

**CENTRAL STATISTICAL OFFICE OF POLAND**

**FINAL QUALITY REPORT**

**ACTION ENTITLED:  
*EU-SILC 2009***

Warsaw, May 2012

**CONTENTS**

**Page**

**PREFACE ..... 3**

**1. COMMON LONGITUDINAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS ..... 4**

**2. ACCURACY..... 4**

2.1. Sample design ..... 4

2.1.1. *Type of sampling design*..... 4

2.1.2. *Sampling units*..... 4

2.1.3. *Stratification and substratification criteria*..... 5

2.1.4. *Sample size and allocation criteria*..... 5

2.1.5. *Sample selection schemes*..... 5

2.1.6. *Sample distribution over time* ..... 5

2.1.7. *Renewal of sample: rotational groups* ..... 5

2.1.8. *Weightings*..... 6

2.1.9. *Substitutions* ..... 10

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*..... 16

2.3.3. *Non-response errors*..... 17

2.4. Mode of data collection..... 34

2.5. Imputation procedure ..... 37

2.6. Imputed rent ..... 41

2.7. Company cars..... 43

**3. COMPARABILITY ..... 43**

3.1. Basic concepts and definitions ..... 43

3.2. Components of income..... 46

3.2.1. *Differences between the national definitions and standard EU-SILC definitions* ..... 46

3.2.2. *The source or procedure used for the collection of income variables*..... 48

3.2.3. *The form in which income variables at component level have been obtained*..... 48

3.2.4. *The method used for obtaining income target variables in the required form* ..... 48

3.3. Tracing rules..... 48

**4. COHERENCE ..... 49**

4.1. Comparison of EU-SILC and HBS results..... 49

4.2. Comparison of income data from SNA for the household sector and EU-SILC ..... 52

## **PREFACE**

This quality report is the final quality report on EU-SILC 2009 carried out in Poland as provided for in Council Regulation No 1177/2003. It follows the structure outlined in Commission Regulation No. 28/2004. This report provides information on accuracy, comparability and coherence of data with external sources.

The indicator on persistence of poverty, which is presented in the context of EU-SILC, was calculated using the longitudinal rotation 2006-2009.

## 1. COMMON LONGITUDINAL EUROPEAN UNION INDICATORS

Persistent-at-risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender (60% median)			
No.	Age	Gender	(%)
1	Total (AGE ≥ 0)	T	10.20
2		M	10.35
3		F	10.06
4	(0 ≤ AGE ≤ 17)	T	15.79
5	(18 ≤ AGE ≤ 64)	T	9.79
6		M	10.01
7		F	9.58
8	(AGE ≥ 65)	T	5.51
9		M	4.21
10		F	6.27

Persistent-at-risk-of-poverty rate by age and gender (50% median)			
No.	Age	Gender	(%)
1	Total (AGE ≥ 0)	T	5.07
2		M	5.31
3		F	4.85
4	(0 ≤ AGE ≤ 17)	T	8.39
5	(18 ≤ AGE ≤ 64)	T	4.94
6		M	5.10
7		F	4.78
8	(AGE ≥ 65)	T	1.80
9		M	1.90
10		F	1.74

## 2. ACCURACY

### 2.1. Sample design

#### 2.1.1. Type of sampling design

The two-stage sampling scheme with diversified selection probabilities at the first stage was used. Prior to selection, sampling units were stratified.

#### 2.1.2. Sampling units

The first-stage primary sampling units (PSUs) were census areas, while at the second stage dwellings were selected.

### ***2.1.3. Stratification and substratification criteria***

The strata were the voivodships (NUTS2), while within voivodships primary sampling units were classified by class of locality. In urban areas census enumeration areas were grouped by size of town, but in the five largest cities districts were treated as strata. In rural areas strata were represented by rural gminas (NUTS5) of a subregion (NUTS3) or of a few neighbouring poviats (NUTS4). Altogether 211 strata were distinguished.

### ***2.1.4. Sample size and allocation criteria***

It was decided that the sample should include some 24 000 dwellings. Proportional allocation of dwellings to particular strata was applied. The number of dwellings selected from a particular stratum was in proportion to the total number of dwellings in the stratum. Furthermore, the number of the first-stage units selected from the strata was obtained by dividing the number of dwellings in the sample by the number of dwellings determined for a given class of locality to be selected from the first-stage unit. In towns with over 100 000 population 3 dwellings per PSU were selected, in towns with 20-100 thousand population – 4 dwellings per PSU, in towns with less than 20 000 population – 5 dwellings per PSU, respectively. In rural areas 6 dwellings from each PSU were selected. Altogether 5912 census areas and 24044 dwellings were selected for the sample. The subsample 5 was selected for the survey in 2006 in order to replace the subsample 1. It consisted of 1476 census areas and 6002 dwellings. For the cross-sectional component of the survey conducted in 2007 a new subsample (the subsample 6) was selected. It replaced the subsample 2, and consisted of 1487 PSUs and 6008 dwellings. For the cross-sectional component of the survey conducted in 2008 the subsample 7 was selected. It replaced the subsample 3, and consisted of 1479 PSUs and 6016 dwellings.

For the cross-sectional component of the survey conducted in 2009 the subsample 8 was selected. It replaced the subsample 4, and consisted of 1479 PSUs and 6017 dwellings.

The subsample 5 formed the four year longitudinal (panel) component.

In official cross-sectional and longitudinal data for EU-SILC 2009 operation the following coding was used: variable DB075 (rotation group) equals 1 for subsample 5, 2 for subsample 6, 3 for subsample 7, and 4 for subsample 8.

### ***2.1.5. Sample selection schemes***

Census areas were selected according to the Hartley-Rao scheme. Prior to selection, census areas were put in a random order, for each stratum separately and then the required number of PSUs was selected with probabilities proportionate to the number of dwellings. Next, in each of the census areas belonging to the PSU sample, dwellings were selected using the simple random selection procedure.

### ***2.1.6. Sample distribution over time***

The sample is not distributed over time.

### 2.1.7. Renewal of sample: rotational groups

The selected sample of first-stage units was divided into four subsamples, equal in size. Starting from 2006 one of the subsamples was eliminated and replaced with another one, selected independently as described above. For the 2006 survey the subsample 5 was selected as a replacement of the subsample 1. Then, for the 2007 survey the subsample 6 was selected to replace the subsample 2, for the 2008 survey the subsample 7 was selected to replace the subsample 3, and for the 2009 survey the subsample 8 was selected to replace the subsample 4. Rotation comprised first-stage units.

### 2.1.8. Weightings

#### Design factor

Design factor – DB080 is equal to the dwelling sampling fraction reciprocal in the h-th stratum i.e.

$$f_h = \frac{n_h * m'_h}{M_h},$$

$$DB080 = \frac{1}{f_h}$$

where:

$n_h$  - number of PSUs selected from the h-th stratum,

$m'_h$  - number of dwellings selected from PSUs in the h-th stratum,

$M_h$  – number of dwellings in the h-th stratum.

#### Non-response adjustment

DB080 weights were then adjusted with the use of the completeness indicator, estimated for each class of locality separately:

Code of class of locality (p)	Class of locality	Completeness rate (Ra <sub>p</sub> *Rh <sub>p</sub> )
	Poland	0.612
1	Warsaw	0.382
2	Towns 500 000 – 1 000 000 inhabitants	0.443
3	Towns 100 000 – 500 000 inhabitants	0.556
4	Towns 20 000 – 100 000 inhabitants	0.605
5	Towns less than 20 000 inhabitants	0.666
6	Rural areas	0.730

The adjusted weights were calculated according to the formula:

$$DB080_p^{corrected} = \frac{DB080_p}{Ra_p * Rh_p},$$

The weights DB080 and DB080<sup>corrected</sup> were calculated for the subsample 8. The next step consisted in calculating the weights DB090 and RB050 for the households of the subsample 8 with the use of the integrated calibration method as described below in the section “Adjustments to external data”.

### Adjustments to external data

With the use of the integrated calibration method (in its hyperbolic sinus version) weights were calculated for individuals and for households simultaneously. To do this, the following information about households was used: 4 size categories (1-person, 2-person, 3-person and 4- and more person households) and number of persons by age and gender (14 age groups: under 16, 16-19 years, then eleven 5-year groups, 75 years and over). The data at the level of NUTS2, additionally classified by urban/rural areas, were derived from the 2002 Census and current demographic estimates.

### Final longitudinal weight

For the subsamples 3, 4 and 5, surveyed for the second time, the base weights were determined by the correction of the base weights from the previous year. The base weight of 2006 is equal to RB050 multiplied by 4. This weight was then adjusted by non-response and households’ and individuals’ falling out of the population surveyed. The calculations were performed on the subsets of the so called *sample persons* i.e. those who were at the age of 14 and over when participating in the surveyed sample in 2006 and who should be surveyed in 2007. The modifying factor was determined for each subsample (3, 4 and 5) separately according to the class of locality and took the form:

$$\frac{R(1)_p - M}{R(2)_p}$$

where:

$R(t)_p$  – estimated number of respondents belonging to the “*sample person*” group in the p-th class of locality in the subsample surveyed for the t-th time (t = 1, 2),

$M$  – estimated number of “*sample persons*” who belonged to the surveyed population in the first year and in the next year were out of the survey scope.

The base weights of 2006 were used for the calculation of numerator and denominator. The above expression is the reciprocal of the empirical estimate of probability that a given person will be interviewed again in the second year of the survey.

In the second stage of the base weight calculation for the second year of the survey children of “sample persons” received the weights of mothers and “co-residents’ i.e. additional persons included in the household surveyed were ascribed zero weights. Then the respondents’ weights were averaged and all the members of a given household were ascribed such a mean weight. To the base weights thus obtained the trimming of extreme weights was applied. Adjustment to external data was not made. The panel weight RB062 was calculated by dividing the base weights by 3.

Non-response adjustments – subsequent waves

*Third wave*

For the subsamples 4 and 5 surveyed for the third time and the subsample 6 surveyed for the second time the base weights were determined by the correction of the base weights from the previous year.

For the subsample 6 the following method was applied:

The base weight of 2007 is equal to RB050 multiplied by 4. This weight was then adjusted by non-response and households’ and individuals’ falling out of the population surveyed. The calculations were made on the subsamples of the so called sample persons i.e. those who were at the age of 14 and over when participating in the surveyed sample in 2007 and who should be surveyed in 2008. The modifying factor was determined according to the class of locality and took the form:

$$\frac{R(1)_p - M}{R(2)_p}$$

where:

$R(t)_p$  – estimated number of respondents belonging to the sample person group in the p-th class of locality in the subsample surveyed for the t-th time,

$M$  – estimated number of sample persons who belonged to the surveyed population in the first year and in the next year were out of the survey scope.

The base weights of 2007 were used for the calculation of numerator and denominator. The above expression is the reciprocal of the empirical estimate of probability that a given person will be interviewed again in the second year of the survey. In the second stage of the base weight calculation for the second year of the survey children of “sample persons” received the weights of mothers and “co-residents’ i.e. additional persons included in the household surveyed were ascribed zero weights.

For the subsamples 4 and 5 (surveyed for the third time) the algorithm based on the method described for the subsample 5 was used. Additionally, re-entries, i.e. persons who were surveyed in 2006, not surveyed in 2007, and surveyed in 2008 again, were taken into account. The base weights for such persons were computed by the correction of base weights from 2006 on the data for 2006 and 2008 (with no data for 2007). The inclusion of re-entries in the subsamples surveyed in 2008 made it necessary to additionally correct the base weights for the persons surveyed in the three successive years. Coefficients of these corrections were computed separately according to the class of locality as ratios between the weighted number of respondents surveyed in all the three years and the weighted number of respondents in the last year of survey (i.e. with re-entries); the weight used in these calculations was the weight RB050 for 2006.

The last stage of the base weight calculation for the third year of the survey consisted in receiving weights of mothers by children of “sample persons” and zero weights by “co-residents” i.e. additional persons included in the households.

#### *Fourth wave*

For the subsample 5 surveyed for the fourth time, the subsample 6 surveyed for the third time, and the subsample 7 surveyed for the second time, the base weights were determined by the correction of the base weights from the previous year.

For the subsample 7 the following method was used:

The base weight of 2008 is equal to RB050 multiplied by 4. This weight was then adjusted by non-response and households’ and individuals’ falling out of the population surveyed. The calculations were made on the subsamples of the so called sample persons i.e. those who were at the age of 14 and over when participating in the surveyed sample in 2008 and who should be surveyed in 2009. The modifying factor was determined according to the class of locality and took the form:

$$\frac{R(1)_p - M}{R(2)_p}$$

where:

$R(t)_p$  – estimated number of respondents belonging to the sample person group in the p-th class of locality in the subsample surveyed for the t-th time,

$M$  – estimated number of sample persons who belonged to the surveyed population in the first year and in the next year were out of the survey scope.

The base weights of 2008 were used for the calculation of numerator and denominator. The above expression is the reciprocal of the empirical estimate of probability that a given person will be interviewed again in the second year of the survey. In the second stage of the base weight calculation for the second year of the survey children of “sample persons” received the weights of mothers and “co-residents” i.e. additional persons included in the household surveyed were ascribed zero weights.

For the subsamples 5 and 6 (surveyed for the fourth and third time respectively) the algorithm based on the method described for the subsample 7 was used. Additionally, re-entries, i.e. persons who were surveyed in 2007, not surveyed in 2008, and surveyed in 2009 again, were taken into account. The base weights for such persons were computed by the correction of the base weights from 2007 on the data for 2007 and 2009 (with no data for 2008). The inclusion of re-entries in the subsamples surveyed in 2009 brought about the necessity to additionally correct the base weights for persons surveyed in the three successive years. Coefficients of these corrections were computed separately according to the class of locality as ratios between the weighted number of respondents surveyed in all the three years and the weighted number of respondents in the last year of the survey (i.e. with re-entries); the weight used in these calculations was the weight RB050 for 2007.

#### Adjustments to external data

Adjustment to external data was not applied.

#### Final longitudinal weight

The panel weight RB062 was calculated:

- 1) by taking the base weights for subsamples 5, 6 and 7,
- 2) by giving a zero value to people not present in the two waves (like for example the newly born),
- 3) by dividing the obtained weights by 3.

The panel weight RB063 was calculated with a similar procedure, that is:

- 1) by taking the base weights for subsamples 5 and 6,
- 2) by giving a zero value to people not present in the three waves,
- 3) by dividing the obtained weights by 2.

The panel weight RB064 was also calculated with a similar procedure, that is:

- 1) by taking the base weights for the subsample 5,
- 2) by giving a zero value to people not present in the four waves.

#### Final household cross-sectional weight

The last stage of calculations consisted in combining the four independent subsamples, applying the integrated calibration and trimming of extreme weights. As a result the following cross-sectional weights were calculated for households and individuals from the samples 2, 3, 4 and 5 in EU-SILC 2006:

DB090 – weight for households,

RB050 – weight for all household members but

$RB050_{ij} = DB090_i$

where:

i – household number,

j – person number in the i-th household.

PB040 – weight for respondents at the age of 16 and over who had individual interviews. This weight is obtained by the adjustment of RB050 separately in the groups according to gender and age in each voivodship by urban and rural area,

RL070 – weight for children at the age of 0–12 years. It is obtained by the adjustment of RB050 weight in 26 groups, i.e. 13 years of birth and gender.

Final cross-sectional weights for EU-SILC 2007 were calculated in a similar way for households and individuals from the samples 3, 4, 5 and 6. This is documented in the EU-SILC 2007 Intermediate Quality Report.

Final cross-sectional weights for EU-SILC 2008 were calculated in a similar way for households and individuals from the samples 4, 5, 6 and 7. This is documented in the EU-SILC 2008 Intermediate Quality Report.

Final cross-sectional weights for EU-SILC 2009 were calculated in a similar way for households and individuals from the samples 5, 6, 7 and 8. This is documented in the EU-SILC 2008 Intermediate Quality Report.

### ***2.1.9. Substitutions***

No substitution was applied if the household did not enter the survey.

## 2.2. Sampling errors

### *Standard error and effective sample size*

Estimation of standard errors was based on the resampling approach. We used a bootstrap method which resamples 500 times from each stratum  $n_h - 1$  PSUs (primary sampling units) with replacement (McCarthy and Snowden method (1985)), where  $n_h$  the number of PSUs selected for the sample size selected from each PSUs in the  $h$ th stratum. After resampling the original weights were properly rescaled and bootstrap variance estimate of the corresponding indicator was obtained by the usual Monte Carlo approximation based on the independent bootstrap replicates. Computations were carried out using SAS software. Additionally, we implemented the linearization method of variance estimation for the main poverty indicators, and the results were similar to those obtained with the bootstrap method.

### *Cross-sectional component*

**The mean, the total number of observations (before and after imputation) and the standard errors for the following income components**

Income components	Mean <sup>1</sup>	Standard error	Mean <sup>2</sup>	Standard error	Number of observations	
					Before imputation	After imputation
Total household gross income (HY010)	50304	500	50299	500	4196	13223
Total disposable household income (HY020)	38829	373	38825	372	8797	13223
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits (HY022)	37061	373	36694	372	8821	13097
Total disposable household income including old-age and survivor's benefits (HY023)	31409	425	28070	389	7848	11815
<b>Net income components at household level</b>						
HY040N	8507	1024	139	20	116	190
HY050N	3415	84	562	19	2361	2498
HY060N	2060	98	78	6	506	537
HY070N	1535	52	50	3	393	409
HY080N	5692	238	373	23	696	792
HY090N	6153	1026	150	27	152	286
HY110N	2554	171	69	6	432	453
HY120N	224	4	127	3	0	7613
HY130N	5248	342	261	21	603	648
HY140N	11614	128	11456	128	13066	13066
HY145N	-820	37	-370	17	0	5800

<sup>1</sup> Taking into account only households/persons receiving such income.

<sup>2</sup> Taking into account whole population (households/persons) surveyed.

Income components	Mean <sup>1</sup>	Standard error	Mean <sup>2</sup>	Standard error	Number of observations	
					Before imputation	After imputation
<b>Gross income components at household level</b>						
HY040G	9837	1221	161	24	158	190
HY050G	3550	92	585	20	2231	2498
HY060G	2060	98	78	6	506	537
HY070G	1535	52	50	3	393	409
HY080G	5692	238	373	23	696	792
HY090G	7556	1264	184	33	63	286
HY110G	2717	193	74	7	386	453
HY120G	224	4	127	3	6626	7613
HY130G	5248	342	261	21	603	648
HY140G	11237	132	11086	132	13073	13073
<b>Net income components at personal level</b>						
PY010N	21918	256	10018	137	9737	13114
PY020N	1041	49	161	9	2700	4312
PY035N	2001	88	76	5	991	991
PY050N	15885	567	1522	64	1985	3174
PY080N	27903	6923	3	2	2	2
PY090N	4501	159	114	7	652	816
PY100N	14436	85	3544	54	7709	8645
PY110N	9214	351	102	8	326	385
PY120N	2194	238	12	2	144	173
PY130N	7883	117	454	15	1651	1920
PY140N	2602	178	29	3	286	317
<b>Gross income components at personal level</b>						
PY010G	29609	338	13533	182	4441	13114
PY020G	1041	49	161	9	2700	4312
PY035G	2001	88	76	5	991	991
PY050G	20884	687	2148	84	1641	3420
PY080G	34028	8443	3	3	0	2
PY090G	5208	188	132	8	252	816
PY100G	16756	102	4113	63	4210	8645
PY110G	10575	399	117	9	141	385
PY120G	2527	289	14	2	88	173
PY130G	8980	137	517	17	894	1920
PY140G	2602	178	29	3	286	317
PY200G	2483	24	894	12	26058	28109

**The mean, the number of observations (before and after imputation) and the standard errors for the equivalised disposable income breakdown by sex, age groups and household size**

Equivalised disposable income	Mean <sup>3</sup>	Standard error	Mean <sup>4</sup>	Standard error	Number of observations	
					Before imputation	After imputation
Subclasses by household size						
1 household member	19068	418	19068	418	2130	2522
2 household members	23652	517	23652	517	5466	7408
3 household members	23830	358	23830	358	4767	7977
4 and more	19438	285	19433	285	10961	20634
Population by age group						
<25	19553	265	19551	265	6889	12047
25 to 34	23391	376	23385	375	2736	4936
35 to 44	22621	506	22621	506	2717	4674
45 to 54	21508	251	21497	251	3440	5986
55 to 64	21963	582	21963	582	3410	5207
65+	18517	178	18517	178	4132	5691
Population by sex						
Male	21287	209	21284	209	10957	18401
Female	20768	198	20765	198	12367	20140

*Longitudinal component*

**The mean, the total number of observations (before and after imputation) and the standard errors for the following income components , subsample 5.**

Income components	Mean <sup>5</sup>	Standard error	Mean <sup>6</sup>	Standard error	Number of observations	
					Before imputation	After imputation
Total household gross income (HY010)	50220	967	50220	967	1106	3256
Total disposable household income (HY020)	38852	692	38852	692	2189	3256
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits (HY022)	36966	714	36630	706	2198	3225
Total disposable household income including old-age and survivor's benefits (HY023)	30839	823	27539	784	1973	2924

<sup>3</sup> Taking into account only households/persons receiving such income.

<sup>4</sup> Taking into account whole population (households/persons) surveyed.

<sup>5</sup> Taking into account only households/persons receiving such income.

<sup>6</sup> Taking into account whole population (households/persons) surveyed.

Income components	Mean <sup>5</sup>	Standard error	Mean <sup>6</sup>	Standard error	Number of observations	
					Before imputation	After imputation
<b>Net income components at household level</b>						
HY040N	10020	1600	181	46	30	49
HY050N	3357	154	563	35	622	655
HY060N	1996	223	74	12	125	128
HY070N	1590	108	57	8	102	107
HY080N	5466	374	378	39	180	214
HY090N	5016	1431	109	35	31	56
HY110N	3079	352	99	15	120	122
HY120N	226	8	129	6	0	1895
HY130N	4759	593	256	41	157	169
HY140N	11499	274	11368	274	3220	3220
HY145N	-874	63	-385	29	0	1393
<b>Gross income components at household level</b>						
HY040G	11178	1715	202	50	39	49
HY050G	3467	168	582	38	600	655
HY060G	1996	223	74	12	125	128
HY070G	1590	108	57	8	102	107
HY080G	5466	374	378	39	180	214
HY090G	6161	1766	134	44	9	56
HY110G	3291	398	106	16	107	122
HY120G	226	8	129	6	1685	1895
HY130G	4759	593	256	41	157	169
HY140G	11106	278	10983	277	3222	3222
<b>Net income components at personal level</b>						
PY010N	21918	256	10018	137	2407	3205
PY020N	1041	49	161	9	649	955
PY035N	2001	88	76	5	221	221
PY050N	15885	567	1522	64	468	747
PY080N	27903	6923	3	2	1	1
PY090N	4501	159	114	7	168	194
PY100N	14436	85	3544	54	1933	2134
PY110N	9214	351	102	8	102	111
PY120N	2194	238	12	2	36	41
PY130N	7883	117	454	15	431	497
PY140N	2602	178	29	3	69	76
<b>Gross income components at personal level</b>						
PY010G	29609	338	13533	182	1137	3205
PY020G	1041	49	161	9	649	955
PY035G	2001	88	76	5	221	221
PY050G	20884	687	2148	84	389	809
PY080G	34028	8443	3	3	0	1
PY090G	5208	188	132	8	62	194
PY100G	16756	102	4113	63	1127	2134
PY110G	10575	399	117	9	51	111
PY120G	2527	289	14	2	24	41
PY130G	8980	137	517	17	252	497
PY140G	2602	178	29	3	69	76
PY200G	2483	24	894	12	6450	6962

The mean, the number of observations (before and after imputation) and the standard errors for the equivalised disposable income breakdown by sex, age groups and household size (mean and standard errors based on weighted data, the number of observations based on unweighted results), subsample 5.

Equivalised disposable income	Mean <sup>7</sup>	Standard error	Mean <sup>8</sup>	Standard error	Number of observations	
					Before imputation	After imputation
Subclasses by household size						
1 household member	17560	476	17560	476	569	683
2 household members	24414	948	24414	948	1290	1722
3 household members	23705	633	23705	633	1170	1968
4 and more	19637	534	19637	534	2703	5029
Population by age group						
<25	19600	482	19600	482	1685	2920
25 to 34	24577	993	24577	993	665	1216
35 to 44	22002	783	22002	783	685	1130
45 to 54	22201	557	22201	557	817	1432
55 to 64	21500	609	21500	609	845	1275
65+	18572	341	18572	341	1035	1429
Population by sex						
Male	21562	407	21562	407	2688	4485
Female	20777	350	20777	350	3044	4917

## 2.3. Non-sampling errors

### 2.3.1. Sampling frame and coverage errors

The samples for EU-SILC were selected from the sampling frame based on the TERYT system, i.e. the *Domestic Territorial Division Register*. Two kinds of primary sampling units (PSUs) were distinguished in the sampling frame:

- about 178 000 *CEA* – *census enumeration areas* including about 68 dwellings each,
- about 33 000 *ESD* – *enumeration statistical districts* including about 377 dwellings each.

<sup>7</sup> Taking into account only households/persons receiving such income.

<sup>8</sup> Taking into account whole population (households/persons) surveyed.

The whole territory of Poland is divided into enumeration statistical districts and census enumeration areas. In EU-SILC census enumeration areas are used as primary sampling units. The secondary sampling units are dwellings. For each census enumeration area a list of dwellings was made up to form the secondary sampling frame. All the households from the selected dwellings are supposed to enter the survey.

The TERYT system is updated annually with respect to the territorial division into statistical districts and census enumeration areas. The lists of dwellings, names of towns, villages and streets are updated. Other changes due to new construction, dismantle of buildings and administrative division modifications are also introduced.

In the longitudinal (panel) component consisting of the subsample 5, some 6.2% of dwellings were found to be non-existing (cancelled, changed for non-residential units), uninhabited or temporarily inhabited.

### ***2.3.2. Measurement and processing errors***

Very much like any other statistical survey, EU-SILC may be burdened with non-sampling errors which occur at various stages of the survey and which cannot be eliminated completely. This mainly applies to interviewers' errors at the stage of collecting the information, errors due to the respondents' misunderstanding of questions and inaccurate or sometimes even false answers as well as the errors taking place at the stage of data recording.

For EU-SILC 2006 it is possible to state that about three quarters of respondents (78% of those filling in the household questionnaire and 75% of those filling in the individual questionnaire) showed a favourable attitude towards the survey, while about 3% (both in the case of the household and individual interview) were unwilling towards it. In the interviewers' opinion, in about 88% of questionnaires (both household and individual ones) the quality of non-income data collected could be recognised as good or very good and in 1% - as doubtful.

For EU-SILC 2007 and EU-SILC 2008 the figures were almost the same, about three quarters of respondents (80% of those filling in the household questionnaire and 78% of those filling in the individual questionnaire) showed a favourable attitude towards the survey, while about 3% (both in the case of the household and individual interview) were unwilling towards it. In the interviewers' opinion, in about 89% of questionnaires (both household and individual ones) the quality of non-income data collected could be recognised as good or very good and in 1% - as doubtful.

For EU-SILC 2009 about three quarters of respondents (83% of those filling in the household questionnaire and 81% of those filling in the individual questionnaire) showed a favourable attitude towards the survey, while about 2% (both in the case of the household and individual interview) were unwilling towards it. In the interviewers' opinion, in about 74% of questionnaires (both household and individual ones) the quality of non-income data collected could be recognised as good or very good and in 2% - as doubtful.

The quality of income data in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 was evaluated as slightly worse, mainly because of item non-response. It should also be pointed out that, in our opinion, the quality of data concerning net income categories is much higher than that of gross income. This is due to the fact that non-response was much more frequent for the information on taxes and social and health insurance contributions.

In Poland EU-SILC was carried out in May/June 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. During the years 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 the data collection was performed by a face-to-face interview technique with the use of paper form questionnaires (the so called PAPI method). Two types of questionnaire: individual and household questionnaire were applicable.

The organisation and performance of the survey in the field was within the responsibility of regional statistical offices. Many interviewers were regular employees of the statistical offices and had experience in other social surveys. Survey performance in the field was preceded by a series of trainings organised in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. Regional survey coordinators were instructed by CSO Social Statistics Division staff members and then the regional survey coordinators trained the interviewers at the regional statistical offices. Interviewers' visits to households were preceded by the introductory letter of the CSO President.

The interviewers received written instructions concerning the survey performance. Small gifts were given to the families participating in the survey. Each statistical office chose the type of gift for its respondents.

Data recording and check-up took place in regional statistical offices and was done with the use of Microsoft Visual FoxPro. After all the questionnaires for a given household had been recorded (the identifiers being voivodship number, dwelling number and household number), it was possible to make the household screening which consisted of logical and calculation check-up at the section, inter-section and inter-questionnaire levels. The regional files were then transferred to the CSO Computing Centre and combined to make up the general files at the national level. The national file completeness was also checked with the use of Microsoft Visual FoxPro. Additional check-up was made with SAS checking programmes.

On the basis of overall data files it was possible to create files for Eurostat. Some of the primary target variables could be found directly in the questionnaires, others had to be calculated with the algorithms especially prepared for this purpose.

The tables of EU-SILC results were compiled with the use of: SAS, SPSS, Microsoft Visual FoxPro.

**2.3.3. Non-response errors**

Achieved sample size

subsample 5:

Sample size	wave			
	1	2	3	4
A	4105	3632	3452	3256
B	9452	8396	7936	7401

- A - number of households for which an interview is accepted for the database
- B - number of persons of 16 years or older who are members of the households for which the interview is accepted for the database, and who completed a personal interview

### Unit non-response

wave 1 (subsample 5):

- Household non-response rate  $NRh = [1 - (Ra * Rh)] * 100$ ,  
Ra = 0.992  
Rh = 0.702  
NRh = 30.36
- Individual non-response rates  $NRp = (1 - Rp) * 100$ ,  
Rp = 0.950  
NRp = 5.00
- Overall individual non-response rates  $*NRp = [1 - (Ra * Rh * Rp)] * 100$ ,  
\*NRp = 33.84

Response rate for household:

*Comparison between wave 2 and wave 1 (subsample 5).*

- Wave response rate = 0.884  
(percentage of households successfully interviewed (DB135 = 1) which were passed on to wave  $t$  (from wave  $t-1$ ) or newly created or added during wave  $t$ , excluding those out of scope (under the tracing rules) or non-existent)
- Longitudinal follow-up rate = 0.919  
(percentage of households which are passed on to wave  $t+1$  for follow-up within the households received into wave  $t$  from wave  $t-1$ , excluding those out of scope (under the tracing rules) or non-existent)
- Follow-up rate = 0.925  
(Number of households passed on from wave  $t$  to wave  $t+1$  in comparison to the number of households received for follow-up at wave  $t$  from wave  $t-1$ )
- Achieved samples size ratio = 0.886  
(ratio of the number of households accepted for the database (DB135 = 1) in wave  $t$  to the number of households accepted for the database (DB135 = 1) in wave  $t-1$ )

*Comparison between wave 3 and wave 2 (subsample 5).*

- Wave response rate = 0.926
- Longitudinal follow-up rate = 0.939
- Follow-up rate = 0.952
- Achieved samples size ratio = 0.955

*Comparison between wave 4 and wave 3 (subsample 5).*

- Wave response rate = 0.927
- Longitudinal follow-up rate = 0.946
- Follow-up rate = 0.952
- Achieved samples size ratio = 0.951

Response rate for persons:

*Personal interview response rates in wave 2 (subsample 5).*

- Wave response rate = 0.943  
(percentage of sample persons successfully interviewed (RB250 = 11, 12, 13) among those passed on to wave  $t$  (from wave  $t-1$ ) or newly created or added during wave  $t$ , excluding those out of scope (under the tracing rules).
- Wave response rate of co-residents = 0.000  
(percentage of co-residents selected in wave 1, successfully interviewed (RB250 = 11, 12, 13) among those passed on to wave  $t$  (from wave  $t-1$ ))
- Longitudinal follow-up rate = 0.841  
(percentage of sample persons successfully interviewed (RB250 = 11, 12, 13) in wave  $t$  out of all sample persons selected, excluding those who have died or been found ineligible (out of scope), breakdown by causes of non-response).
- Achieved sample size ratio = 0.886  
(ratio of the number of completed personal interviews (RB250 = 11, 12, 13) in wave  $t$  to the number of completed personal interviews in wave  $t-1$ . This ratio will be defined for sample persons and for all persons, including non-sample persons aged 16+ and for co-residents aged 16+ selected in the first wave).
- Response rate for non-sample persons = 0.875  
(ratio of the number of completed personal interviews (RB250 = 11, 12, 13) of non-sample persons aged 16+ in wave  $t$  to all non-sample persons aged 16+ listed in the households accepted for the database (DB135 = 1) in wave  $t$  or listed in the most recently conducted household interviews for households, which were forwarded from wave  $t-1$  to wave  $t$  for follow-up, but could not be successfully interviewed in wave  $t$ ).

*Personal interview response rates in wave 3 (subsample 5).*

- Wave response rate = 0.941
- Wave response rate of co-residents = 0.000
- Longitudinal follow-up rate = 0.879
- Achieved sample size ratio = 0.932
- Response rate for non-sample persons = 0.754

*Personal interview response rates in wave 4 (subsample 5).*

- Wave response rate = 0.928
- Wave response rate of co-residents = 0.000
- Longitudinal follow-up rate = 0.870
- Achieved samples size ratio = 0.924
- Response rate for non-sample persons = 0.785

*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)*

**Wave 1** (subsample 5).

**Household questionnaire result**

<b>DB130</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	5409	100.0
11 – household questionnaire completed	4105	75.9
21 – refusal to co-operate	1107	20.5
22 – entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork	81	1.5
23 – household unable to respond (illness, incapacity,...)	94	1.7
24 – other reasons	22	0.4
Missing	0	0.0

**Household interview acceptance**

<b>DB135</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	4105	100.0
1 – interview accepted for database	4101	99.9
2 – interview rejected	4	0.1

**Wave 2** (subsample 5).

**Household status**

<b>DB110</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	4135	100.0
1 – at the same address as last interview	3934	95.1
2 – entire household moved to a private household within the country	67	1.6
3 – entire household moved to a collective household or institution within the country	2	0.0
4 – household moved outside the country	8	0.2
5 – entire household died	24	0.6
6 – household does not contain sample persons	0	0.0
7 – address non-contacted (unable to access, lost - no information on record on what happened to the household)	63	1.5
8 – split –off household	34	0.8
10 – fusion	3	0.1

**Record of contact at address**

<b>DB120</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	101	100.0
11 – address contacted	72	71.3
21 – address cannot be located	3	3.0
22 – address unable to access	0	0.0
23 – address does not exist or is non-residential or unoccupied or is not principal residence	26	25.7

**Household questionnaire result**

<b>DB130</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	4006	100.0
11 – household questionnaire completed	3632	90.7
21 – refusal to co-operate	234	5.8
22 – entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork	86	2.1
23 – household unable to respond (illness, incapacity,...)	33	0.8
24 – other reasons	21	0.5
Missing	0	0.0

**Household interview acceptance**

<b>DB135</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Total	3632	100.0
1 – interview accepted for database	3632	100.0
2 – interview rejected	0	0.0

### Wave 3 (subsample 5).

#### Household status

DB110	Total	%
Total	3818	100.0
1 – at the same address as last interview	3620	94.8
2 – entire household moved to a private household within the country	78	2.0
3 – entire household moved to a collective household or institution within the country	2	0.1
4 – household moved outside the country	6	0.2
5 – entire household died	31	0.8
6 – household does not contain sample persons	4	0.1
7 – address non-contacted (unable to access, lost - no information on record on what happened to the household)	1	0.0
8 – split –off household	46	1.2
10 – fusion	1	0.0
11 – lost household	29	0.8

#### Record of contact at address

DB120	Total	%
Total	124	100.0
11 – address contacted	90	72.6
21 – address cannot be located	1	0.8
22 – address unable to access	1	0.8
23 – address does not exist or is non-residential or unoccupied or is not principal residence	32	25.8
Missing	0	0.0

#### Household questionnaire result

DB130	Total	%
Total	3710	100.0
11 – household questionnaire completed	3452	93.0
21 – refusal to co-operate	139	3.7
22 – entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork	77	2.1
23 – household unable to respond (illness, incapacity,...)	28	0.8
24 – other reasons	14	0.4
Missing	0	0.0

#### Household interview acceptance

DB135	Total	%
Total	3452	100.0
1 – interview accepted for database	3452	100.0
2 – interview rejected	0	0.0

## Wave 4 (subsample 5).

### Household status

DB110	Total	%
Total	3556	100.0
1 – at the same address as last interview	3422	96.2
2 – entire household moved to a private household within the country	41	1.2
3 – entire household moved to a collective household or institution within the country	4	0.1
4 – household moved outside the country	14	0.4
5 – entire household died	14	0.4
6 – household does not contain sample persons	2	0.1
7 – Household unable to access (due to for example climatic conditions)	0	0.0
8 – split –off household	24	0.7
10 – fusion	1	0.0
11 – lost household (no information on record on what happened to the household)	34	1.0

### Record of contact at address

DB120	Total	%
Total	65	100.0
11 – address contacted	54	83.1
21 – address cannot be located	0	0.0
22 – address unable to access	1	1.5
23 – address does not exist or is non-residential or unoccupied or is not principal residence	10	15.4

### Household questionnaire result

DB130	Total	%
Total	3476	100.0
11 – household questionnaire completed	3256	93.7
21 – refusal to co-operate	127	3.7
22 – entire household temporarily away for duration of fieldwork	63	1.8
23 – household unable to respond (illness, incapacity,...)	23	0.7
24 – other reasons	7	0.2
Missing	0	0.0

### Household interview acceptance

DB135	Total	%
Total	3256	100.0
1 – interview accepted for database	3256	100.0
2 – interview rejected	0	0.0

*Distribution of persons for membership status (RB110)*

**Wave 2** (subsample 5).

**Distribution of persons for membership status (RB110)**

	Total	Current household members				No current household members		
		RB110=1	RB110=2	RB110=3	RB110=4	RB120 = 2 to 4	RB110=6	RB110=7
Total	11289	10707	40	116	115	130	68	0
%	100.0	94.8	0.4	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.6	0.0

**Distribution of persons moving out by variable RB120.**

	Total	RB110 = 5				
		RB120 = 1		RB120 = 2	RB120 = 3	RB120 = 4
		A	B			
Total	243	40	73	36	73	21
%	100.0	16.5	30.0	14.8	30.0	8.7

A – this person is a current household member in this wave

B - this person is not a current household member

**Wave 3** (subsample 5).

**Distribution of persons for membership status (RB110)**

	Total	Current household members				No current household members		
		RB110=1	RB110=2	RB110=3	RB110=4	RB120 = 2 to 4	RB110=6	RB110=7
Total	10712	10019	99	138	102	122	86	0
%	100.0	93.5	0.9	1.3	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.0

**Distribution of persons moving out by variable RB120.**

	Total	RB110 = 5				
		RB120 = 1		RB120 = 2	RB120 = 3	RB120 = 4
		A	B			
Total	268	99	47	30	73	19
%	100.0	36.9	17.5	11.2	27.3	7.1

A – this person is a current household member in this wave

B - this person is not a current household member

**Wave 4** (subsample 5).

**Distribution of persons for membership status (RB110)**

	Total	Current household members				No current household members		
		RB110=1	RB110=2	RB110=3	RB110=4	RB120 = 2 to 4	RB110=6	RB110=7
Total	9994	9516	36	99	79	102	71	0
%	100.0	95.2	0.4	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.7	0.0

**Distribution of persons moving out by variable RB120.**

	Total	RB110 = 5				
		RB120 = 1		RB120 = 2	RB120 = 3	RB120 = 4
		A	B			
Total	193	36	55	27	56	19
%	100.0	18.7	28.5	14.0	29.0	9.8

A – this person is a current household member in this wave

B - this person is not a current household member

*Item non-response (income variables)*

2006

Item non-response	(A)	(B)	(C)
	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values	% of households with partial information
Total household gross income	40.4	5.8	53.6
Total disposable household income	71.8	4.6	23.5
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits	71.5	6.6	20.4
Total disposable household income before social transfers, including old-age and survivor's benefits	65.6	8.4	16.3
<b>Net income components at household level</b>			
HY040N	1.0	0.2	0.2
HY050N	23.0	0.4	0.2
HY060N	5.7	0.0	0.0
HY070N	5.4	0.1	0.0
HY080N	6.1	0.6	0.0
HY090N	1.0	0.5	0.0
HY110N	4.0	0.0	0.0
HY120N	46.4	5.2	0.0
HY130N	4.9	0.3	0.0
HY140N	39.4	33.2	24.6
HY145N	47.4	2.4	0.1
<b>Gross income components at household level</b>			
HY040G	1.1	0.2	0.0
HY050G	21.9	0.4	1.3
HY060G	5.7	0.0	0.0
HY070G	5.4	0.1	0.0
HY080G	6.1	0.6	0.0
HY090G	0.5	0.5	0.4
HY110G	3.7	0.0	0.3
HY120G	46.4	5.2	0.0
HY130G	4.9	0.3	0.0
HY140G	39.4	32.7	25.4

	<b>% of persons 16+ having received an amount</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with missing values</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with partial information</b>
<b>Net income components at personal level</b>			
PY010N	31.2	7.7	0.0
PY021N	0.1	0.2	0.0
PY035N	2.8	0.7	0.0
PY050N	5.9	2.8	0.4
PY080N	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090N	3.2	0.3	0.0
PY100N	21.6	1.9	0.3
PY110N	1.4	0.1	0.0
PY120N	0.4	0.0	0.0
PY130N	6.1	0.7	0.1
PY140N	1.4	0.1	0.0
<b>Gross income components at personal level</b>			
PY010G	16.0	7.7	15.3
PY021G	0.1	0.2	0.0
PY035G	2.8	0.7	0.0
PY050G	5.1	2.0	3.2
PY080G	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090G	2.0	0.3	1.2
PY100G	15.1	1.9	6.8
PY110G	0.9	0.1	0.5
PY120G	0.2	0.0	0.2
PY130G	4.3	0.7	1.9
PY140G	1.4	0.1	0.0

2007

Item non-response	(A)	(B)	(C)
	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values	% of households with partial information
Total household gross income	35.2	5.5	59.1
Total disposable household income	72.8	5.3	21.8
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits	72.5	7.4	18.5
Total disposable household income before social transfers, including old-age and survivor's benefits	64.7	10.0	14.3
<b>Net income components at household level</b>			
HY040N	0.9	0.2	0.2
HY050N	21.4	0.4	0.4
HY060N	5.1	0.1	0.1
HY070N	4.8	0.1	0.0
HY080N	5.6	0.5	0.0
HY090N	1.2	0.8	0.0
HY100N	1.2	2.2	0.0
HY110N	4.2	0.1	0.0
HY120N	49.7	5.2	0.0
HY130N	4.2	0.3	0.0
HY140N	34.0	38.9	25.0
HY145N	37.1	2.5	0.0
<b>Gross income components at household level</b>			
HY040G	1.1	0.2	0.0
HY050G	20.3	0.4	1.5
HY060G	5.1	0.1	0.1
HY070G	4.8	0.1	0.0
HY080G	5.6	0.5	0.0
HY090G	0.5	0.8	0.7
HY100N	1.2	2.2	0.0
HY110G	3.8	0.1	0.4
HY120G	49.7	5.2	0.0
HY130G	4.2	0.3	0.0
HY140G	33.8	38.1	26.1

	<b>% of persons 16+ having received an amount</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with missing values</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with partial information</b>
<b>Net income components at personal level</b>			
PY010N	31.7	7.9	0.1
PY020N	7.7	2.9	1.0
PY021N	0.2	0.2	0.0
PY035N	2.6	0.7	0.0
PY050N	5.8	2.9	0.3
PY070N	6.1	1.3	0.0
PY080N	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090N	2.5	0.4	0.0
PY100N	22.8	1.9	0.2
PY110N	1.2	0.2	0.0
PY120N	0.4	0.0	0.0
PY130N	5.8	0.6	0.0
PY140N	1.4	0.1	0.0
<b>Gross income components at personal level</b>			
PY010G	15.5	7.9	16.3
PY020N	7.7	2.9	1.0
PY021G	0.2	0.2	0.0
PY030G	0.0	19.8	2.7
PY035G	2.6	0.7	0.0
PY050G	5.8	2.3	2.8
PY070N	6.1	1.3	0.0
PY080G	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090G	1.2	0.4	1.3
PY100G	13.2	1.9	9.8
PY110G	0.6	0.2	0.7
PY120G	0.2	0.0	0.2
PY130G	2.9	0.6	2.9
PY140G	1.4	0.1	0.0

2008

Item non-response	(A)	(B)	(C)
	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values	% of households with partial information
Total household gross income	33.7	7.0	59.1
Total disposable household income	69.3	6.7	23.9
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits	69.4	8.8	20.5
Total disposable household income before social transfers, including old-age and survivor's benefits	62.0	12.2	15.1
<b>Net income components at household level</b>			
HY040N	0.9	0.2	0.3
HY050N	19.4	0.5	0.5
HY060N	4.3	0.2	0.0
HY070N	3.7	0.1	0.0
HY080N	5.0	0.7	0.0
HY081N	2.2	0.2	0.0
HY090N	1.2	0.8	0.0
HY100N	1.2	2.6	0.0
HY110N	3.7	0.1	0.0
HY120N	50.7	5.6	0.0
HY130N	4.4	0.3	0.0
HY131N	1.1	0.1	0.0
HY140N	33.2	41.7	23.4
HY145N	33.8	3.5	0.1
<b>Gross income components at household level</b>			
HY040G	1.1	0.2	0.0
HY050G	18.4	0.5	1.4
HY060G	4.3	0.2	0.0
HY070G	3.7	0.1	0.0
HY080G	5.0	0.7	0.0
HY081G	2.2	0.2	0.0
HY090G	0.5	0.8	0.7
HY100G	1.2	2.6	0.0
HY110G	3.4	0.1	0.4
HY120G	50.7	5.6	0.0
HY130G	4.4	0.3	0.0
HY131G	1.1	0.1	0.0
HY140G	33.0	41.1	24.3

	<b>% of persons 16+ having received an amount</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with missing values</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with partial information</b>
<b>Net income components at personal level</b>			
PY010N	31.0	9.7	0.1
PY020N	8.3	3.3	1.3
PY021N	0.2	0.3	0.0
PY035N	2.5	0.7	0.0
PY050N	6.3	3.0	0.3
PY070N	6.4	1.4	0.0
PY080N	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090N	2.2	0.5	0.0
PY100N	24.0	2.4	0.2
PY110N	1.0	0.2	0.0
PY120N	0.3	0.1	0.0
PY130N	5.4	0.7	0.0
PY140N	0.9	0.1	0.0
<b>Gross income components at personal level</b>			
PY010G	14.3	9.7	16.7
PY020G	8.3	3.3	1.3
PY021G	0.2	0.3	0.0
PY030G	2.5	24.9	0.3
PY031G	2.4	24.6	0.0
PY035G	2.5	0.7	0.0
PY050G	5.4	2.0	3.3
PY070G	6.4	1.4	0.0
PY080G	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090G	1.4	0.5	0.8
PY100G	14.0	2.4	10.2
PY110G	0.4	0.2	0.6
PY120G	0.2	0.1	0.1
PY130G	2.9	0.7	2.5
PY140G	0.9	0.1	0.0

2009

Item non-response	(A)	(B)	(C)
	% of households having received an amount	% of households with missing values	% of households with partial information
Total household gross income	32.3	7.2	60.5
Total disposable household income	66.9	6.4	26.7
Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits	67.1	8.4	23.6
Total disposable household income before social transfers, including old-age and survivor's benefits	59.8	12.3	17.4
<b>Net income components at household level</b>			
HY040N	0.9	0.2	0.3
HY050N	18.4	0.4	0.6
HY060N	3.8	0.2	0.0
HY070N	2.9	0.1	0.0
HY080N	5.2	0.8	0.0
HY081N	2.3	0.2	0.0
HY090N	1.1	0.9	0.0
HY100N	1.4	2.7	0.0
HY110N	3.5	0.1	0.0
HY120N	51.0	6.9	0.0
HY130N	4.7	0.3	0.0
HY131N	0.9	0.1	0.0
HY140N	31.7	43.8	23.3
HY145N	38.2	5.0	0.0
<b>Gross income components at household level</b>			
HY040G	1.2	0.2	0.0
HY050G	17.6	0.4	1.4
HY060G	3.8	0.2	0.0
HY070G	2.9	0.1	0.0
HY080G	5.2	0.8	0.0
HY081G	2.3	0.2	0.0
HY090G	0.4	0.9	0.7
HY100G	1.4	2.7	0.0
HY110G	3.1	0.1	0.4
HY120G	51.0	6.9	0.0
HY130G	4.7	0.3	0.0
HY131G	0.9	0.1	0.0
HY140G	31.4	43.6	23.9

	<b>% of persons 16+ having received an amount</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with missing values</b>	<b>% of persons 16+ with partial information</b>
<b>Net income components at personal level</b>			
PY010N	30.6	10.6	0.1
PY020N	8.5	3.4	1.3
PY021N	0.2	0.2	0.0
PY035N	2.2	0.7	0.0
PY050N	6.3	3.2	0.5
PY070N	7.2	1.4	0.0
PY080N	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090N	2.0	0.5	0.0
PY100N	24.5	2.5	0.4
PY110N	1.1	0.2	0.0
PY120N	0.5	0.1	0.0
PY130N	5.2	0.8	0.0
PY140N	0.9	0.1	0.0
<b>Gross income components at personal level</b>			
PY010G	14.0	10.6	16.6
PY020G	8.5	3.4	1.3
PY021G	0.2	0.2	0.0
PY030G	1.8	26.9	0.3
PY031G	0.4	3.9	0.0
PY035G	2.2	0.7	0.0
PY050G	5.3	2.1	3.4
PY070G	7.2	1.4	0.0
PY080G	0.0	0.0	0.0
PY090G	0.8	0.5	1.2
PY100G	13.6	2.5	11.3
PY110G	0.5	0.2	0.6
PY120G	0.3	0.1	0.2
PY130G	2.9	0.8	2.4
PY140G	0.9	0.1	0.0

## 2.4. Mode of data collection

EU-SILC is a non-obligatory, representative survey of individual households, performed by a face-to-face interview technique with the use of paper form questionnaires (the so called PAPI method). Two types of questionnaire: individual and household questionnaire were applicable.

**Wave 1** (subsample 5).

### Distribution of household members by RB250

#### Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3)

	Total	RB250=11	RB250=14
Total	9951	9452	499
%	100.0	95.0	5.0

### Distribution of household members by RB260

#### Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB250 = 11 or 13)

	Total	RB260 = 1	RB260 = 2	RB260 = 3	RB260 = 4	RB260 = 5
Total	9452	7771	0	0	0	1681
%	100.0	82.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.8

**Wave 2** (subsample 5).

### Distribution of household members by RB250

#### Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3)

	Total	RB250=11	RB250=14
Total	8909	8396	513
%	100.0	94.2	5.8

#### Sample persons 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 1)

	Total	RB250=11	RB250=14
Total	8805	8305	500
%	100.0	94.3	5.7

#### Co-residents 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 2)

	Total	RB250=11	RB250=14
Total	104	91	13
%	100.0	87.5	12.5

*Distribution of household members by RB260*

**Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	8396	6922	0	0	0	1474
%	100.0	82.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.6

**Sample persons 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 1) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	8305	6855	0	0	0	1450
%	100.0	82.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.5

**Co-residents 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 2) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	91	67	0	0	0	24
%	100.0	73.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.4

**Wave 3 (subsample 5).**

*Distribution of household members by RB250*

**Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3)**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB250=11</b>	<b>RB250=14</b>
Total	8463	7936	527
%	100.0	93.8	6.2

**Sample persons 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 1)**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB250=11</b>	<b>RB250=14</b>
Total	8267	7781	486
%	100.0	94.1	5.9

**Co-residents 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 2)**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB250=11</b>	<b>RB250=14</b>
Total	196	155	41
%	100.0	79.1	20.9

*Distribution of household members by RB260*

**Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	7936	6463	0	0	0	1473
%	100.0	81.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.6

**Sample persons 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 1) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	7781	6349	0	0	0	1432
%	100.0	81.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.4

**Co-residents 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 2) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	155	114	0	0	0	41
%	100.0	73.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.5

**Wave 4 (subsample 5).**

*Distribution of household members by RB250*

**Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3)**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB250=11</b>	<b>RB250=14</b>
Total	8005	7401	604
%	100.0	92.5	7.5

**Sample persons 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 1)**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB250=11</b>	<b>RB250=14</b>
Total	7626	7078	548
%	100.0	92.8	7.2

**Co-residents 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 2)**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB250=11</b>	<b>RB250=14</b>
Total	379	323	56
%	100.0	85.2	14.8

### Distribution of household members by RB260

#### **Household members 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	7401	5912	0	0	0	1489
%	100.0	79.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.1

#### **Sample persons 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 1) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	7078	5703	0	0	0	1375
%	100.0	80.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.4

#### **Co-residents 16+ (RB245 = 1 to 3 and RB100 = 2) and RB250 = 11 or 13**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>RB260 = 1</b>	<b>RB260 = 2</b>	<b>RB260 = 3</b>	<b>RB260 = 4</b>	<b>RB260 = 5</b>
Total	323	209	0	0	0	114
%	100.0	64.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.3

As for individual interviews, in 2006, 2007, 2008 and in 2009 a relatively high share (17.8%, 17.6%, 18.6% and 20.1%) of proxy interviews was noted. This was thoroughly discussed with the survey coordinators in the field.

The interviewers decided on proxy interviews only if the substitute respondents were well informed about the situation in the household and there was no other possibility to get the information. Proxy interviews were performed in the following situations:

- no contact with the respondent because of long-term absence (e.g. work in another town or abroad);
- respondent's disability, illness or pathology (such as alcoholism);
- according to other members of the household, the respondent was only available late at night and was not willing to participate in such a long interview, while at the same time the proxy could provide detailed information, sometimes even based on the documents, such as tax statements.

## **2.5. Imputation procedures**

Imputation is aimed at obtaining complete records at the level of target variables. Target variables do not simply reflect questionnaire variables and their calculation algorithm is often complicated, although it principally consists in aggregation. So it is necessary to decide what aggregation level the imputation should take place at. There are three possible options:

- the level of questionnaire variables,
- the level of partly aggregated components,
- the level of ready-calculated target variables.

Since the only formal requirement is to obtain imputed target variables, all the above options are permissible and practicable, depending on the specific character of variables. However, the most frequent practice is the imputation at the level of questionnaire variables. There are certain arguments for this approach, on condition that the quantity of data and calculation algorithm details allow for it without much complication.

First of all, imputation at the lowest aggregation level can be desirable for the principal reasons related to the quality of imputation when:

- a target variable implies components of different nature (i.e. components take different but rather predictable values, e.g. various social benefits, or they depend on different variables and thus they are easier to be modelled separately);
- target variables include many components and it is often the case that some of them have the missing values, while others - the correct values which would be missed during the imputation of an aggregated variable.

Secondly, there are practical arguments for the imputation of disaggregated variables, as the same data serve as a basis for the calculation of national variables differing from the Eurostat's target variables. Thus the imputation of disaggregated components may be required so as to ensure the imputed data needed for other calculations.

The imputation at the target variable level is carried out only when the above circumstances do not occur or when overcoming the practical difficulties is easier than the imputation of disaggregated data.

There are several methods of component imputation. They can be classified as deterministic and stochastic methods. In the case of deterministic methods the selected method and the set of explanatory variables (algorithm) clearly determine the imputation values for each record. In stochastic methods the imputation value is determined with the use of a random component. That is why it may happen that with the same algorithm and the same data file each algorithm realisation will give slightly different imputation values. Although the stochastic methods slightly increase estimator variance (introducing an additional random error component), they do not distort variance or original data distribution characteristics and allow for the correct estimation of random error. Deterministic imputation brings about variable variance reduction in the file and random error underestimation; it also distorts to a greater extent the correlation structure (increasing correlations with explanatory variables). According to item 2.7 of Regulation 1981/2003 it is recommended that for EU-SILC imputation the methods retaining distribution characteristics should be applied, which means the preference for the stochastic methods.

Out of the stochastic methods the following were used in the task presented here:

- Hot-deck method

Random selection of a representative (donor) out of the correct records.

If auxiliary categorizing variables are used in the hot-deck method, a random representative is selected out of the records showing adequate values of auxiliary variables. If it is not possible to find a donor with the equivalent values for all the auxiliary variables, the so called sequence approach is applied. The categorising variables were ranked from the most to the least significant ones. If there are no donors available, categorization is carried out with the subsequent explanatory variables being left out, starting from the least significant ones so as to obtain a subset containing donors.

- Stochastic regression imputation

Auxiliary variables are the explanatory variables of the regression model. The model takes the linear form or the logarithmic transformation is used. It is fitted on the basis of the correct records. The imputed value (or its logarithm in the case of transformed models) is a sum of the theoretical value derived from the model and a randomly selected model residual. The set of records of which the residual is selected is restricted to those which are nearest to the record imputed for the theoretical value derived from the model.

Out of the deterministic methods the following are applied:

- Regression deterministic imputation

The theoretical value from the model is adopted as the imputation value.

- Deduction imputation

The imputation value is directly determined on the basis of the relationships between variables.

In case of imputation at the target variable level or imputation of the most significant components of target variables, stochastic imputation is applied in order to retain the variable properties distribution as required by Regulation 1981/2003.

The application of stochastic regression imputation requires a model which describes well the formation of a variable with relatively small variance of an error term and good statistical qualities. With high variance of an error term, there is a danger of getting accidental values which are not typical of the correct part of the dataset. That is why in the cases where, in accordance with the assumption referred to above, stochastic imputation is required, the hot-deck method is applied in preference to regression imputation. This is particularly justified when the number of records for imputation is rather low, or when the number of correct records is too small for a suitable model fitting.

Stochastic regression imputation is most widely used for incomes from hired employment, as:

- it is an important category of income, declared by a significant rate of respondents which, if present, has a significant share in the total household's income;
- this category can be successfully modelled with the use of the variables included in the questionnaire;
- there is a large (absolute) number of missing data, the percentage, however, being rather small; a large number of correct records make it possible to design a well-fitted model.

In the case of incomes from hired employment, stochastic regression imputation is applied to the majority of records with missing items, both those for which observations from the previous year are available (panel sample) and the new ones in the sample. For other income categories stochastic regression imputation is used as the basic imputation method when incomes of the same type for a given person/household are known from the previous year. If such income data from the previous year are not available, the hot-deck method is applied. The hot-deck method is also used when the income data are known from the previous year but a suitable model fitting is difficult. In such a case the income from the previous year is used as a grouping variable. If the quantitative categorizing variable is applied in the hot-deck method, the categorization criterion is a break-down into deciles.

Considering a relatively wide application of stochastic regression imputation, supplementary protection against the effects of a potentially insufficient model adequacy was introduced. The residuals are not generated from the distribution of residuals for the whole sample but they are selected from a restricted subset. Although in an ideal model residuals should be in the form of white noise, showing no trend whatsoever, in reality some trends can be observed in the distribution of residuals which are not detected by the model (like those related to non-linearity of relationships which cannot be removed by known transformations). In the case of 2005 data, where the use of stochastic regression is not so wide, imputed residuals are generated as pseudo-random numbers of the normal distribution with variance corresponding to the estimated variance of an error term in the model.

In such a case, if we used residuals from the whole range, we could combine a particular theoretical value obtained from the model with the residual which occurs in the whole distribution but is quite improbable in combination with this particular theoretical value. So we could generate values significantly diverging from the real variable distribution. The use of residuals from the restricted range only reduces that risk.

Deterministic imputation is applied where missing data concern less significant components of target variables (taxes, burdens to the main component, additions, etc.) and the main component is known. In such cases deterministic regression imputation is usually applied. Gross/net conversion is carried out with the use of the deterministic regression method. Deduction imputation is employed in rare cases of obvious relationships and can be treated as a supplementary stage of data editing.

The explanatory variables in the models and the grouping ones in the hot-deck method have been selected so as to represent the relationships which, according to logics and knowledge about the phenomena studied, should occur in the data set, taking into account accessibility of the potential variables in the questionnaire. The relationships have been tested on the file of correct data and in the majority of cases they proved to be significant. Some of the explanatory variables have been retained, even if their impact on the imputed variable has not been statistically confirmed, if they expressed an economically important relationship or provided a grouping condition (interpretation criterion) in the calculation algorithm.

For the persons and households not surveyed in the previous year (a new sample, new household members, persons who could not be interviewed) or for those who did not gain a particular type of income in the previous year, explanatory variables derived from the current data file are applied.

Wherever the same type of income is found in the data for the previous year, its value is treated as the main explanatory (categorizing) variable, both in the case of regression imputation and the hot-deck method. The current variables can be treated as additional explanatory variables.

The imputation of the missing individual questionnaires is carried out with the use of the hot-deck method. A wide set of variables providing household's characteristics (main source of maintenance) and variables from R set determining the person's position in the household and on the labour market is used as the categorization criterion. All the primary target variables related to the donor are transferred to the taker's record and then they are used for the calculation of household's total income.

## 2.6. Imputed rents

### *Definitions*

Actual housing costs should be understood as rentals (charges for water, electricity, gas, other fuels, maintenance and repair of the dwelling and rent) paid by the tenants renting dwellings at market prices.

Actual rentals should be understood as the profit being a surplus of the rent over the dwelling maintenance costs, which is the landlord's net profit gained by the landlords hiring their dwellings at market prices.

Imputed housing costs should be understood as the estimated amount consisting of the actual payments effected by the owners (i.e. charges for water, electricity, gas, other fuels, maintenance and repair of the dwelling and other services relating to the dwelling) as well as imputed rentals that should be ascribed to the owners of flats or houses for their unpaid accommodation resources.

Imputed rentals should be understood as the estimated amount of profit gained in the form of a surplus of the rent over the dwelling maintenance costs, being the landlord's net profit, equal to the amount which could be gained by owners if they wanted to hire their dwellings in the same conditions at market prices.

### *Methodology*

For the purposes of imputed rent estimation, regression analysis has been used. It was decided to use econometric methods, and especially regression analysis.

The first step consists in the estimation of a hedonic price function according to which actual rents paid by tenants depend on the main characteristics of dwellings. In the second step an imputed rent is ascribed to all households, which do not pay rent at market price. In case of households, which do not pay any rent (e.g. owners), the imputed rent is equal to the forecast from the hedonic model (based on their dwelling characteristics). In case of tenants, who pay rent below market prices (reduced rent), the imputed rent is equal to the difference between the forecasted rent and the actual rent (if the forecasted rent is lower than the actual rent, the imputed rent equal to zero is ascribed).

Data in the panel dataset refer to the years 2006 – 2009. The analysis has been made separately for each year. There are small differences in description of the flat/house on questionnaire in particular years (what implies small differences in the model form, regressors set) but the general methodology is the same. Detailed description of the sample and modeling and statistics presented below refer to the 2009 subset.

### *Subsets of tenants*

In the survey the function representing the relationship between the rentals and dwelling characteristics is determined using the observations of households being tenants who pay rents at market prices.

The sample of 2009 covered 276 such households, of which 243 (1,84% of all households participating in the survey) gave the amount of rentals, while 33 households did not, although they declared such payments.

### *Form of the hedonic function*

Following Eurostat's recommendations the variable explained is equal to the monthly rent for a dwelling. For the purposes of this model the value was calculated per 1 m sq. of the usable dwelling area occupied by the household or a total rent was introduced. If in the time of the survey a household did not pay any rent, it could declare the monthly rent paid last.

It was assumed that the estimated function of rentals is an exponential function which means that in the estimation form the dependent variable is a logarithm of variable. This is a convenient solution, ensuring that the theoretical values (calculated and forecasted) will be positive, which could not be guaranteed by the linear function.

### *Explanatory variables*

The set of explanatory variables in the rent function consisted of regressors describing flat/house location, building and environment standard as well as dwelling standard (arrangement and equipment).

There was relatively wide set of potential explanatory variables, which described housing condition considering the aspects mentioned above. The set contained mandatory target variables for EU-SILC survey and other variables included in EU-SILC-G1 questionnaire, collected for domestic use. The set of potential regressors was made according to Eurostat recommendations included in the handbook.

Final set of explanatory variables was obtained by statistical and logical verification of the model. It was selected taking into account parameters values (and signs) and statistical significance of potential regressors. The final set of explanatory variables contains: class of locality, region, dwelling area, dwelling standard, housing infrastructure (water supply, bathroom, heating), crime threat, form of property and building administrator type and – finally – the indicator, if it is self-contained dwelling or not.

### *Estimation technique*

Taking into account the fact, that the surveys is based on the representative method, the weighted least square method (WLS) was applied. As weights for the regression procedure the survey weights are used. They are contained in the variable DB090.

Using the final version of regression model imputed rentals were determined for all the households except those paying the actual rentals.

### *Main characteristics*

Sample size	13 224
Number of observations on tenants at market prices	243
R2 (adjusted)	0.74
<b>Imputed rentals</b> (in PLN per household, per year)	
Averages for all households (paying and do not paying actual rent)	6 197
Averages for the households, which do not pay any actual rent	6 221
Averages for dwelling owners	6 530
Averages for other others households, which do not pay any actual rent	4 706
<b>Actual rentals</b> (in PLN per household, per year)	
Averages for tenants paying rentals at market prices	5 728

## **2.7. Company cars**

The information on the private use of the company car is collected in the individual questionnaire. The data covers the estimated amount the respondent gained by using the company car for private purposes. In case of the missing value (the respondent was using the company car but did not estimate the amount gained) imputation is applied with the use of the hot-deck and regression imputation with simulated residuals methods.

## **3. COMPARABILITY**

### **3.1. Basic concepts and definitions**

#### *The reference population*

There were no essential differences between the national concepts and standard EU-SILC concepts.

The survey unit was a household and all the household members who had completed 16 years of age by:

- December 31, 2005 for EU-SILC 2006;
- December 31, 2006 for EU-SILC 2007;
- December 31, 2007 for EU-SILC 2008.
- December 31, 2008 for EU-SILC 2009;

The survey did not cover collective accommodation households (such as boarding house, workers' hostel, pensioners' house or monastery), except for the households of the staff members of these institutions living in these buildings in order to do their job (e.g. hotel manager, tender etc.).

The households of foreign citizens should participate in the survey.

#### *The private household definition*

No difference to the common definition in either wave (EU-SILC 2006, EU-SILC 2007, EU-SILC 2008 and EU-SILC 2009).

Household is a group of persons related to each other by kinship or not, living together and sharing their income and expenditure (multi-person household) or a single person, not sharing his/her income or expenditure with any other person, whether living alone or with other persons (one-person household).

Family members living together but not sharing their income and expenditure with other family members make up separate households.

The household size is determined by the number of persons comprised by the household.

#### *The household membership*

No difference to the common definition in either wave (EU-SILC 2006, EU-SILC 2007, EU-SILC 2008 and EU-SILC 2009).

The household composition accounted for:

- persons living together and sharing their income and expenditure who have been in the household for at least 6 months (either the real or the intended time of staying in the household should be considered),
- persons absent from the household because of their occupation, if their earnings are allocated to the household's expenditure,
- persons at the age of up to 15 years (inclusive), absent from the household for education purposes, living in boarding houses or private dwellings,
- persons absent from the household at the time of the survey, staying at education centres, welfare houses or hospitals, if their real or intended stay outside the household is less than 6 months.

The household composition did not account for:

- persons at the age of over 15 years, absent from the household for education purposes, living in boarding houses, students' hostels or private dwellings,
- men in military service (those performing substitute military service by working in companies and living at home are included in the household),
- persons in prison,
- persons absent from the household at the time of the survey, staying at education centres, welfare houses or hospitals, if their real or intended stay outside the household is more than 6 months,
- persons (household's guests) staying in the household at the time of the survey who have been or intended to be there for less than 6 months,
- persons renting a room, including students (unless they are treated as household members),
- persons renting a room or bed for the time of work in a given place (including such works as land melioration, geodetic measurements, forest cut-down or building constructions),
- persons living in the household and employed as au pairs, helping personnel on the farm, craft apprentices or trainees.

#### *The income reference period(s) used*

No difference to the common definition in either wave. The income reference year for:

EU-SILC 2006 was 2005,

EU-SILC 2007 was 2006,

EU-SILC 2008 was 2007

EU-SILC 2009 was 2008 year.

#### *Reference period for taxes on income and social insurance contributions*

No difference to the common definition in either wave (EU-SILC 2006, EU-SILC 2007, EU-SILC 2008 and EU-SILC 2009).

The reference periods for income tax prepayment and compulsory social insurance contributions were again the years 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008. The account clearance with the Treasury Office (including payments and returns) effected in 2005 refers to the income for 2004, in 2006 for 2005 in 2007 for 2006 and in 2008 for 2007.

#### *The reference period for taxes on wealth*

No difference to the common definition in either wave (EU-SILC 2006, EU-SILC 2007, EU-SILC 2008 and EU-SILC 2009).

Taxes on wealth paid during the income reference period were recorded correspondingly - 2005, 2006, 2007 or 2008.

#### *The lag between the income reference period and current variables*

The lag between the income reference period and current variables is about 5 months for each wave.

#### *The total duration of the data collection*

EU-SILC was performed on the territory of the whole country in:

2006 - between May 2 and June 19,

2007 - between May 2 and June 19,

2008 - between May 2 and June 26,

2009 - between May 4 and June 26.

#### *Basic information on activity status during the income reference period*

##### Differences concerning EU-SILC 2006:

In EU-SILC 2006 the definition of retired person was changed (now this definition is in accordance with the international recommendations). In EU-SILC 2005 people obtaining disability pensions were included in PL085 and in variable PL210 in category 6, while in EU-SILC 2006 they were included in variable PL090 and in variable PL210 in category 8.

## **3.2. Components of income**

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

## **3.3. Components of income**

*Differences between the national definitions and standards EU-SILC definitions, and an assessment:*

HY010 – Total household gross income

HY020 – Total disposable household income

HY022 – Total disposable household income before social transfers other than old-age and survivor's benefits

HY023 - Total disposable household income before social transfers including old-age and survivor's benefits

There were no essential differences between the national concepts and standard EU-SILC concepts.

Income components where no difference between national and standard definitions can be found are not mentioned. The differences between the national and the EUROSTAT definitions refer to three waves likewise unless it is indicated.

*PY010 - Cash or near-cash employee income*

This variable does not account for:

- assistance for foster families; since granting the benefit is not connected with quitting the job, this benefit has been qualified to the category of „Family related allowances’ (HY050),
- benefit granted to the families when the only person providing income for the family is called up to the active military service; since this benefit is only granted when the only family supporter has been called to the military service, it has been included in the category of „Family related allowances’ (HY050).

*PY020 - Non-cash employee income*

In EU-SILC 2006 this information collected only refers to the income gained from the use of the company car for private purposes. Since 2007, also collected information about other non-cash employee income, but only at component level (PY021) and not included in the income.

*PY030 – Employer’s social insurance contributions*

Variables was collected since EU-SILC 2006 only at component level.

*PY050 - Cash profits or losses from self-employment (including royalties)*

The data on income from self-employment were collected in two different ways: the respondents were asked about the company’s costs and profits and also about the amount of money gained from self-employment which was allocated to the household’s expenditure. After a detailed analysis of data it was decided that the income from self-employment would be equal to the amount allocated to the household’s needs.

*HY050 – Family/children related allowances*

For EU-SILC 2006 (the income reference year 2005):

All family benefits was collected for the whole year, with except advance payment of alimony (was collected for the maximum of 4 months).

*PY080 and PY130 - Regular inter-household cash transfer received*

These variables include alimonies (compulsory and voluntary). It will be created to new separate alternate variables (PY081G/PY081N – Alimonies received: compulsory + voluntary and HY131G/HY131N – Alimonies paid: compulsory + voluntary) in EU-SILC2008.

*PY110 - Survivors` benefits*

Death grants are not included in the income because the whole sum is used to cover the cost of the funeral.

*PY120 - Sickness benefits*

Sickness and childcare benefits are not included (a childcare benefit is granted to the working parent of a sick child), because they are paid by the employer and cannot be detached from the income from hired employment. Therefore, they are accounted for in the income from hired employment.

*PY200 – Gross monthly earnings for employees*

Variables was collected since EU-SILC 2006.

All the other variables not listed above

*Dwelling conditions and material deprivation items*

The analysis of questions and explanatory notes from the guideline for interviewers concerning dwelling conditions and material deprivation items showed that some records differed from those included in document 065/04:

*Arrears on mortgage payment* – it was not clarified that only arrears on mortgage should be taken into account, so other dwelling related credits might have been included.

*Arrears on hire purchase instalments other than loan payments* – this question included arrears on hire purchase and credits other than dwelling-related ones.

*Capacity to afford paying for one week annual holiday away from home* – first of all, the question included the expression “if the household wants”; secondly, a family as such was concerned and it was not pointed out that the question referred to the household as a whole.

*Leaking roof, damp walls/floors/foundation, or rot in window frames or floor* – the question was formulated in a different way, namely: “Do you think your dwelling requires renovation because of...?”

*Indoor flushing toilet for sole use of the household* – the toilet could have been shared with other households.

Additionally, for the variables from HS010 to HS050 no information was given that paying through borrowing meant that household was not in arrears.

There were no other major divergences from common definitions.

In 2008 changes were introduced to bridge these differences according with document 065/04.

VARIABLES ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS

In 2009 the recommendations from EU-SILC 065 (2009 operation) concerning economic status variables were applied.

The variables introduced:

**PL031: SELF-DEFINED CURRENT ECONOMIC STATUS** (replaced PL030)

**PL073: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT AT FULL-TIME WORK AS EMPLOYEE**

**PL074: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT AT PART-TIME WORK AS EMPLOYEE**

**PL075: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT AT FULL-TIME WORK AS SELF-EMPLOYED  
(INCLUDING FAMILY WORKER)**

**PL076: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT AT PART-TIME WORK AS SELF-EMPLOYED  
(INCLUDING FAMILY WORKER)**

**PL086: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT AS DISABLED OR/AND UNFIT TO WORK**

**PL088: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT IN COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE**

**PL089: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT FULFILLING DOMESTIC TASKS AND CARE  
RESPONSIBILITIES**

**PL111: NACE REV.2** (since 2009 without PL110)

**PL211: MAIN ACTIVITY (JANUARY – DECEMBER) –replaced PL210**

Additionally, the following variables were removed:

**PL070: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT AT FULL-TIME WORK**

**PL072: NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT AT PART-TIME WORK**

No difference to the common definition.

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

The income data were collected during the interviews with respondents. The target income variables were split into components corresponding to particular benefits applicable in the Polish conditions.

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

The respondents were asked to give the net incomes and contributions (income tax prepayments and compulsory social insurance). Only in the case of income from rental of a property (HY040) the respondents were asked to give the gross income and the amount of tax paid.

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

The gross income was obtained by summing up net value, income tax prepayments and compulsory social insurance contributions. If the information on tax and insurance contributions was missing, the amounts were imputed on the basis of the results obtained. Only in the case of income from rental of property, the tax paid was subtracted from the gross income.

## **3.3. Tracing rules**

Standard EU-SILC tracing rules are applied.

## 4. COHERENCE

The calculation in point 4.1 and 4.2 was made taking into account the cross-sectional data of EU-SILC 2006 - 2009.

### 4.1. Comparison of EU-SILC and HBS results

The objective of this section is to compare HBS (Household Budget Survey) and EU-SILC results.

Up to 2004 the HBS provided the main source of data on the living conditions of the Polish population, among others on incomes, dwelling conditions and households' equipment.

The HBS has been regularly conducted every year since 1993 up to now with the use of the rotational method. The households are surveyed in the two year panel.

In HBS the main source of data on income and expenditure is provided by the diaries, while that concerning dwelling-related expenditure and utilities – by BR-01a questionnaire. In addition, three other questionnaires are filled in.

When comparing these two sources we must take into account some discrepancies. The differences are to a great extent brought about by the methodological diversity. Here are the main diverging points:

- Different reference periods for income variables – in HBS the reference period is 1 month and, following Eurostat's recommendation, the annual income is the monthly income multiplied by 12, which in the case of irregular income, like that from farming, can bring about significant distortions. In EU-SILC the reference period is a calendar year preceding the survey;
- EU-SILC does not take into account the so called lump sums and irregular donations, which is the case in HBS. Moreover, in EU-SILC disposable income covers non-monetary profit related to the use of the company car;
- Different ways of data collection – in HBS the respondents make records in the so called diary. They have to determine the data sources themselves and do not have them listed in the diary. This may cause omissions. In EU-SILC each respondent is asked detailed questions. In EU-SILC all the income missing data are imputed, while there is no imputation in HBS;
- Different ways of sample selection – in HBS dwellings in which all the households refused to participate in the survey are replaced with new ones from the so called reserve list;
- Slightly different weighting of results.

In some tables given below the data are presented in the breakdown by socio-economic group and household size. The household survey results are usually released by CSO in the breakdown by socioeconomic group and household size.

The main criterion for socioeconomic group classification is the prevailing source of income. In the tables below only weighted data are presented.

The differences in distributions may be due to different sample sizes of both surveys (HBS has approximately three times more sample than the EU-SILC).

**Tab. 1. Structure of population by age**

Specification	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2006	EU-SILC 2007	HBS 2007	EU-SILC 2008	HBS 2008	EU-SILC 2009	HBS 2009
	<i>In %</i>							
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
0-14	16.5	18.1	16.0	18.1	15.7	18.1	15.5	18.0
15-24	15.7	16.6	15.5	16.1	15.1	15.8	14.6	15.7
25-54	44.1	41.6	44.0	41.9	44.0	41.6	44.0	41.1
55-64	10.5	11.3	11.1	11.6	11.8	12.1	12.4	12.7
65+	13.3	12.4	13.4	12.3	13.5	12.4	13.6	12.5

There are no significant differences when comparing the results from both surveys conducted between 2006 and 2009. Analyzing the structure of the age groups, largest differences can be observed in the range 25 - 54 years (only 3 percentage points in 2009). At the same time, in the EU-SILC survey, this age group remained at the same level throughout this period.

**Tab. 2. Structure of population by level of education**

Specification	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2006	EU-SILC 2007	HBS 2007	EU-SILC 2008	HBS 2008	EU-SILC 2009	HBS 2009
	<i>In %</i>							
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No school education	2.5	0.9	2.1	0.9	1.9	0.7	1.6	0.7
Completed primary	19.2	20.0	18.5	19.1	16.4	17.0	16.6	16.2
Lower secondary	4.9	6.5	5.1	6.6	5.1	6.8	4.9	6.7
Elementary vocational	26.6	26.8	26.8	26.6	26.8	27.0	26.7	27.0
Secondary	33.5	33.5	33.6	33.9	34.4	34.5	34.2	34.5
Higher	13.2	12.2	13.8	12.9	15.4	14.0	16.0	14.9

The number of people without education decreases from year to year in both surveys. In the EU-SILC the phenomenon is more evident due to a larger share of this category (HBS: 0,9% in 2006 – 0,7% in 2009; EU-SILC: 2,5% in 2006 – 1,6% in 2009).

There were no significant differences either between the different years or between the results from both surveys.

**Tab. 3. Structure of households by socioeconomic group**

Households of	Households							
	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2005	EU-SILC 2007	HBS 2006	EU-SILC 2008	HBS 2007	EU-SILC 2009	HBS 2008
<i>Total = 100</i>								
Employees	47.9	43.1	49.5	45.1	52.3	47.5	53.3	49.4
Farmers	2.5	4.7	2.6	4.6	2.6	4.3	2.5	4.1
Self-employed	5.0	5.9	4.8	6.1	4.6	6.4	4.8	6.6
Retirees	27.8	27.0	27.6	27.9	27.4	27.6	27.3	28.0
Pensioners	9.8	11.8	9.3	10.3	8.4	9.2	7.6	7.8
Maintained from non-earned sources	6.9	7.5	6.1	6.0	4.8	5.0	4.4	4.1

**Tab. 4. Structure of persons in households by socioeconomic group**

Households of	Persons in households							
	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2005	EU-SILC 2007	HBS 2006	EU-SILC 2008	HBS 2007	EU-SILC 2009	HBS 2008
<i>Total = 100</i>								
Employees	57.4	51.3	59.3	53.6	62.7	56.3	64.0	58.7
Farmers	3.7	7.0	3.6	7.0	3.5	6.6	3.4	6.2
Self-employed	5.6	7.0	5.6	7.1	5.2	7.6	5.4	7.7
Retirees	19.7	18.8	19.4	19.5	18.6	18.9	18.2	18.7
Pensioners	7.1	8.8	6.4	7.4	5.2	6.4	4.6	5.3
Living on unearned sources	6.5	7.0	5.9	5.4	4.7	4.2	4.4	3.4

Analyzing the structure of households in terms of socio-economic groups in both surveys, we observed significant differences in the groups of employed (higher percent in the EU-SILC) and farmers (higher percent in HBS).

Modifications to sampling methodology in the HBS survey (before 2006) resulted in more precise data in a study of farmers' income. These changes consisted in increasing the number of rural areas in the sample. In EU-SILC the sampling methodology has also been changed, introducing in the 2012 survey a new stratification method. It is expected that this will improve also in this survey the quality of data on the income of rural areas.

**Tab. 5. Average yearly equivalent income in PLN by socio-economic group**

Households of	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2005	EU-SILC 2007	HBS 2006	EU-SILC 2008	HBS 2007	EU-SILC 2009	HBS 2008
Disposable income								
Total	14902	13444	16166	14767	18684	16549	21015	18645
Employees	16872	14325	18143	15455	20899	17120	23285	19621
Farmers	9224	12229	10555	13891	13550	16879	13596	17556
Self-employed	18271	18271	17851	20416	21348	23317	26554	24945
Retirees	13700	13309	14668	14278	15618	15089	17209	16445
Pensioners	9649	9622	10880	10478	12061	11472	12930	12104
Living on unearned sources	7213	8552	8751	9272	9665	10327	11063	11636
Income from hired work								
Total	8727	6636	9670	7482	11719	8857	13298	10289
Employees	14160	11695	15236	12677	17609	14287	19520	16053
Farmers	689	1216	1043	1367	1356	1669	1662	1862
Self-employed	2975	2565	2711	2805	3201	3412	4718	3934
Retirees	1270	1266	1467	1423	1545	1694	1746	1823
Pensioners	1004	902	1177	1022	1178	1234	1330	1314
Living on unearned sources	1390	727	1669	736	2401	936	2581	1134

The most similar results in both surveys were obtained in households of pensioners and retirees. Households dependent on agriculture show higher incomes in the HBS survey than in the EU-SILC. In HBS these incomes include also the value of goods produced for own consumption.

Differences in income from employed between surveys arise from the method of data collection. In EU-SILC the annual income data is collected soon after the settlement with the Tax Office and often respondents provide these data on the basis of relevant documents. By contrast, the HBS survey enquires about expenditure and consumption, while income is only additional information. HBS data is collected each month which results in lower availability of evidence of the income. However, in the case of income from agriculture, this method of data collection gives better results.

**Tab. 6. Average yearly equivalent income in PLN by number of persons**

Households with specified number of persons	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2005	EU-SILC 2007	HBS 2006	EU-SILC 2008	HBS 2007	EU-SILC 2009	HBS 2008
Disposable income								
Total	14902	13444	16166	14769	18684	16549	21018	18645
1	14372	13704	15412	14686	16883	15540	19096	17121
2	17611	15961	18725	17225	21201	18849	23652	21145
3	17378	14954	18561	16511	21001	18690	23830	21056
4	14928	13582	16235	14862	19273	16936	21879	19168
5	12349	11318	13733	12716	16238	14498	18455	16552
6 and more	10959	9964	12456	11187	14947	12605	16184	14183
Income from hired work								
Total	8727	6636	9670	7484	11719	8857	13264	10289
1	4470	3673	4737	4103	5675	4627	6549	5551
2	7275	5589	8015	6145	9830	7426	11549	8726
3	11709	8839	12712	9955	14861	11635	16760	13546
4	10761	8382	11742	9393	14363	11036	16306	12611
5	7584	5888	8895	6735	11012	8179	12562	9542
6 and more	6115	3970	7171	4684	9019	5679	9592	6678

In all the presented years and groups of households, incomes shown in the EU-SILC are higher than in HBS. This results from the previously mentioned methodological differences and method of calculating annual income of the HBS survey (average monthly income multiplied by 12 months).

In both surveys there is however a comparable rate of income's growth over the reported years

**Tab. 7. Households provided with selected durables**

Specification	EU-SILC 2006	HBS 2005	EU-SILC 2007	HBS 2006	EU-SILC 2008	HBS 2007	EU-SILC 2009	HBS 2008
	<i>In %</i>							
Fixed telephone	74.0	71.9	71.6	67.9	68.5	64.2	64.9	60.7
Mobile telephone	70.7	73.1	75.5	79.3	79.9	83.5	84.1	86.5
Television set	96.9	98.5	97.1	98.5	97.5	98.5	97.8	98.5
Computer	44.4	43.7	48.7	50.1	54.5	56.4	59.3	60.8
Printer	31.8	29.5	35.7	33.6	40.0	37.1	43.9	40.1
Internet connection	28.5	28.4	34.8	36.6	43.0	45.6	51.1	53.4
Microwave oven	34.1	38.0	37.9	42.4	41.9	46.1	46.6	50.1
Dishwasher	8.0	6.2	9.3	7.4	11.5	9.6	13.4	12.3
Refrigerator	96.9	98.6	97.6	98.9	97.7	98.4	98.5	97.9
Washing machine	96.2	96.8	96.6	97.1	96.8	97.3	97.6	97.9
Passenger car	50.7	49.5	53.6	52.5	56.2	54.7	58.9	57.4

Results from both studies are very similar. The greatest differences (about 4 percentage points) are observed in the Telephone and Microwave Oven categories.

## 4.2. Comparison of income data from SNA for the household sector and EU-SILC

The comparison covered disposable income and its main components: income from hired employment, self-employment (in and outside farming), as well as social benefits.

When comparing these two sources we must take into account some discrepancies. The differences are to a great extent brought about by the methodological diversity. Here are the main diverging points:

1. In SNA the household sector includes collective households which do not enter EU-SILC.
2. Both systems employ different methods of measuring income from self-employment.
3. Accounts of primary and secondary income distribution in SNA used for the determination of disposable income include some items not covered by EU-SILC or not taken into account in the calculation of its results. The most important of them are imputed rents.

In SNA income from self-employment is determined as the so called operation surplus which is the balance between the global production and current production inputs (i.e. intermediate consumption) and hired employees' wages. This difference is reduced by taxes and increased by subsidies. The operation surplus thus calculated is allocated to the household's consumer needs, housing-related investment as well as production-related investment. In the Polish EU-SILC the question about income from self-employment concerns just the amount allocated to the household's consumer needs and its housing-related investment. In addition, SNA takes into account consumption from own production which is not taken into consideration by EU-SILC for farmers' households.

Due to these differences incomes from self-employment according to EU-SILC made 24% - 30% of the operation surplus only (after deduction of section K).

Incomes from hired employment in EU-SILC 2009 are equal to 101% of the corresponding figure in SNA, while social benefits – 93% respectively, which seems to be a good result.

In EU-SILC 2009, as compared with EU-SILC 2006, the data coherence for disposable income with SNA increased by 7 percentage points. This is due to the coherence increase for income from hired employment by 2 percentage points, i.e. from 99% to 101%. In terms of value, wages and other incomes related to hired employment provide the most important component of disposable income in SNA. This category made up over 50% of the disposable income for 2009.

In EU-SILC 2008 RB050 weight was used for the calculation of individual incomes, while in EU-SILC 2007 – PB040, respectively. In SNA incomes of the employees working abroad were calculated in a different way. However, these methodological changes do not explain the increased coherence of incomes from hired employment. The change of weight in EU-SILC could justify an increase by 1 percentage point only. The methodological changes of SNA bring about reduced coherence between SNA data and EU-SILC data, since they lead to an increase in wages and other incomes from hired employment in SNA (for 2006 by over PLN

15 million). Considering the fact that SNA data are based on the results of the enterprise surveys, it can be judged that the increased coherence of incomes from hired employment might be due to some deterioration of the quality of enterprise survey results in the scope of wages. Unlike for EU-SILC 2006 and 2007, it is less probable that the increased coherence of SNA results in the area of hired employment could be brought about by a higher quality of EU-SILC results, as the coherence for all the other significant economic categories remained more or less at the same level.

The data coherence for social benefits between SNA and EU-SILC was 92%, and taking into account the change of the weighting method – 93%, which is equivalent to EU-SILC 2007. The coherence of income from self-employment between EU-SILC 2008 and SNA was 26% and taking into account the change of the weighting method – 27%, which is by 1 percentage point more than in EU-SILC 2007.

## Comparison between SNA results for the household sector and EU-SILC

Category in SNA	Category description in EU-SILC	Incomes: 2005 r.			Incomes: 2006 r.			Incomes: 2007 r.			Incomes: 2008 r.		
		SNA	EU-SILC	SNA = 100%									
		in mln PLN	in mln PLN		in mln PLN	in mln PLN		in mln PLN	in mln PLN		in mln PLN	in mln PLN	
Gross disposable income (net)	Total disposable household income (net)	651 512	369 046	<b>57</b>	683 483	398 939	<b>58</b>	742 374	457 807	<b>62</b>	799 085	513 594	<b>64</b>
Wages, salaries and other income connected with hired work (gross)	Employee cash or near cash income (gross)	303 358	290 140	<b>96</b>	325 030	323 956	<b>99</b>	375 358	380 422	<b>99</b>	426 735	423 255	<b>99</b>
Gross operating surplus (gross) with the exception of section K	Self-employment income (gross) - value allocated to household's consumption and dwelling-related investment	189 378	50 167	<b>27</b>	201 601	53 219	<b>26</b>	220 168	58 291	<b>26</b>	226 352	67 485	<b>30</b>
Social security benefits and social assistance benefits (gross)	Social benefits (gross)	153 946	141 334	<b>92</b>	161 336	149 258	<b>93</b>	166 880	153 565	<b>93</b>	179 112	163 289	<b>91</b>

### Notes:

1. Remarks in brackets: "net" or "gross" refer to including or not including income tax and social security contributions, while the word "gross" in SNA names of categories refers to including fixed assets depreciation.
2. Data for gross operating surplus in SNA has been taken into consideration with the exception of section K, which allows for better comparability with EU-SILC data on self-employment income (PY050G). The data for section K mainly cover imputed rents, not included in the results of EU-SILC, and market income from renting of real estate included in EU-SILC as variable HY040G.

