the NSO itself, and included sources such as National Accounts, Labour Force Survey and Government Finance data. Annual figures held at the Inland Revenue department were also used to verify income from employment, interests and dividends.

4.2 Other comments

In this year’s EU-SILC, there were three major methodological changes from the 2004 EU-SILC data collection. These were:

1. When weighting, it was possible to use population data obtained from the 2005 census, as opposed to the updated 1995 census which was used previously.
2. Calibration techniques were applied which made inference of the sample over the 2005 population possible.
3. The use of the SABS database as described above means that social benefits are no longer subject to under-coverage.

These three changes have caused considerable differences in the indicators derived from EU-SILC 2005. It was therefore decided to apply these modifications on SILC 2005 as well. Revised datasets and results from SILC 2005 have been sent to Eurostat together with SILC 2006 data.

4.3 Revisions

From the date of first submission of 2006 cross-sectional data-files to Eurostat, we have had to revise these datasets and consequently resubmit new, revised files. There are two reasons behind these revisions.

As a result of the incorporation of register data for social benefits for the first time in SILC 2006, the under-reporting that is characteristic of self-employment income became further emphasized. Consequently the necessity for revisions was felt.

At a later stage we identified a minor component that was in our social benefits register but had erroneously not been included in the SILC data-files. This component consisted of part of the government bonus on social benefits. Although this did not affect our data much, the datasets were revised once again for the sake of completion.