



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
EUROSTAT

Directorate F: Social and information society statistics  
**Unit F-3: Living conditions and social protection**



# **EU-SILC 2005 MODULE ON INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF POVERTY**

## **Assessment of the implementation**

## **Table of Contents**

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Analysis of the flags.....	5
3. Analysis of the questionnaires .....	14
4. Comments from countries .....	24
5. Analysis of the results .....	25
6. Annex: Tables A.1 – A.5 .....	36

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this report<sup>1</sup> is to review the 2005 EU-SILC module on inter-generational transmission of poverty.

It is necessary to review each of the three major aspects of the methodology of the Module:

- (1) The scope of the information to be collected, and the associated concepts, definitions and classifications.
- (2) The formulation of the above in the form of variables and survey questions.
- (3) The coding of the questions, identifying the applicability of the question to particular respondents, response status of the item, and the response categories.

A most important added concern in the context of an inter-country survey such as EU-SILC is the comparability of the results across countries. Special attention needs to be paid to ensuring consistency and comparability among the countries.

In a sense, the complexity of the issues involved increases as we go from (3) to (1), that is, in a reverse order to the above list.

Hence this report begins in **Section 2** with the most obvious and visible aspect affecting comparability, namely the coding of variable flags in a standard way across all countries. The flags distinguish between response, non-response and different categories of non-applicable cases. Making this distinction in a consistent manner is essential for comparability of the item non-response rates and also of the distribution of responses across countries. Data from the 2005 survey show that the coding in this respect needs to be better standardised so as to improve comparability of the micro-data. Fortunately, mostly these problems can be removed through better standardisation.

Another important step in the analysis of 2005 experience on the Module concerns the evaluation of the national concepts and questionnaires used in that application for constructing the required variables of the 2004 Commission Regulation. This is undertaken in **Section 3**. The purpose of such an analysis is the detection of lack of comparability among the national concepts and questionnaires and also related problems in data quality to the extent possible.

The basic survey concepts concern the following four, among other: eligibility for inclusion in the survey for the Module; the reference period; the definition of parents, siblings and other relations; and the concept of 'main' in identifying the state of affairs or characteristics during the reference period.

For the above purpose, we have been able to consider the questionnaires of a subset of countries, including Italy and ten countries for which we were able to find English, Italian or French version. It has to be admitted that the results of this analysis are affected by the quality of the available translations and also linguistic and cultural differences between countries. Nevertheless, this

---

<sup>1</sup> A first version of this document was presented at the first meeting of the Task Force on intergenerational transmission of poverty of 14 May 2009.

analysis is very useful in developing suggestions and recommendations for clarifying survey concepts and questions and improving their comparability.

**Section 4** presents the comments received from countries.

**Section 5** undertakes an analysis of substantive results. Such an analysis has two objectives. The first is to investigate whether, for each variable, the chosen categories provide a reasonable and useful breakdown of the population. For example, it is not desirable to have a set of categories where a single one covers most of the cases, and many categories among the remaining contain no or very few cases. The second objective – particularly important in the EU-SILC comparative context – is to identify large variations in the distribution across countries. On the one hand, the presence of such variation – if it is real – is interesting and makes the variable more useful in understanding differences in national situations. On the other hand, the presence of large variations across countries can – and often does – reflect lack of comparability resulting from conceptual and methodological differences in the surveys. It is a matter of researchers' judgement as to the correct interpretation of observed differentials across countries. In any case, it is always necessary to question at least large differences and seek plausible and convincing reasons before accepting them.

Specifically, we analyse in Section 5 summary measures to indicate the overall average pattern as well as the extent of variation across countries: simple average over countries in the percentage distribution, and dispersion (standard deviation and coefficient of variation) of the national distributions for each variable. It is useful to examine categories of extreme size, and also incidences of pronounced dispersion across countries. Also important is to examine in more detail where this variability comes from: which variables and in which countries tend to be very different from the average pattern.

## 2. ANALYSIS OF THE FLAGS

We begin in this section with the most obvious and visible aspect affecting comparability, namely the coding of variable flags in a standard way across all the countries. The flags distinguish between response, non-response and different categories of non-applicable cases.

Data from the 2005 survey show that the coding in this respect needs to be better standardised so as to improve comparability of the micro-data. Below we analyse results of the 2005 application in order to identify the main problems in specific terms. Mostly, these problems can be easily removed through better standardisation.

Detailed figures on flags by variable and country are shown in annex Table A.1.

### 2.1 Non-applicable cases common to all variables

1. The main non-applicable cases common to all variables are:

- (1) Person not a selected respondent (code '-3').
- (2) Person not in the required age range for the module (code '-5').

The first case, of course, appears only in register countries - the 7 countries shown in Table 1. In these countries the order in which individuals are assigned to categories (1) or (2) matters since these categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 1 shows that countries have followed different procedures: DK, FI, LV and SI give precedence to (1) over (2), but IS, NO, SE give precedence to (2) over (1). This needs to be standardised: the more logical procedure is that of the first set of four countries, that is, coding all non-selected respondents first, and then among the remaining coding person not in the required age range as another category.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 1. Non-applicable cases common to all variables (Register countries)**

	DK	FI	IS	NL	NO	SI	SE
<b>Frequency</b>							
-3 not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575	4.010
-5 Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083
Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191
<b>% of total</b>							
-3 not selected respondent	49,9	51,1	36,6	47,6	35,1	65,3	32,9

<sup>2</sup> This is because first all non-selected persons are excluded from the whole interview; and then among the remaining, additional persons are excluded from the module because of being outside the age range of interest.

-5 Not in age range (25-65)	13,0	13,6	33,6	12,7	28,3	11,7	33,5
remaining	37,0	35,3	29,8	39,7	36,6	23,0	33,6
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

2. It is also helpful to standardise the coding when a question has been excluded in a country. In the 2005 survey, this applies to PM100 (financial problems) in NO, EL, LU, DE and PT, and to PM035 (number of siblings) in SE (see Table A.1). The common procedure has been to leave this variable blank throughout (though a non-blank code such as ‘-7’ would be preferable). In a couple of cases, however, this standard has not been followed: for PM100 in LU, PM035 in SE – see Table A.1. Such unnecessary variation should be avoided.

3. There is also some unnecessary variation in the coding of non-applicable cases for particular variables within a country, as can be seen from Table A.1. Table 2 shows some specific cases.

**Table 2. Examples of miscoding (or not coding in standard way) of excluded questions**

Country	Variables	Codes	Miscoded as
LU	all variables	-5 (outside age range)	-1 (missing)
SE	most variables	-3	-1 (missing)
DK	PM100	-3 (not selected respondent), -5	blank
BE	PM100	-3	-2 (n/a)

Such variations can be problematic. For example, in LU item non-response cannot be computed since ‘missing’ includes an unknown number of ‘n/a’ cases.<sup>3</sup> In the case of SE, the actual number of ‘-3’ cases is known (4.010) since, fortunately, the above-mentioned miscoding does not occur in one of the variables (PM030 – see Table A.1). By removing this number of cases from the number coded as ‘-1’ makes it possible to compute item non-response.

4. Editing errors also seem to be present in the n/a codes in some non-register countries; these could have been very easily corrected.

<sup>3</sup> The maximum number ‘n/a’ cases is the minimum number appearing under missing for any variable (in this case 2.043 for PM010), assuming that the actual number of missing in that variable is zero. With this assumption, one can compute a *minimal* estimate for item non-response for each variable in LU.

Table 3. Numbers of '-2' (n/a) erroneously coded as '-3' (not selected respondent): examples.

country	Father		Mother	
	birth year	education level	birth year	education level
	PM020	PM040	PM030	PM050
ES	618	618	265	(OK)
EL	382	(OK)	(OK)	(OK)
HU	(OK)	(OK)	(OK)	292

## 2.2 Variable-specific non-applicable cases

More complex is the situation concerning the appearance of n/a ('-2') code. This depends on the variable concerned. Nevertheless, certain erroneous departures from the standard can be easily identified from Annex Table A.2 (extracted from Table A.1).

1. Firstly, in some countries, this code does not appear at all, for any variable (DK, NO, IE, UK).
2. For PM100 (financial problems), code '-2' is meant to indicate that the respondent lived in collective household or institution when young. Normally this number should not be zero, if defined as above. However, it is zero in a number (9) of countries (SE, ES, EL, CY, DE, PL, NO, SK, UK)<sup>4</sup>. This may be a substantive (e.g. resulting from question wording) rather than a coding problem.

The lack of standardisation across countries in terms of the non-applicable category is illustrated in Table 4. For each country, the table compares two numbers:

- (1) The number coded as '-7' on variable PM010, i.e. reported as living in a collective household or institution in the question on the main family composition.
- (2) The number coded as '-2' on variable PM100, i.e. as a non-applicable case (additional to cases coded as '-5' and '-3') in the question on financial problems.

In a number (10) of countries (FI, IS, SI, AT, CZ, EE, FR, IT, LT, LV), the results are in accordance with the specified standards.

However, in the remaining majority of the countries, there is some discrepancy. This consists of two groups.

<sup>4</sup> As noted earlier, the very large number of (n/a) cases in PM100 in BE results from the miscoding of '-5' (not in age range) as '-2'. The same applies to LU, though in this case, actually no data have been collected on PM100 in the survey (there are no 'filled' cases reported).

In the 9 countries already mentioned above, there are no cases recorded as ‘-2’ in PM100\_F despite the presence of code ‘7’ in PM010.

In 4 countries (NL, HU, LU, BE), the number recorded as ‘-2’ in PM100\_F exceeds the number coded as ‘7’ in PM010. The discrepancy is extremely large in the case of LU and BE.

(In the remaining 3 countries – EL, DE, PT - variable PM100 was not collected.)

**Table 4. Coding of non-applicable cases (‘flag -2’) in PM100.**

DK	FI	IS	NL	NO	SI	SE	ES	GR	HU	LU	AT	BE
<b>Non-applicable if in collective household or institution flag PM100_F</b>												
Financial problems in household when young teenager, code ‘-2’ (n/a)												
	23	2	185		19				194	2.155	65	3.143

**Main family composition PM010**

Lived in collective household or institution, code ‘7’

52	23	2	76	12	19	5	226	9	78	41	64	51
----	----	---	----	----	----	---	-----	---	----	----	----	----

CY	CZ	DE	EE	FR	IE	IT	LT	LV	PL	PT	SK	UK
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

**Non-applicable if in collective household or institution flag PM100\_F**

Financial problems in household when young teenager flag PM100\_F code ‘-2’ (n/a)

	19		71	183		226	48	44				
--	----	--	----	-----	--	-----	----	----	--	--	--	--

**Main family composition PM010**

Lived in collective household or institution, code ‘7’

39	18	132	71	183	24	226	48	44	93	62	6	67
----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	----	----	----	---	----

3. For three of the variables concerning the ‘father’ (PM020, PM040, PM060), ‘-2’ code (=n/a) means ‘no father’ (whatever the substantive definition of this term). For a given survey, this number should be the same for all these three variables, as is the case in most countries. However, there are some departures from this standard practice (ES, EL, LU – see Table A.2).

4. Variable PM070 has additional cases with code ‘-2’ corresponding to certain responses to the variable on father’s activity status (PM060). Indeed we see that the number of cases with code ‘-2’ in PM070 exceeds that number in PM020/040/060 in most countries. But a number of countries did not follow this standard practice - SE, HU, BE, DE, SK and PT - where the two numbers are equal. This indicates differences in the skip patterns for PM070. Generally in these countries the ‘extra’ cases which should have code ‘-2’ generally seem to have been given the code ‘-1’, corresponding to missing or non-response. This makes it impossible to compute item non-response rates in a comparable manner.

5. Similar to the above, for three of the variables concerning the ‘mother’ (PM030, PM050, PM080), ‘-2’ code (=n/a) means ‘no mother’ (whatever the substantive definition of this term). This number should be the same for all these three variables, as is the case in most countries. However, again there are some departures from this standard practice (ES, HU, LU and also FR – see Table A.2).



6. Variable PM090 has additional cases with code '-2' corresponding to certain responses to the variable on mother's activity status (PM080). This is discussed in more detail in the next subsection. Indeed we see that the number of cases with code '-2' in PM090 exceeds that number in PM030/050/080 in most countries. But a number of countries did not follow this standard practice (the number in PM090 equals that in PM030/050/080 in the same countries as in the case of PM070 for the father, except for PT which is now shows the normal pattern). Again, this indicates differences in the skip patterns for PM090, and precludes computation of item non-response rates in a comparable manner across countries.

**Table 5. Number of eligible persons and percentage 'non-applicable' for variables concerning presence and occupation of father and mother**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<b>DK</b>	4.408	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<b>NO</b>	4.358	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<b>IE</b>	7.517	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<b>UK</b>	13.724	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<b>SE</b>	4.098	4,7	4,2	missing	missing
<b>HU</b>	9.906	11,6	2,9	missing	missing
<b>BE</b>	6.831	3,8	2,0	missing	missing
<b>DE</b>	17.235	6,8	1,4	missing	missing
<b>SK</b>	8.632	2,8	0,6	missing	missing
<b>PT</b>	6.856	13,6	6,8	missing	27,6
<b>FR</b>	12.675	1,7	0,6	0,1	26,9
<b>PL</b>	24.875	2,2	0,5	1,0	16,3
<b>ES</b>	20.202	3,1	1,3	0,5	51,0
<b>AT</b>	7.397	4,0	1,0	5,1	32,9
<b>LU</b>	5.492	4,6	1,5	0,1	42,9
<b>CY</b>	6.050	4,7	1,5	0,7	59,2
<b>EL</b>	7.870	4,9	1,5	0,2	45,9
<b>IT</b>	32.044	7,2	2,6	5,2	59,5
<b>CZ</b>	5.852	9,9	1,9	0,1	7,3
<b>NL</b>	7.090	10,2	4,8	4,9	69,3
<b>SI</b>	5.493	12,5	2,7	0,6	5,0
<b>FI</b>	8.099	12,8	4,2	5,4	12,6
<b>LT</b>	6.433	15,2	2,3	0,9	15,1
<b>IS</b>	1.987	15,2	4,3	0,5	40,5
<b>EE</b>	5.940	24,6	7,0	0,2	3,8
<b>LV</b>	4.958	24,8	3,0	0,9	8,6

Column headings:

(1) Total number of cases, excluding codes '-5' and '-3'\*

(2) 'No father' as % if (1)

(3) 'No mother' as % if (1)

(4) 'fathers occupation=n/a' as % if (1)

(5) 'mothers occupation=n/a' as % if (1)

n.a. not available

missing no cases identified (or 0%)

7. Columns (2) and (3) of Table 5 shows the proportion of total ‘eligible’ persons (i.e. selected respondents in the age range for the module) who report as having ‘no father’ and ‘no mother’ at the time they were young. This information has not been coded for four countries (DK, NO, IE, UK) for either father or mother. Among the remaining, ‘no father’ is reported much more frequently than ‘no mother’ (nearly 10% of the cases for fathers, on the average, versus under 3% for mothers). This implies that the question is generally in terms of presence of the parent in the same household, rather than whether or not the parent concerned was alive at the time. The big variation in the proportion ‘no father’ across countries should be noted: from only 1.7% in FR, to 24.8% in LV. This strongly implies lack of comparability in the concepts used and/or their implementation in the country questionnaires.

### **2.3 Activity status and occupation of the parent**

This section is concerned with comparability of the ‘filters’ which determine whether or not a question is applicable to particular cases.

The large differences in the proportion of cases declaring ‘no father’ at the time, as shown in Table 5, has been already noted, and that this implies lack of comparability.

It is also important to investigate the additional n/a cases (code ‘-2’) appearing in the questions on parents occupation. According to Eurostat document “Description of SILC UDB secondary target variables: Module 2005” (version 2005.2), the n/a code for this variable should be the same as that for the preceding variable on the parent’s activity status (namely no father, or no mother). This is the case only in some countries (S, HU, BE, DE, SK – SEE Table 5). In other countries, additional cases are coded as ‘-2’ on parent’s occupation, but the skip pattern in the questionnaire does not appear to be the same, judging from the large variation in the proportions reported in columns (4) and (5) of Table 5.

Annex Table A.3 shows cross tabulation of the flag for occupation versus the activity status code, for both parents. The results are presented for many (but not all) countries. For simplicity, only two values of the flag for occupation are shown:

Code ‘-2’, n/a (not applicable)

Code ‘-1’, missing

For activity status, flag codes ‘-2’ and ‘-1’, and the substantive codes 1-7 when the variable is filled (flag code=1) are shown. The substantive codes are

- 1 employed;
- 2 self-employed;
- 3 unpaid family worker;
- 4 unemployed;
- 5 retired, early retired;
- 6 full-time housework;
- 7 other

It is quite clear from the annex table that the procedure followed varies greatly across countries. Much better standardisation is required to improve comparability.

A selection of the results is shown in Table 6. The pattern is more interesting in the case of he mother. Several patterns of variation may be pointed out.

- In some countries, such as BE, DE and UK (and also HU, SK, IE, ...), large numbers of cases with PM080=6 (activity status full-time housework) has been coded as '-1' on PM090 (occupation missing). In SK, the pattern is similar, except that the large number of cases come from PM080=7 (activity status other 'other'); this may have resulted from differences in how the activity status has been coded for economically inactive persons.
- The pattern is quite different in many other countries, including ES, IT and FR: here the large of cases with PM080=6 (activity status full-time housework) has been coded as '-2' on PM090 (occupation n/a).
- Generally, most of the additional '-2' (n/a) codes on PM090 come from PM080 = '6' (full-time housework), quite significant numbers of PM090='-2' cases can also correspond to other values of PM080
- A few important examples of lack of standardisation in coding PM070 and PM090 flags may be noted on the basis of the detailed figures in Table A.3.

In IE and UK, for example, code '-2' (not applicable) does not appear at all, while in IT and CY it is code '-1' (missing) which does not appear.

In BE, HU and SK, for example, there are no additional cases with code '-2' on PM070/ PM090, other than the cases already coded '-2' on PM060/ PM080.

There are a large number of missing values ('-1') on PM070/ PM090 in UK and LU; these mostly come from cases with PM060/ PM080 = 1 (employee).

## 2.4 Item non-response

As a result of the various non-standard features of the codes used, in many cases item non-response rates cannot be computed, or cannot be computed in a proper comparable manner. For computing item non-response rates, it is necessary to identify (1) not-applicable, (2) applicable but missing, and (3) applicable cases with a valid response. Item non-response rate is (3), divided by (2)+(3).

In particular, for the question relating to occupation it is necessary to fix whether (a) the question is considered applicable for all parents 'present', or (b) is considered non-applicable also for parents with a certain activity statuses (such as full-time housework), in which case the activity statuses so excluded should also be fixed uniformly across countries and specified clearly.

**Table 6. Coding of occupation of mother against activity status**

		Activity status of mother(PM080)							Total		
		-2	-1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Occupation of mother (PM090_F)											
<b>BE</b>											
	-2	138									138
	-1	0	242	110	30	40	30	35	4019	200	4706
<b>DE</b>											
	-2	242									242
	-1	0	522	395	17	107	59	103	8112	81	9396
<b>HU</b>											
	-2	292									292
	-1	0	136	161	6		2	24	2979	118	3426
<b>SK</b>											
	-2	48									48
	-1	0	167	34	0	0	41	118	143	1908	2411
<b>IE</b>											
	-2										no '-2'
	-1		2248	1	0	0	9		3971	25	6254
<b>UK</b>											
	-2										no '-2'
	-1		1662	1392	140	13	34	15	1119	33	4408
<b>CY</b>											
	-2	89		0	0	0			3566	13	3668
	-1										no '-1'
<b>IT</b>											
	-2	849		0	0	0	68	67	18787	157	19928
	-1										no '-1'
<b>CZ</b>											
	-2	112	9	0	0	7	7	11	391	2	539
	-1	0	58	2	0	0	1	5	29	0	95
<b>EE</b>											
	-2	418	2	0	0	0	0	1	222	3	646
	-1	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	63	0	88
<b>LT</b>											
	-2	146	0	0	0	0	2	2	934	36	1120
	-1		70								70
<b>LV</b>											
	-2	147	7	0	0	0	1	19	389	11	574
	-1	0	43	17	0	0	0	0	7	1	68
<b>PT</b>											
	-2	463	0	0	0	0	0	4	1875	10	2352
	-1		91								91
<b>FR</b>											
	-2	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	3364	40	3482
	-1	0	434	36	13	17	0	0	227	3	730
<b>PL</b>											
	-2	136	68	0	0	31	70	94	3796	5	4200
	-1	0	755	496	140	10	26	65	367	10	1869
<b>AT</b>											
	-2	76	194	0	0	0	0	0	2218	19	2507
	-1	0	33	58	3	7	0	10	158	0	269
<b>ES</b>											
	-2	265	12	0	0	0	5	7	10114	167	10570
	-1	0	536	88	20	6	1	1	63	2	717
<b>GR</b>											
	-2	118	0	4	0	1	6	41	3528	30	3728
	-1	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	26
<b>LU</b>											
	-2	85	2	3	0	81	0	4	2267	1	2443
	-1	0	2099	5	0	21	0	0	19	0	2144

Code: -2 n/a; -1 missing

1 employed; 2 self-employed; 3 unpaid family worker; 4 unemployed;  
5 retired, early retired; 6 full-time housework; 7 other

### 3. ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Another important step of the analysis of 2005 experience on the Module concerns the evaluation of some of the national questionnaire used in that application for constructing the required variables of the 2004 Commission Regulation.

We have been able to consider the questionnaire of the following eleven countries, the only ones for which we were able to find English, Italian or a French version on Eurostat CIRCA website: AT, BE, CY, EE, ES, FR, IE, IT, LU, MT, and UK. Of course, where the original questionnaire was not in the above languages, the translation process could have introduced obscurities or differences between countries. It is important to keep in mind this limitation of the following comments.

The purpose of the following analysis is the detection of lack of comparability among the national questionnaires and also other possible problems in data quality.

#### 3.1 General consideration on concept and definition used

Before discussing individual questions, it is necessary to underline the importance of the basic survey concepts. These concern the following three, among other: eligibility for inclusion in the survey for the Module, the reference period, the definition of parents, siblings and other relations, and the concept of 'main' in identifying the state of affairs or characteristics during the reference period.

##### Eligibility for inclusion in the survey ('survey units')

Most countries collected information for adults (or 'selected respondent' if applicable) in the age range 25-65, as specified in the regulations. The official definition was "over 24 and less than 66".

Some countries collect information on age range 24-66 (CY, LU, IE, IT), and one (EE) on 20-70 olds. For some (AT, BE, MT) we have not found any precise indication in the questionnaire on the age range used.

##### Reference period

This refers to the age range of the respondent to which the information relates. A majority of countries refer to the age range 12-16 (e.g. CY, ES, MT, LU, IE, FR, UK), while some others to the precise age of 14 (e.g. BE, IT).

##### Relationships (father, mother, siblings)

These were generally defined in terms of who the respondent regarded different persons as related to him/her. Mostly, of course, these corresponded to the actual blood relationships.

##### 'Main' (statuses, characteristics, etc.)

A standard definition was provided, but it appears that there were difficulties or differences in applying those uniformly.

The above concepts and specific recommendation for their definition and implementation are considered below in Section 5.

### 3.2 PM010: Main Family Composition

Among the survey questionnaires used in 2005, there is mostly a common question formulation with seven response items, the same foreseen in the variable definition:

CY, for example (also a number of other countries such as BE, ES, FR, LU, MT, IT)

So, looking at this card, which of these best describes your family situation when you were a young teenager?

1. Live with both parents
2. Live with your mother only
3. Live with your father only
4. Live with your mother and mother's new partner/husband
5. Live with your father and father's new partner/wife
6. Live in another private household (as an adoptee)
7. Live in a collective household or institution

In IE an eighth item, “other” was added. As that is not a standard response category for the UDB, presumably the ‘other’ items were recoded elsewhere. This can only be done if some descriptive specification is obtained responses coded as ‘other’.

In IT there is also an additional question on the number of member of the family at that time.

IT                    When you were 14 years old, how many persons composed your family?

Number .....

EE followed a different and interesting formulation, asking about which persons belonged to the family:

EE                    Which of the following persons belonged to your household in the early teens (12-16 years old)?

Mother (excluding foster mother)

Father (excluding foster father)

Mother's new partner/husband

Father's new partner/wife

Sister (including foster sister)                    How many .....

Brother (including foster brother)                    How many .....

Other relatives (specify who) .....

Other non-relatives (specify who) .....

Lived in an orphanage, care home, or other institution

Such a question allows PM010 variable to be constructed after data collection with an appropriate algorithm. With the same question, variable PM035 (number of siblings) can also be constructed.

### 3.3 PM035: Main number of siblings

Almost all countries collected such a variable in a very similar way, for example:

“When you were aged 12-16, how many brothers and sisters were you living with?”

IT preceded this question with a filter question

“When you were 14, were you living with and siblings?”

followed by question of the number of brothers and sisters.

And as noted before, EE rebuild such variable from the question on family composition (list of the persons who belonged to the respondent’s household when 12-16 years old).

It has to be underlined that from the available translations it is not clear if the concept of ‘siblings’ was made sufficiently clear in all the countries. Ideally, a short but clear definition should be included as an integral part of the question asked.

### 3.4 PM100 Financial problems in household when young teenager

For this variable, information is available from 23 countries (all participating in the 2005 survey, apart from DE, EL and PT).

A large majority (21) put a question with the same response items as the required standard variable. There are possibly some marginal variations in the exact wording, but some of these may be simply due to language differences or the translation process, for example using phrases like “most of time”, “very often”, “always” etc. for the top response category. Here are a few examples of question formulation.

BE (and a number of other countries)

When you were 14 years old, did your household have financial problems ?

Most of the time	1
Often	2
Occasionally	3
Rarely	4
Never	5

EE

Did the household have financial difficulties when you were in yearly teens (12-16 year-old)?

Always or almost always	1
Often or regularly	2
Sometimes	3
Seldom	4
Never	5



IT uses the same formulation for the question on financial situation, but adds two questions, one concerning the number of working persons in the household at that time, and the other on tenure of accommodation. Both these seem to be interesting questions, and may be considered for possible inclusion at EU level in the next application of the module. The questions used in IT are:

IT Think about the time when you were between 12 and 16 years old. How frequently was your household obliged to cope with economic problems?

- Very often 1
- Often 2
- Sometimes 3
- Rarely 4
- Never 5

When you were 14 years old, how many persons in your family worked?

Number .....

When you were 14 years old, the house in which the family lived was

- in rent or sublease
- own property
- in usufruct
- in free use

Two countries (AT, MT), however, use a different concept, in terms of how bad or good was the financial situation.

AT

Please think of the financial situation of your household when you were 14 years old. Would you say the financial situation then was

- Very bad 1
- Bad 2
- Fair 3
- Good 4
- Very good 5

MT	How do you perceive the economical situation of the household when you were a young teenager, between the ages of 12 and 16?
	Very good .....1
	Good .....2
	Fair/satisfactory .....3
	Bad .....4
	Very bad .....5

It is very likely that such conceptual departures from the common standard adversely affect comparability of the results. In any case, the question is a complex one by its very nature, and detailed explanation for the interviewers is essential in each country for uniform application.

Another point of methodological interest should be noted. This concerns the order of the response categories. Despite the conceptual difference, the response categories are ordered in AT in the same way as most of the other countries: from most to the least difficult financial situation. However, it appears that the order is reversed in some countries, such as MT in the above example. Incidentally, Eurostat document on description of variables for 2005 Module also shows reversed ordering in the case of SK:

SK	How often did your household have financial problems in time you were 12 – 16 years old?
	Never 1
	Rarely 2
	Sometimes 3
	Often 4
	Always 5

Two points should be noted concerning the order of categories. (1) Changing the order can affect the results, and hence comparability – as to how much is of course an empirical question. (2) Care must be taken to ensure that in constructing the standard UDB variables, the order is reversed to become the same as the required standard.

In country evaluations, a concern has often been expressed about the lack of reliability (and hence also of comparability) of the question on the financial situation (see below).

### 3.5 PM020/PM030: Year of birth of father/mother

In general there are no significant differences in question form or wording. The following are some variations.

FR added a filter and asked the subsequent question on the actual year of birth only if the respondent knew, even roughly, the year of birth of father/mother:

The filter question was:

FR	Do you know, even roughly, the year of birth of your father?
	1. Yes
	2. No

3. Without father, unknown father, absence of father...

Non-sample person (NSP)

REFUSAL

The same sequence was also for mother of the respondent.

IE added a filter question on whether the parent concerned was alive at the time, and asked the question on year of birth only if the parent concerned was alive:

IE (the same sequence also for mother of the respondent)

When you were 14 years old was your father alive?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes:

What was the year of birth of your father?

Enter a numeric value between 1860 and 1970

The above assumes that information on a parent is relevant only if the parent was alive at the time the respondent was a teenager. This, however, is not necessarily the criteria followed in other countries in determining whether or not the questions on the parent concerned are applicable.

### **3.6 PM040/PM050: Highest ISCED level of education attained by father/mother**

Almost all countries ask for the highest level of education achieved by the parent, with the reference period corresponding to the time the respondent was a teenager. However, there is considerable variation in the actual wording, and especially in the response categories as listed in the questionnaire. Generally the response categories in the questionnaires are quite different from the codes required in the standard variable.

The national systems differ, and the variation is compounded by historical differences. Naturally this question varies a lot country by country, considering the different educational system. Each country used the collected information to make available the requested variable with its specified response categories through an appropriate algorithm.

Here are some examples of question wording (the same sequence applies in the case of the mother).

- AT Which was the highest formal education, which your father had at that time?
- IE At the time you were a young teenager what was the highest level of education attained by your father?
- IT When you were 14 years old, what was the study title of your father or the person who you considered like father?
- MT What was the highest educational level attained by your father when you were a young teenager, between the ages of 12 and 16?

As noted, there is a much greater variation in the response categories used, in order to accommodate differences between national educational systems and histories.

There are some variations in the basic question as well. Here are some examples.

Some countries, included CY and UK do not refer to the specific period when the respondent was a teenager:

CY Father's educational level  
(followed by a list of response categories)

UK Looking at this card, which of these best describes or is closest to the highest qualification achieved by your father/(mother's new partner/husband)?

EE has a more elaborate sequence of questions, covering general and vocational education separately:

EE What level of education had your father attained in the school of general education by the time you were in early teens (12-16 years old)?  
..... (list of codes)

What was the highest completed vocational or professional education of your father by the time you were in early teens (12-16 years old)?  
..... (list of codes)

This question it is one of the most complicated ones in the Module, considering both the great differences between countries and the great changes which have occurred in educational system during the time span involved – which actually covers a large part of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. There are added difficulties associated with the concept of “highest level completed” and the reference period to which the information relates.

Considering that changes in later life in educational level achieved are rare, in particular in the past when most respondents were teenagers, it should be possible to simplify the reference period issue. Perhaps the coding could also be simplified by grouping some ISCED categories (i.e. 1 and 2).

### 3.7 PM060/PM080: Main activity status of father/mother

A majority of the countries (for example CY, BE, EE, IE, LU, MT, IT) ask a question with the standard categories, exactly the same as present in the variables definitions:

CY etc.           What was the main activity of your father?

- Employee
- Self-employed
- Unpaid family-worker
- Unemployed
- Retired, early-retired
- Full time housework
- Other inactive person

Some countries (for example, IT, ES, FR) ask also if the parents had never worked before.

A more significant variation includes FR, where at the first step, a distinction is not made between different statuses in employment (employee, employer, self-employed, unpaid family worker):

FR               Your father, at the time of your adolescence, what was he professional situation?

1. worked
2. was to unemployment
3. was retired, withdrawn from business, préretraité
4. was occupied full-time to tasks of maintenance of the house or of childcare
5. was in another situation

Non-sample person (NSP)

REFUSAL

For working parents, following the above, FR asks some other questions, (some of them useful also for ISCO classification of variables PM70 and PM90), including the following:

FR               In its principal profession (include the derniere) was it:

1. salary earner of the state of a local authority of the HLM or of the public hospitals
2. Another salary earner(of a company, of craftsman, of an association, at a private individual)
3. Aid grant of a member of his family in its work without being remunerated
4. Independent or to his account, head of employed company, Chairman, minority manager, partner

Non-sample person (NSP)

REFUSAL

UK added a category “other”, and also considered in a separate category the disabled or long-term sick.

UK	Looking at this card, which of these best describes what your father/(mother's new partner/husband) did when you were a young teenager?
	Employee ..... 1
	Self-employed ..... 2
	Unpaid family worker .....3
	Unemployed .....4
	Retired, early-retired .....5
	Looking after the family/home ...6
	Long-term sick or disabled .....7
	Other .....8
	Don't Know .....9

This variable needs to be made more homogeneous both in contents and in concept, in particular the concept of "main" activity status, and the detail of the categories to be used as well as the question path, as necessary, for constructing such a variable .

### 3.8 PM070/PM090: Main occupation of father/mother

To define the ISCO-88 (2 digits), requested for the variable we find mainly two different approaches. Some countries (AT BE CY EE ES IE IT LU) use a single question to obtained the required variable.

CY, IE, IT for example:

When you were at the age of 12-16, what was the main occupation of your father/mother?  
 .....

Some other countries (e.g. FR, UK, MT) add to the question on occupation other questions to have more information on the nature of the job or work. For example:

- UK
- Ask if respondents father/(mother's new partner/husband)/ mother/(father's new partner/wife) was employed, self-employed or an unpaid family worker ...
8. What was your father/(mother's new partner/husband)'s/ mother/(father's new partner/wife)'s (main) job? (enter text of at most 30 characters) .....
9. What did he mainly do in his job? (enter text of at most 30 characters) .....
10. What did the firm/organisation he worked for mainly make or do at the place where he worked? (describe fully - probe manufacturing or processing or distributing etc, and main goods produced, materials used, wholesale or retail etc. enter text of at most 80 characters)  
 .....
- Ask if father/(mother's new partner/husband)/ mother/(father's new partner/wife) was an employee
11. In his job, did he have formal responsibility for supervising the work of other

employees? (do not include people who only supervise: - children, e.g. teachers, nannies, childminders – animals - security or buildings, e.g. caretakers, security guards)

Yes .....1

No .....2

Ask if father/(mother's new partner/husband)/ mother/(father's new partner/wife) had a responsibility for supervising

12. Please describe the type of responsibility he had for supervising the work of other employees. (provide for who and what is being supervised enter text of at most 100 characters) .....

13. How many people worked for his employer at the place where he worked?

Were there...

1-9 .....1

10 .....2

11-24 .....3

25-99 .....4

100-499 .....5

500-999 .....6

1000 or more .....7

Clearly, such a sequence provides much richer set of information on job characteristics of the parent than a single question on occupation.

In any case, it would be desirable to follow a more homogenous approach across countries.

Another source of variation is the particular job to which reference is made: some countries seem to ask for the last occupation during the reference period, while others for the main or more important job during the period. A more homogenous approach is also desirable on this aspect.

#### 4. COMMENTS FROM COUNTRIES

We briefly analyse here the comments of the countries (10 replied to Eurostat mail of 13 February 2009) on the experience of 2005. The emerging critical points are the following.

Many of the respondent countries noted difficulties for the elder respondents to recall the parents conditions (education, occupational condition, etc.) when they were teenager (EL, FR, CY LT NO FI). Some of them propose to reduce the age range of the respondents (i.e. 25-60/55). The consequence is a large amount of "Not recall".

Some variables seems to be too detailed (ISCO-88 2 digits, education)

Educational and occupational variables also present problems of coding, considering the wide structural changes during the 20<sup>th</sup> century

LT pose the problem if parents out of house for long time (i.e. in gulag) has to be still considered as his parents and then give information on them. Maybe an adding question on the effective presence of parents in the house when they were teenager could be useful.

It seems too early to repeat the module, considering the limited elapsed of time to notice great differences (LT, IE)

Some suggest that could be useful to add information on house tenure/house type (NO, IE), geographical/regional mobility (FI) and Rural/Urban (IE), Unemployment experience (FI)

The response item for PM100 on parents financial situation (IE, seems to be too many and in some cases interchangeable each other (in particular 1, 2 and 3, 4).

Countries like FI use census register for a large part of the sample and interviews for the remaining. This could introduce problems of comparability of the information (different impact of memory effects). Besides in census data it is not possible to collect information of PM100.

About question PM100 as to be underlined that for some countries seems to be very difficult to collect such information in reliable way, considering the difficulties to compare the current situation with the previous one and also the reference context of their youth. FI suggest to try a question wording that permits the respondent to answer according to his/her present mental picture of the situation in the past, instead to try reaching objective description.

To this we have to add an overall impression on some difficulties in making homogeneous the concept of family composition and question on mother/father status (i.e. if a father do not live in the house, but it is considered his/her father anyway information on his status could be collected. The results could be some confusion on data collected).



## 5. ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

### 5.1 Summary measures of mean and dispersion of the responses

Annex Table A.4 shows the percentage distribution of ‘filled’ values for the main variables collected in the module<sup>5</sup>. Such analysis has two objectives.

The first is to investigate whether, for each variable, the chosen categories provide a reasonable and useful breakdown of population. For example, it is not desirable to have a set of categories where a single one covers most of the cases, and many categories among the remaining contain no or very few cases.

The second objective – particularly important in a comparative context – is to identify large variations in the distribution across countries. On the one hand, the presence of such variation – if it is real – is interesting and makes the variable more useful in understanding differences in national situations. On the other hand, the presence of large variations across countries can – and often do – reflect lack of comparability resulting merely from conceptual and methodological differences in the surveys.

It is a matter of researchers’ judgement as to the correct interpretation of observed differentials across countries. In any case, it is always necessary to question at least large differences and seek plausible and convincing reasons before accepting them.

Table 7 shows three summary measures to indicate the overall average pattern as well as the extent of variation across countries. These are:

- (1) Simple average over countries of the percentage distribution for each variable. A simple average gives the same importance to the national distributions.
- (2) Standard deviation of the national percentages for each category.
- (3) Its coefficient of variation, i.e. (2)/(1).

Concerning the average of the distributions, note should be taken of categories of extreme size – very large and very small. Sometimes it may be useful to consider splitting the very large ones, and combining the very small ones – but of course only if that appears substantively meaningful.

Consider for example PM010, main family composition. We may consider whether it is really useful to obtain codes 3 and 5 (lived with single father, and lived with single father plus new partner) separately, or whether they can be combined (“lived with father, but not mother”)? The two categories together account only for 1.7% of the cases on the average. Similar questions may be

---

<sup>5</sup> Some simple numerical variables (such as parent’s age) and those with numerous codes (such as parent’s occupation) have not been shown in the table.

raised concerning the separation of codes 6 and 7 (lived in private/foster home, or collective/institutional household). On the other hand, should more detail be sought for the large category 'lived with both parents'?

The above are mere examples, not definitive recommendations pending further consideration and discussion. Also another factor to consider is the extent of variation across countries.

Table 7 identifies various groups according to the magnitude of the coefficient of variations (CV) across countries:

$$CV \geq 1.0, 0.75-1.0, 0.50-0.75, < 0.50.$$

Small categories of course tend to have large CV values.

Nevertheless, the largest CV values are found for the variable on activity status, of the father and especially of the mother. This is followed by the questions on parental level of education. Again, there is greater heterogeneity among countries in relation to the mother characteristics. Questions concerning family composition and financial problems are more stable across countries.

It is also necessary to examine in more detail where this variability comes from. Which variables and in which countries tend to be very different from the average from the pattern? Big and persistent differences would indicate the need to examine and better standardize the data collection methodology.

As an illustration of the analysis, annex Table A.5 shows the following cells from the full data in Table A.4, by variable and country.

- (1) Cells which contain no cases in the country concerns.
- (2) Cells with (percentage) value 3 times or larger than the value for the cell average over countries.
- (3) Cells with (percentage) value (1/3) or smaller than the value averaged over countries.

These are some examples. The idea is to indicate the possible need for deeper examination of the methodologies in particular countries before the next application.

Examples (see Table A.5)

'Never' had financial problems in the household

- overall average 32%; but very low (5-6%) values in AT,CY,SK.

'Full-time housework' as main activity status of mother

- overall average 38/, but very low values (<10%) in a number of countries (CZ, DK, EE, FI, LV, NO, SK), going down to only 2% in the last-mentioned (NO, SK).

‘Unpaid family worker’ as main activity of the mother

- overall average 4%, but very high value in EL (24%), and below 1% in a number of countries (EE, LT, LV, NO, SK, UK).

Mother’s main activity status other than ‘employee’

- very low frequencies in some countries (e.g. EE, LT, LV) level of education, both of mothers and fathers
- very low frequencies above primary level in ES, PT.

‘Self-employed’ as main activity status of father

- overall average 22%, but only 1-2% in CZ, EE, LT, LV, SK.

Some of these differences may suggest the need to standardise country methodologies; other to reduce details of the code (for example, not separately out ‘unpaid family work’ from ‘self-employment’, since also the distinction is often gender-biased); some differences may be genuine despite being large, such as differences in the proportions of man in self-employment as a result of historical differences among the old and new Member States.

**Table 7. Distribution of 'filled' values for main variables**

(Simple average of % distribution over countries, with its standard deviation and coefficient of variation)

	simple average mean	StDev	cv		simple average mean	StDev	cv
<b>Main family composition</b>				<b>Financial problems in household when young teenager</b>			
PM010	%			PM100	%		
Lived with both parents	85,2	5,7	0,07	Most of the time	10,5	4,9	0,46
Lived with single mother	9,1	4,1	0,44	Often	14,7	6,4	0,44
Lived with single father	1,3	0,4	0,29	Occasionally	24,1	7,8	0,33
Lived with mother&mother new partner	1,6	1,1	0,70	Rarely	19,1	4,5	0,24
Lived with father&father new partner	0,4	0,2	0,53	Never	31,6	17,6	0,56
in antoher private household, foster-home	1,7	1,0	0,60		100,0		
Lived in collective household or institution	0,7	0,4	0,58				
	100,0						
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by father</b>				<b>Main activity status of father</b>			
PM040	%			PM060	%		
Less than primary education	15,4	15,0	0,98	Employee	73,9	14,8	0,20
Primary education	33,8	18,6	0,55	Self-employed	22,2	14,4	0,65
Lower secondary education	20,4	13,9	0,68	Unpaid family-worker	0,4	0,6	1,53
Upper secondary education	24,0	17,1	0,71	Unemployed	0,5	0,6	1,24
Post-secondary education	4,2	4,8	1,13	Retired, early retired	1,2	1,1	0,89
First stage of tertiary education	10,6	6,2	0,59	Full time housework	0,2	0,2	0,99
	100,0			Other	1,6	2,2	1,33
					100,0		
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother</b>				<b>Main activity status of mother</b>			
PM050	%			PM080	%		
Less than primary education	18,9	18,9	1,00	Employee	46,4	23,7	0,51
Primary education	35,4	20,1	0,57	Self-employed	8,3	8,0	0,97
Lower secondary education	25,7	19,3	0,75	Unpaid family-worker	4,2	4,8	1,14
Upper secondary education	19,0	13,1	0,69	Unemployed	0,3	0,3	1,20
Post-secondary education	2,5	2,5	0,99	Retired, early retired	1,9	5,9	3,12
First stage of tertiary education	6,8	4,9	0,72	Full time housework	37,6	23,7	0,63
	100,0			Other	1,7	4,3	2,52
					100,0		

## 5.2 PM010: Main Family Composition

Table 7 presented earlier shows that for variable PM010, the first two categories predominate, 'lived with both parents', and 'lived with single mother', accounting respectively for 85% and 10% of the cases on the average. All the remaining categories account for only 5% of the cases on the average. Breakdown of the dominant category and some collapsing of the small categories may be worthwhile. Table 7 also shows that the coefficient of variation across countries of the categories is not large.

Table 8 examines the distribution in more detail. For clarity, the original categories have been collapsed to the following four: the person lived

- (1) with both parents
- (2) with only mother
- (3) with only father
- (4) with neither of them

In the four panels of the table, countries have been sorted by (1) to (4) respectively (reversing the direction of sort in (1) to make the different orderings similar).

There are large differences among countries in the proportions who lived with both parents – from 94% in EL to 68% in LV. This difference results largely from the increasing proportion who lived with the mother alone, though there is also some increase in the proportion who lived away from both parents. The observed differences across countries are plausible and indicate the usefulness of the question.

**Table 8. Distribution of responses to the question on main family composition when young teenager, PM010 (collapsed categories).**

Ordered by (1), descending				Ordered by (2), ascending				Ordered by (3), ascending				Ordered by (4), ascending							
(1) Lived with both parents				(2) Lived with only mother				(3) Lived with only father				(4) Lived with neither							
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(3)	(4)		(1)	(2)	(4)		(1)	(2)	(3)					
GR	94,0	4	1	0	GR	94	4,4	1	0	SK	90	8	1,0	1	GR	94	4	1	0,4
IE	92,0	6	1	1	ES	91	5,0	1	3	GR	94	4	1,1	0	SK	90	8	1	0,6
IT	91,5	6	1	1	IE	92	5,6	1	1	ES	91	5	1,2	3	IE	92	6	1	1,0
ES	90,5	5	1	3	IT	92	5,8	1	1	CY	90	6	1,2	2	CZ	85	12	2	1,1
SK	90,5	8	1	1	CY	90	6,4	1	2	IT	92	6	1,3	1	IT	92	6	1	1,4
CY	90,1	6	1	2	NO	90	6,9	1	2	IS	83	12	1,4	3	NO	90	7	1	1,5
NO	90,1	7	1	2	NL	90	6,9	1	2	EE	74	19	1,4	6	PL	88	9	1	1,6
NL	89,8	7	1	2	LU	89	7,5	2	2	IE	92	6	1,4	1	FI	84	11	3	1,6
LU	89,1	8	2	2	BE	88	7,8	2	2	NL	90	7	1,4	2	LU	89	8	2	1,8
BE	88,4	8	2	2	SK	90	7,9	1	1	PL	88	9	1,5	2	SE	82	13	3	1,8
PL	88,0	9	1	2	PT	85	8,6	2	5	NO	90	7	1,5	2	NL	90	7	1	1,9
CZ	85,1	12	2	1	PL	88	9,0	1	2	LU	89	8	1,6	2	BE	88	8	2	2,0
PT	84,6	9	2	5	FR	83	10,9	2	4	CZ	85	12	1,6	1	UK	84	12	2	2,1
FI	84,3	11	3	2	FI	84	11,4	3	2	PT	85	9	1,6	5	CY	90	6	1	2,2
UK	83,8	12	2	2	UK	84	11,7	2	2	LT	79	17	1,6	3	DE	83	13	2	2,2
FR	83,2	11	2	4	AT	83	11,8	2	4	AT	83	12	1,7	4	SI	82	13	2	2,5
IS	83,2	12	1	3	DK	83	11,8	2	3	LV	68	27	1,8	3	LT	79	17	2	2,5
DK	83,2	12	2	3	CZ	85	12,3	2	1	SI	82	13	1,8	2	HU	83	12	2	2,7
HU	83,0	12	2	3	HU	83	12,3	2	3	BE	88	8	1,8	2	DK	83	12	2	2,7
AT	82,7	12	2	4	IS	83	12,5	1	3	DE	83	13	1,8	2	IS	83	12	1	3,0
DE	82,6	13	2	2	SE	82	13,1	3	2	HU	83	12	2,0	3	ES	91	5	1	3,3
SI	82,5	13	2	2	SI	82	13,2	2	2	FR	83	11	2,3	4	LV	68	27	2	3,4
SE	82,1	13	3	2	DE	83	13,4	2	2	DK	83	12	2,3	3	FR	83	11	2	3,6
LT	78,7	17	2	3	LT	79	17,2	2	3	UK	84	12	2,5	2	AT	83	12	2	3,9
EE	74,0	19	1	6	EE	74	19,0	1	6	FI	84	11	2,6	2	PT	85	9	2	5,2
LV	68,0	27	2	3	LV	68	26,8	2	3	SE	82	13	2,9	2	EE	74	19	1	5,7

CODE:

- (1) Lived with both parents
- (2) Lived with only mother
- (3) Lived with only father
- (4) Lived with neither

### 5.3 PM100 Financial problems in household when young teenager

As noted in the previous section, in country evaluations, a concern has often been expressed about the lack of reliability (and hence also of comparability) of the question on the financial situation. However, the pattern of results, as summarised in Table 9, is not so unreasonable.

Firstly, as already seen from Table 7, averaged over countries, the five response categories divide the total sample into fairly similar size groups (each accounting from 10-30 percent of the total).

Secondly, and more importantly, the coefficient of variations of the country distributions of various categories, which average to around 0.4 over the categories, are relatively small compared to those for some other questions in the Module.

Table 9 examines the distribution in more detail. For clarity, the two top (mostly+often) and the two bottom (rarely+never) categories have been collapsed.

The first panel of the table shows countries ordered according to the size of the middle category ('occasionally'); there is big range of its size, from only 14% of the sample in SE to 40% in AT. Large concentration in the middle (neutral) category can be indicative of the quality of the question.<sup>6</sup> The remaining two panels show the same information with countries ordered, respectively, by the size of the top and the bottom categories (reversing the direction in the latter to make the two orderings similar).

The two panels very clearly show the more negative responses in the new Member States, as might be expected. This consistency in the results is encouraging. We may also note that the size of the middle category (the first panel) tend to be larger in the new Member States. This increase seems to be more at the expense of positive responses (financial problems rarely or never) than that of negative ones (financial problems mostly or often). This also appears to be consistent with what might be expected.

One may therefore say that the question seems to have worked reasonably well despite earlier concerns.

---

<sup>6</sup> For these reasons, some researchers prefer to have an even number of response categories, so as to avoid a 'neutral' middle category.

**Table 9. Distribution of responses to the question on financial problems when young teenager (collapsed categories)**

	Ordered by (2)			Ordered by (1)			Ordered by (3), descending					
	(1) mostly +often	(2) Occasionally	(3) rarely +never	(1) mostly +often	(2) Occasionally	(3) rarely +never	(1) mostly +often	(2) Occasionally	(3) rarely +never			
SE	12,5	13,7	73,7	NO	9,3	15,3	75,4	DK	9,6	14,5	75,9	
BE	13,0	13,7	73,2	DK	9,6	14,5	75,9	NO	9,3	15,3	75,4	
DK	9,6	14,5	75,9	IS	9,9	15,6	74,5	IS	9,9	15,6	74,5	
NO	9,3	15,3	75,4	SE	12,5	13,7	73,7	SE	12,5	13,7	73,7	
HU	38,4	15,5	46,1	BE	13,0	13,7	73,2	BE	13,0	13,7	73,2	
IS	9,9	15,6	74,5	NL	14,8	16,7	68,5	NL	14,8	16,7	68,5	
NL	14,8	16,7	68,5	LU	20,3	20,0	59,6	LU	20,3	20,0	59,6	
LU	20,3	20,0	59,6	IE	20,6	22,2	57,2	IE	20,6	22,2	57,2	
ES	23,7	20,4	55,9	CZ	22,0	29,8	48,2	ES	23,7	20,4	55,9	
IE	20,6	22,2	57,2	FI	22,2	25,2	52,5	UK	23,8	22,4	53,8	
UK	23,8	22,4	53,8	ES	23,7	20,4	55,9	FI	22,2	25,2	52,5	
FR	25,4	23,1	51,5	UK	23,8	22,4	53,8	FR	25,4	23,1	51,5	
LV	34,8	25,0	40,2	FR	25,4	23,1	51,5	CZ	22,0	29,8	48,2	
FI	22,2	25,2	52,5	CY	25,8	38,8	35,4	HU	38,4	15,5	46,1	
LT	39,3	26,8	33,9	EE	27,3	36,5	36,2	LV	34,8	25,0	40,2	
IT	41,4	28,1	30,5	AT	28,0	39,5	32,5	PL	31,9	29,6	38,5	
PL	31,9	29,6	38,5	PL	31,9	29,6	38,5	EE	27,3	36,5	36,2	
SI	42,5	29,6	27,9	LV	34,8	25,0	40,2	CY	25,8	38,8	35,4	
CZ	22,0	29,8	48,2	HU	38,4	15,5	46,1	LT	39,3	26,8	33,9	
SK	43,3	32,1	24,6	LT	39,3	26,8	33,9	AT	28,0	39,5	32,5	
EE	27,3	36,5	36,2	IT	41,4	28,1	30,5	IT	41,4	28,1	30,5	
CY	25,8	38,8	35,4	SI	42,5	29,6	27,9	SI	42,5	29,6	27,9	
AT	28,0	39,5	32,5	SK	43,3	32,1	24,6	SK	43,3	32,1	24,6	
DE				DE				DE				
GR				GR				GR				
PT				PT				PT				
simple average	25,2	24,1	50,7	25,2	24,1	50,7	25,2	24,1	50,7	25,2	24,1	50,7

#### 5.4 PM040/PM050: Highest ISCED level of education attained by father/mother

Table 7 presented earlier shows that for variables PM040/PM050, the coefficient of variation across countries of the categories is quite large, indicating large differences between countries. While some of these differences are undoubtedly real, some are very likely to be the results of conceptual differences and measurement errors.

Table 10 examines the distribution in more detail. Generally, the results are quite similar for fathers and mothers. For each parent, the same data are shown sorted in two ways: (i) by the proportion recorded with educational below the primary level (ascending); and (ii) by the proportion recorded with educational higher than upper secondary level (descending, so as to reflect similar ordering to the first panel). In the second case, two original categories at the highest level have been collapsed to obtain a larger and more consistent category covering education beyond upper secondary.

The detail shows up some data or coding inconsistencies. In UK for instance, 55% of fathers and 67% of mothers are reported to have had less than primary education, while not a single case is reported with completed primary education (variable code '1') . By contrast, in a number of countries no persons (mothers or fathers) are reported with less than primary completed (AT, CZ, DE, DK, NL, NO, SK). These striking differences point to the need for improving the methodology for better comparability.

**Table 10. Level of education of the father and the mother. A. Highest ISCED level of education attained by father (PM040)**

**Highest ISCED level of education attained by father (PM040)**

	Sorted by (1)							Sorted by (2)							
	(1) Less than primary education	Primary education	Lower secondary education	Upper secondary education	Post-secondary education	First stage of tertiary education	(2) Above upper secondary	(1) Less than primary education	Primary education	Lower secondary education	Upper secondary education	Post-secondary education	First stage of tertiary education	(2) Above upper secondary	
AT	0	0,2	59,7	35,4	0,3	4,5	4,8	NO	0	0	35,8	29,0	14,6	20,6	35,2
CZ	0	0,7	20,4	70,1	1,0	7,7	8,7	DE	0	2,0	12,9	51,1	1,6	32,3	33,9
DE	0	2,0	12,9	51,1	1,6	32,3	33,9	UK	54,6	0	10,4	3,5	17,3	14,2	31,6
DK	0	0	41,8	39,1	4,4	14,7	19,1	IS	3,3	20,5	16,4	35,0	13,0	11,8	24,8
NL	0	33,0	31,9	18,0	0	17,0	17,0	DK	0	0	41,8	39,1	4,4	14,7	19,1
NO	0	0	35,8	29,0	14,6	20,6	35,2	LT	11,5	40,0	18,0	11,7	10,3	8,4	18,7
SK	0	11,1	29,4	51,1	0	8,4	8,4	EE	1,9	22,3	27,5	29,9	5,4	13,0	18,4
SE	1,1	50,6	22,5	9,5	2,6	13,7	16,3	LU	6,2	47,9	4,4	24,0	5,6	11,9	17,5
HU	1,5	26,1	23,4	37,7	3,3	8,0	11,3	NL	0	33,0	31,9	18,0	0	17,0	17,0
EE	1,9	22,3	27,5	29,9	5,4	13,0	18,4	BE	17,1	32,7	15,7	17,5	2,1	14,9	17,0
IE	3,1	68,9	11,1	7,0	2,6	7,3	9,9	SE	1,1	50,6	22,5	9,5	2,6	13,7	16,3
IS	3,3	20,5	16,4	35,0	13,0	11,8	24,8	LV	3,9	18,7	36,3	25,7	5,1	10,3	15,4
LV	3,9	18,7	36,3	25,7	5,1	10,3	15,4	FI	7,5	24,1	39,9	14,1	0,7	13,7	14,4
SI	6,1	39,4	11,0	35,6	3,6	4,3	7,8	HU	1,5	26,1	23,4	37,7	3,3	8,0	11,3
LU	6,2	47,9	4,4	24,0	5,6	11,9	17,5	IE	3,1	68,9	11,1	7,0	2,6	7,3	9,9
FR	6,7	56,2	21,7	6,4	0,3	8,7	8,9	FR	6,7	56,2	21,7	6,4	0,3	8,7	8,9
FI	7,5	24,1	39,9	14,1	0,7	13,7	14,4	CZ	0	0,7	20,4	70,1	1,0	7,7	8,7
LT	11,5	40,0	18,0	11,7	10,3	8,4	18,7	ES	26,1	54,3	5,6	5,5	0,4	8,1	8,5
BE	17,1	32,7	15,7	17,5	2,1	14,9	17,0	SK	0	11,1	29,4	51,1	0	8,4	8,4
PL	17,3	41,2	0,7	35,7	0,5	4,6	5,1	SI	6,1	39,4	11,0	35,6	3,6	4,3	7,8
IT	18,8	51,2	16,2	10,8	0	3,1	3,1	GR	31,9	46,0	9,0	5,3	2,3	5,6	7,8
ES	26,1	54,3	5,6	5,5	0,4	8,1	8,5	CY	30,6	42,3	6,4	13,5	0,8	6,4	7,2
CY	30,6	42,3	6,4	13,5	0,8	6,4	7,2	PL	17,3	41,2	0,7	35,7	0,5	4,6	5,1
GR	31,9	46,0	9,0	5,3	2,3	5,6	7,8	AT	0	0,2	59,7	35,4	0,3	4,5	4,8
PT	43,1	48,2	3,3	2,5	0,1	2,8	2,9	IT	18,8	51,2	16,2	10,8	0	3,1	3,1
UK	54,6	0	10,4	3,5	17,3	14,2	31,6	PT	43,1	48,2	3,3	2,5	0,1	2,8	2,9
average	15,4	33,8	20,4	24,0	4,2	10,6	14,4	average	15,4	33,8	20,4	24,0	4,2	10,6	14,4



**Table 10. Level of education of the father and the mother. B. Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother (PM050)**

Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother (PM050) Sorted by (1)								Sorted by (2)							
	(1) Less than primary education	Primary education	Lower secondary education	Upper secondary education	Post-secondary education	First stage of tertiary education	Above upper secondary		(1) Less than primary education	Primary education	Lower secondary education	Upper secondary education	Post-secondary education	First stage of tertiary education	(2) Above upper secondary
NO	0	0	42,8	32,2	0	25,0	25,0	NO	0	0	42,8	32,2	0	25,0	25,0
DE	0	3,6	37,4	46,8	2,1	10,2	12,3	LT	14,8	41,4	14,6	10,5	11,1	7,6	18,7
DK	0	0,1	68,8	20,0	0	11,0	11,0	EE	2,6	23,7	28,0	27,1	5,8	12,7	18,5
NL	0	39,3	41,8	12,1	0	6,8	6,8	UK	67,7	0	13,8	3,6	4,3	10,7	14,9
AT	0	3,4	72,9	19,4	2,0	2,3	4,3	LV	6,4	20,0	33,2	26,7	5,2	8,4	13,6
SK	0	13,2	42,6	40,2	0	4,0	4,0	SE	1,8	52,9	23,0	9,0	3,4	9,9	13,3
CZ	0	1,5	42,3	52,5	0,7	3,0	3,7	DE	0	3,6	37,4	46,8	2,1	10,2	12,3
SE	1,8	52,9	23,0	9,0	3,4	9,9	13,3	BE	18,5	37,8	17,0	15,2	2,0	9,4	11,4
HU	1,9	30,5	33,9	25,5	3,9	4,2	8,1	DK	0	0,1	68,8	20,0	0	11,0	11,0
IE	2,4	66,5	13,0	9,8	2,7	5,7	8,4	FI	6,4	26,2	40,7	16,5	0,5	9,7	10,3
EE	2,6	23,7	28,0	27,1	5,8	12,7	18,5	IE	2,4	66,5	13,0	9,8	2,7	5,7	8,4
IS	3,7	28,7	38,2	21,5	1,7	6,2	7,9	HU	1,9	30,5	33,9	25,5	3,9	4,2	8,1
FI	6,4	26,2	40,7	16,5	0,5	9,7	10,3	LU	8,5	61,4	7,1	15,1	0,7	7,2	8,0
LV	6,4	20,0	33,2	26,7	5,2	8,4	13,6	IS	3,7	28,7	38,2	21,5	1,7	6,2	7,9
FR	7,5	62,4	18,0	6,7	0,3	5,2	5,5	NL	0	39,3	41,8	12,1	0	6,8	6,8
SI	8,2	58,2	5,2	24,0	2,6	1,8	4,4	FR	7,5	62,4	18,0	6,7	0,3	5,2	5,5
LU	8,5	61,4	7,1	15,1	0,7	7,2	8,0	GR	38,6	45,1	6,7	4,7	2,0	2,9	4,9
LT	14,8	41,4	14,6	10,5	11,1	7,6	18,7	SI	8,2	58,2	5,2	24,0	2,6	1,8	4,4
BE	18,5	37,8	17,0	15,2	2,0	9,4	11,4	AT	0	3,4	72,9	19,4	2,0	2,3	4,3
PL	19,3	46,5	0,7	29,3	1,1	3,0	4,1	PL	19,3	46,5	0,7	29,3	1,1	3,0	4,1
IT	23,5	54,0	13,3	8,0	0	1,3	1,3	SK	0	13,2	42,6	40,2	0	4,0	4,0
ES	30,4	56,7	5,4	3,8	0,2	3,5	3,7	CY	43,4	35,7	5,7	11,3	0,5	3,4	3,9
GR	38,6	45,1	6,7	4,7	2,0	2,9	4,9	CZ	0	1,5	42,3	52,5	0,7	3,0	3,7
CY	43,4	35,7	5,7	11,3	0,5	3,4	3,9	ES	30,4	56,7	5,4	3,8	0,2	3,5	3,7
PT	53,6	40,7	2,1	1,3	0,1	2,2	2,3	PT	53,6	40,7	2,1	1,3	0,1	2,2	2,3
UK	67,7	0	13,8	3,6	4,3	10,7	14,9	IT	23,5	54,0	13,3	8,0	0	1,3	1,3
average	18,9	35,4	25,7	19,0	2,5	6,8	8,9	average	18,9	35,4	25,7	19,0	2,5	6,8	8,9

### **5.5 PM060/PM080: Main activity status of father/mother**

Table 7 presented earlier shows that for variables PM060/PM080, the coefficient of variation across countries of the categories is often very large, indicating large differences between countries. Some of the large cv's occur for categories which are very small. Statuses as employee and self-employed predominate for fathers, and statuses as employee and full-time family worker predominate for mothers.

Table 11 examines the distribution by country in more detail, separately for fathers and mothers. Countries in the first panel, for fathers, are arranged according to the proportion employees. Countries in the second panel, for mothers, are arranged according to the proportion in full-time housework. There are large differences among countries. Again, while many of these differences are undoubtedly real, some are very likely to be the results of conceptual differences and measurement errors.

The detail shows up some data or coding inconsistencies:

In NO for instance, 30% of mothers have been coded as 'retired/early retired', while the average of countries is only 2%.

Another notable characteristic of the table is the smallness of many categories, even complete absence in some countries.

Concerning main activity status of father, we also note that there are too many 'other' (code 7) cases in BE, IT; for main activity status of mother, very large number of 'other' cases in SK.

**Table 11. Main activity status of the father and the mother**

Main activity status of father (PM060)									Main activity status of mother (PM080)						
	Employee	Self-employed	Unpaid family-worker	Unemployed	Retired, early retired	Full-time housework	Other		Employee	Self-employed	Unpaid family-worker	Unemployed	Retired, early retired	Full-time housework	Other
EE	97,8	0,5	0,2	0,1	0,7	0,3	0,4	IE	18,6	4,1	1,2	0,2		75,4	0,5
LV	96,8	1,0	0,2	0,1	0,9	0,2	0,8	IT	14,8	7,1	2,4	0,4	0,8	73,4	1,2
LT	96,0	1,0	0,6	0,1	0,5	0,4	1,3	NL	21,5	2,6	3,4	0,1	0,0	71,6	0,9
CZ	95,9	2,4	0,1	0,0	1,4	0,0	0,2	ES	19,5	8,1	3,6	0,1	0,1	67,6	1,0
SK	94,8	1,7	0,1	0,3	1,7	0,1	1,3	BE	22,8	5,5	5,2	0,5	0,5	62,3	3,1
HU	90,5	5,5		0,2	2,2	0,1	1,5	LU	24,9	6,2	7,1	0,0	0,2	61,4	0,2
UK	82,5	14,6	0,0	1,0	0,7	0,2	1,1	CY	23,0	7,0	9,7	0,0		60,0	0,3
DE	80,9	14,9	0,1	0,6	2,0	0,1	1,4	AT	28,4	8,3	8,0	0,1	0,4	54,1	0,6
LU	77,0	21,2	0,1	0,2	1,2	0,1	0,3	DE	41,4	3,7	3,7	0,4	0,6	49,3	1,0
SI	76,4	19,6	0,3	0,7	1,7	0,6	0,7	FR	36,2	7,3	7,2	0,1	0,1	48,5	0,7
NL	74,9	20,3	0,2	0,6	0,5	0,2	3,2	GR	15,0	14,6	23,7	0,1	0,5	45,7	0,4
FR	73,3	24,4	0,2	0,4	0,4	0,0	1,4	UK	50,0	4,4	0,6	0,7	0,2	43,5	0,7
NO	72,3	26,3	0,1	0,1	1,2		0,1	IS	46,3	10,8	1,0		0,4	40,9	0,6
SE	71,9	25,5	0,7	0,3	1,3	0,1	0,3	PT	35,5	19,7	3,7	0,1	0,5	40,0	0,5
ES	69,8	28,0	0,4	0,3	0,8	0,0	0,6	SI	47,8	10,2	3,6	1,2	0,9	35,7	0,7
AT	69,8	26,2	0,7	0,5	1,6	0,1	1,2	SE	57,6	6,8	2,0	0,2	0,7	32,3	0,4
BE	69,4	20,4	0,0	0,6	1,0	0,4	8,1	HU	64,0	1,5		0,1	1,7	31,4	1,2
PT	68,5	29,5	0,7	0,2	0,7	0,1	0,4	PL	44,5	29,7	6,1	0,5	0,8	18,4	0,1
DK	66,1	27,2	0,5	1,2	0,1	0,0	4,9	LT	81,0	0,5	0,6	0,1	0,2	16,6	1,0
PL	65,5	32,5	0,4	0,1	1,2	0,1	0,1	FI	52,1	24,1	6,3	0,0	2,5	11,6	3,3
IE	65,3	30,4	0,1	2,3	0,5	0,1	1,4	CZ	85,5	0,7	1,1	0,3	1,0	11,3	0,2
IS	61,5	37,9	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,1	0,2	LV	88,3	0,5	0,3	0,0	0,5	10,0	0,4
FI	57,6	33,0	3,0	0,0	3,9	0,4	2,1	EE	91,3	0,1	0,2	0,0	0,3	8,0	0,2
CY	56,3	42,6	0,1	0,1	0,1		0,8	DK	52,1	4,8	4,7	1,3	30,1	4,5	2,5
IT	55,3	29,0	0,3	2,1	5,0	0,0	8,2	NO	71,2	25,9	0,1	0,1	0,7	2,1	0,0
GR	36,3	62,6	0,1	0,2	0,5		0,2	SK	72,7	0,5	0,1	0,5	1,4	2,0	22,7
mean	73,9	22,2	0,4	0,5	1,2	0,2	1,6		46,4	8,3	4,2	0,3	1,9	37,6	1,7

## 6. ANNEX: TABLES A.1 – A.5

**Table A.1. Frequency distribution of variable flags**

		DK	FI	IS	NL	NO	SI	SE	ES	GR	HU	LU
<b>Main family composition flag PM010_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575					
-2	-N/A											
-1	missing	22	244	21	109	12	17	4.133	351	24	83	2.043
1	filled	4.386	7.855	1.966	6.981	4.346	5.476	3.975	19.851	7.846	9.823	5.492
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Financial problems in household when young teenager flag PM100_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)		3.130	2.243	2.266		2.654	4.083	10.173		4.885	
-3	not selected respondent		11.732	2.440	8.496		15.572					
-2	-N/A		23	2	185		19				194	2.155
-1	missing	66	433	44	357		80	4.259	722			
1	filled	4.342	7.643	1.941	6.548		5.537	3.849	19.480		9.712	5.380
	Blank	7.493				11.913				12.381		
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Main number siblings flag PM035_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575					
-2	-N/A											
-1	missing		277	24	185	13	64	8.108	759	24	300	2.060
1	filled	4.408	7.822	1.963	6.905	4.345	5.429		19.443	7.846	9.606	5.475
	Blank											
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
	Total excluding '-5' and '-3'*	4.408	8.099	1.987	7.090	4.358	5.493	4.098	20.202	7.870	9.906	5.492

**Table A.1. Frequency distribution of variable flags (cont.)**

		BE	CY	CZ	DE	EE	FR	IE	IT	LT	LV	PL	PT	SK	UK
<b>Main family composition flag PM010_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A														
-1	missing	106		62	329	5	20	2.199		49	29	20	78	17	1.292
1	filled	6.725	6.050	5.790	16.906	5.935	12.655	5.318	32.044	6.384	4.929	24.855	6.778	8.615	12.432
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Financial problems in household when young teenager flag PM100_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)		2.947	2.776		3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	13.657		4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	3.143		19		71	183		226	48	44				
-1	missing	158		71		14	751	2.243		68	119			44	2.771
1	filled	6.673	6.050	5.762		5.855	11.741	5.274	31.818	6.317	4.795	24.014		8.588	10.953
	Blank				24.982								10.706		
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Main number siblings flag PM035_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A														
-1	missing	115		0	496	5	224	2.133	226	49	33	39	102	148	1.224
1	filled	6.716	6.050	5.852	16.739	5.935	12.451	5.384	31.818	6.384	4.925	24.836	6.754	8.484	12.500
	Blank														
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
Total excluding '-5' and '-3'		6.831	6.050	5.852	17.235	5.940	12.675	7.517	32.044	6.433	4.958	24.875	6.856	8.632	13.724

**Code**

- N/A (no father/mother)
- 2 -N/A (Father/mother never had job/no father/mother)
- N/A (Lived in a collective household or institution)

**\*Notes**

- SE Number of 'not selected respondent' cases taken from PM020 (it is missing in all other variables)
- LU Number of 'not in age range' cases estimated from code '-1' in variable PM010. This is an upper limit for this number (see text).

**Table A.1. Frequency distribution of variable flags (cont.)**

		DK	FI	IS	NL	NO	SI	SE	ES	GR	HU	LU
<b>Year of birth of father flag PM020_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575	4.010	618	382		
-2	-N/A		1.040	303	723		686	191			1.147	114
-1	missing		368	44	395	440	200	67	2.946	24	263	2.318
1	filled	4.408	6.691	1.640	5.972	3.918	4.607	3.840	16.638	7.464	8.496	5.103
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by father flag PM040_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575		618			
-2	-N/A		1.040	303	723		686	191		382	1.147	250
-1	missing	548	432	60	1.041	518	68	4.211	1.046	24	208	2.388
1	filled	3.860	6.627	1.624	5.326	3.840	4.739	3.706	18.538	7.464	8.551	4.897
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Main activity status of father flag PM060_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575					
-2	-N/A		1.040	303	723		686	191	618	382	1.147	250
-1	missing	51	373	29	56	445	76	4.238	692	24	209	2.106
1	filled	4.357	6.686	1.655	6.311	3.913	4.731	3.679	18.892	7.464	8.550	5.179
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Main occupation of father flag PM070_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575					
-2	-N/A		1.476	313	1.070		717	191	717	395	1.147	258
-1	missing	357	310	51	319	529	163	7.037	1.126	28	590	2.152
1	filled	4.051	6.313	1.623	5.701	3.829	4.613	880	18.359	7.447	8.169	5.125
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535

**Table A.1. Frequency distribution of variable flags (cont.)**

		BE	CY	CZ	DE	EE	FR	IE	IT	LT	LV	PL	PT	SK	UK
<b>Year of birth of father flag PM020_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	260	287	579	1.172	1.464	221		2.314	979	1.230	541	935	238	
-1	missing	395		57	373	116	1.298	2.641	1.950	49	109	3.325	263	262	3.296
1	filled	6.176	5.763	5.216	15.690	4.360	11.156	4.876	27.780	5.405	3.619	21.009	5.658	8.132	10.428
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by father flag PM040_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	260	287	579	1.172	1.464	221		2.314	979	1.230	541	935	238	
-1	missing	488		74	2.487	55	1.445	2.503		150	132	1.684	125	289	5.373
1	filled	6.083	5.763	5.199	13.576	4.421	11.009	5.014	29.730	5.304	3.596	22.650	5.796	8.105	8.351
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Main activity status of father flag PM060_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	260	287	579	1.172	1.464	221		2.314	979	1.230	541	935	238	
-1	missing	284		74	634	11	1.016	2.413		81	49	1.491	105	354	2.738
1	filled	6.287	5.763	5.199	15.429	4.465	11.438	5.104	29.730	5.373	3.679	22.843	5.816	8.040	10.986
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Main occupation of father flag PM070_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	260	330	584	1.172	1.477	239		3.980	1.037	1.274	779	935	238	
-1	missing	1.312		74	1.818	36	1.111	2.633		81	70	2.326	101	656	8.042
1	filled	5.259	5.720	5.194	14.245	4.427	11.325	4.884	28.064	5.315	3.614	21.770	5.820	7.738	5.682
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115

**Table A.1. Frequency distribution of variable flags (cont.)**

		DK	FI	IS	NL	NO	SI	SE	ES	GR	HU	LU
<b>Year of birth of mother flag PM030_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575	4.010	265			
-2	-N/A		339	85	341		149	173		118	292	27
-1	missing		321	48	314	200	189	65	2.567	24	215	2.300
1	filled	4.408	7.439	1.854	6.435	4.158	5.155	3.860	17.370	7.728	9.399	5.208
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother flag PM050_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496	4.184	15.575				292	
-2	-N/A		339	85	341		149	173	265	118		85
-1	missing	999	391	75	825	268	92	4.175	897	25	145	2.374
1	filled	3.409	7.369	1.827	5.924	4.090	5.252	3.760	19.040	7.727	9.469	5.076
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Main activity status of mother flag PM080_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496		15.575					
-2	-N/A		339	85	341		149	173	265	118	292	85
-1	missing	32	346	26	63	4.566	86	4.122	550	25	137	2.104
1	filled	4.376	7.414	1.876	6.686	3.976	5.258	3.813	19.387	7.727	9.477	5.346
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535
<b>Main occupation of mother flag PM090_F</b>												
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	1.549	3.130	2.243	2.266	3.371	2.794	4.083	10.173	4.511	4.885	
-3	not selected respondent	5.944	11.732	2.440	8.496		15.575					
-2	-N/A		1.362	889	5.255		421	173	10.570	3.728	292	2.443
-1	missing	1.979	1.002	54	37	5.988	1.721	7.267	717	26	3.426	2.144
1	filled	2.429	5.735	1.044	1.798	2.554	3.351	668	8.915	4.116	6.188	2.948
	Total	11.901	22.961	6.670	17.852	11.913	23.862	12.191	30.375	12.381	14.791	7.535



**Table A.1. Frequency distribution of variable flags**

		BE	CY	CZ	DE	EE	FR	IE	IT	LT	LV	PL	PT	SK	UK
<b>Year of birth of mother flag PM030_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	138	89	112	242	418	0		849	146	147	136	463	48	
-1	missing	346		58	369	87	1.069	2.436	9.026	49	118	2.843	249	199	2.368
1	filled	6.347	5.961	5.682	16.624	5.435	11.606	5.081	22.169	6.238	4.693	21.896	6.144	8.385	11.356
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother flag PM050_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	138	89	112	242	418	77		849	146	147	136	463	48	
-1	missing	412		68	2.479	45	888	2.346		143	140	1.319	124	243	4.601
1	filled	6.281	5.961	5.672	14.514	5.477	11.710	5.171	31.195	6.144	4.671	23.420	6.269	8.341	9.123
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Main activity status of mother flag PM080_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	138	89	112	242	418	77		849	146	147	136	463	48	
-1	missing	242		91	537	6	450	2.248		70	60	873	94	167	1.893
1	filled	6.451	5.961	5.649	16.456	5.516	12.148	5.269	31.195	6.217	4.751	23.866	6.299	8.417	11.831
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115
<b>Main occupation of mother flag PM090_F</b>															
-5	Not in age range (25-65)	3.143	2.947	2.776	7.747	3.703	6.094	4.515	15.267	3.496	2.955	12.796	3.850	4.247	6.391
-3	not selected respondent														
-2	-N/A	138	3.668	539	242	646	3.482		19.928	1.120	574	4.200	2.352	48	
-1	missing	4.706		95	9.396	88	730	6.254		70	68	1.869	91	2.411	4.408
1	filled	1.987	2.382	5.218	7.597	5.206	8.463	1.263	12.116	5.243	4.316	18.806	4.413	6.173	9.316
	Total	9.974	8.997	8.628	24.982	9.643	18.769	12.032	47.311	9.929	7.913	37.671	10.706	12.879	20.115

**Table A.2. Occurrence of n/a ('flag -2')**

		DK	FI	IS	NL	NO	SI	SE	ES	GR	HU	LU
<b>Always applicable variables (if selected respondent in the required age range)</b>												
Main family composition flag PM010_F												
-2	-N/A											
Main number siblings flag PM035_F												
-2	-N/A											
<b>Non-applicable if in collective household or institution</b>												
Financial problems in household when young teenager flag PM100_F												
-2	-N/A		23	2	185		19				194	2.155
<b>Variables concerning the father</b>												
Year of birth of father flag PM020_F												
-2	-N/A		1.040	303	723		686	191			1.147	114
Highest ISCED level of education attained by father flag PM040_F												
-2	-N/A		1.040	303	723		686	191		382	1.147	250
Main activity status of father flag PM060_F												
-2	-N/A		1.040	303	723		686	191	618	382	1.147	250
Main occupation of father flag PM070_F												
-2	-N/A		1.476	313	1.070		717	191	717	395	1.147	258
<b>Variables concerning the mother</b>												
Year of birth of mother flag PM030_F												
-2	-N/A		339	85	341		149	173		118	292	27
Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother flag PM050_F												
-2	-N/A		339	85	341		149	173	265	118		85
Main activity status of mother flag PM080_F												
-2	-N/A		339	85	341		149	173	265	118	292	85
Main occupation of mother flag PM090_F												
-2	-N/A		1.362	889	5.255		421	173	10.570	3.728	292	2.443

**Table A.2. Occurrence of n/a ('flag -2') (cont.)**

			AT	BE	CY	CZ	DE	EE	FR	IE	IT	LT	LV	PL	PT	SK	UK
<b>Always applicable variables (if selected respondent in the required age range)</b>																	
Main family composition flag PM010_F																	
-2	-N/A																
Main number siblings flag PM035_F																	
-2	-N/A																
<b>Non-applicable if in collective household or institution</b>																	
Financial problems in household when young teenager flag PM100_F																	
-2	-N/A		65	3.143		19		71	183		226	48	44				
<b>Variables concerning the father</b>																	
Year of birth of father flag PM020_F																	
-2	-N/A		298	260	287	579	1.172	1.464	221		2.314	979	1.230	541	935	238	
Highest ISCED level of education attained by father flag PM040_F																	
-2	-N/A		298	260	287	579	1.172	1.464	221		2.314	979	1.230	541	935	238	
Main activity status of father flag PM060_F																	
-2	-N/A		298	260	287	579	1.172	1.464	221		2.314	979	1.230	541	935	238	
Main occupation of father flag PM070_F																	
-2	-N/A		674	260	330	584	1.172	1.477	239		3.980	1.037	1.274	779	935	238	
<b>Variables concerning the mother</b>																	
Year of birth of mother flag PM030_F																	
-2	-N/A		76	138	89	112	242	418			849	146	147	136	463	48	
Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother flag PM050_F																	
-2	-N/A		76	138	89	112	242	418	77		849	146	147	136	463	48	
Main activity status of mother flag PM080_F																	
-2	-N/A		76	138	89	112	242	418	77		849	146	147	136	463	48	
Main occupation of mother flag PM090_F																	
-2	-N/A		2.507	138	3.668	539	242	646	3.482		19.928	1.120	574	4.200	2.352	48	

**Code**

- N/A (no father/mother)
- 2 -N/A (Father/mother never had job/no father/mother)
- N/A (Lived in a collective household or institution)

**Table A.3. Cross-tabulation of occupation (flag variable) versus activity status**

		Activity status of father(PM060)									
		-2	-1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Occupation of father (PM070_F)											
<b>BE</b>											
-2		260									260
-1		0	284	292	98	1	38	64	28	507	1312
<b>DE</b>											
-2		1172									1172
-1		0	600	611	56	2	95	310	9	135	1818
<b>HU</b>											
-2		1147									1147
-1		0	208	216	7		2	19	6	132	590
<b>SK</b>											
-2		238									238
-1		0	353	44	2	1	20	131	2	103	656
<b>IE</b>											
-2											no '-2'
-1			2413	6	2	0	117	23	3	69	2633
<b>UK</b>											
-2											no '-2'
-1			2096	4770	942	1	79	57	16	81	8042
<b>CY</b>											
-2		287		0	0	0	0	4		39	330
-1											no '-1'
<b>IT</b>											
-2		2314		0	0	0	287	346	4	1029	3980
-1											no '-1'
<b>CZ</b>											
-2		579	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	584
-1		0	57	6	0	0	0	8	0	3	74
<b>EE</b>											
-2		1464	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	1477
-1		0	4	26	0	0	0	2	3	1	36
<b>LT</b>											
-2		979	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	36	1037
-1			81								81
<b>LV</b>											
-2		1230	4	0	0	0	0	15	8	17	1274
-1		0	42	22	1	0	0	3	0	2	70
<b>PT</b>											
-2		935									935
-1		0	97	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	101
<b>FR</b>											
-2		221	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	13	239
-1		0	986	96	7	1	3	1	0	17	1111
<b>PL</b>											
-2		541	95	0	0	3	12	115	7	6	779
-1		0	1332	781	92	4	8	95	4	10	2326
<b>AT</b>											
-2		298	361	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	674
-1		0	33	111	19	3	4	5	0	6	181
<b>ES</b>											
-2		618	13	0	0	0	15	22	6	43	717
-1		0	668	364	78	1	3	7	0	5	1126
<b>GR</b>											
-2		382	0	0	0	0	0	0		13	395
-1		0	24	3	1	0	0	0		0	28
<b>LU</b>											
-2		250	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	258
-1		0	2100	41	3	0	1	4	0	3	2152

**Table A.3. Cross-tabulation of occupation (flag variable) versus activity status (cont.)**

		Activity status of mother (PM080)									
		-2	-1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Occupation of mother (PM090_F)											
<b>BE</b>											
	-2	138									138
	-1	0	242	110	30	40	30	35	4019	200	4706
<b>DE</b>											
	-2	242									242
	-1	0	522	395	17	107	59	103	8112	81	9396
<b>HU</b>											
	-2	292									292
	-1	0	136	161	6		2	24	2979	118	3426
<b>SK</b>											
	-2	48									48
	-1	0	167	34	0	0	41	118	143	1908	2411
<b>IE</b>											
	-2										no '-2'
	-1		2248	1	0	0	9		3971	25	6254
<b>UK</b>											
	-2										no '-2'
	-1		1662	1392	140	13	34	15	1119	33	4408
<b>CY</b>											
	-2	89		0	0	0	0		3566	13	3668
	-1										no '-1'
<b>IT</b>											
	-2	849		0	0	0	68	67	18787	157	19928
	-1										no '-1'
<b>CZ</b>											
	-2	112	9	0	0	7	7	11	391	2	539
	-1	0	58	2	0	0	1	5	29	0	95
<b>EE</b>											
	-2	418	2	0	0	0	0	1	222	3	646
	-1	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	63	0	88
<b>LT</b>											
	-2	146	0	0	0	0	2	2	934	36	1120
	-1		70								70
<b>LV</b>											
	-2	147	7	0	0	0	1	19	389	11	574
	-1	0	43	17	0	0	0	0	7	1	68
<b>PT</b>											
	-2	463	0	0	0	0	0	4	1875	10	2352
	-1		91								91
<b>FR</b>											
	-2	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	3364	40	3482
	-1	0	434	36	13	17	0	0	227	3	730
<b>PL</b>											
	-2	136	68	0	0	31	70	94	3796	5	4200
	-1	0	755	496	140	10	26	65	367	10	1869
<b>AT</b>											
	-2	76	194	0	0	0	0	0	2218	19	2507
	-1	0	33	58	3	7	0	10	158	0	269
<b>ES</b>											
	-2	265	12	0	0	0	5	7	10114	167	10570
	-1	0	536	88	20	6	1	1	63	2	717
<b>GR</b>											
	-2	118	0	4	0	1	6	41	3528	30	3728
	-1	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	26
<b>LU</b>											
	-2	85	2	3	0	81	0	4	2267	1	2443
	-1	0	2099	5	0	21	0	0	19	0	2144

**Table A.4 Distribution of 'filled' values for main variables**

(excluding simple numerical variables, and other variables with numerous codes)

	simple average			AT	BE	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IE
	mean	StDev	cv													
<b>Main family composition</b>																
PM010	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Lived with both parents	85,2	5,7	0,07	82,7	88,4	90,1	85,1	82,6	83,2	74,0	90,5	84,3	83,2	94,0	83,0	92,0
Lived with single mother	9,1	4,1	0,44	9,9	6,7	6,2	10,7	10,1	10,0	17,0	4,9	10,3	8,9	4,3	10,0	5,2
Lived with single father	1,3	0,4	0,29	1,1	1,3	1,0	1,2	0,9	1,9	1,1	1,0	2,0	1,5	0,9	1,3	1,2
Lived with mother&mother new partner	1,6	1,1	0,70	1,9	1,1	0,2	1,6	3,3	1,8	2,0	0,1	1,1	2,0	0,2	2,2	0,4
Lived with father&father new partner	0,4	0,2	0,53	0,5	0,5	0,1	0,4	1,0	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,6	0,7	0,2	0,7	0,2
in antoher private household, foster-home	1,7	1,0	0,60	3,0	1,2	1,6	0,8	1,4	1,6	4,5	2,2	1,3	2,2	0,3	1,9	0,6
Lived in collective household or institution	0,7	0,4	0,58	0,9	0,8	0,6	0,3	0,8	1,2	1,2	1,1	0,3	1,4	0,1	0,8	0,5
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
<b>Financial problems in household when young teenager</b>																
PM100	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Most of the time	10,5	4,9	0,46	6,3	5,8	7,9	9,0		4,3	8,4	12,6	10,8	8,6		17,9	10,1
Often	14,7	6,4	0,44	21,7	7,2	17,9	12,9		5,3	19,0	11,2	11,4	16,7		20,5	10,5
Occasionally	24,1	7,8	0,33	39,5	13,7	38,8	29,8		14,5	36,5	20,4	25,2	23,1		15,5	22,2
Rarely	19,1	4,5	0,24	26,6	11,4	28,9	22,6		17,5	18,1	19,1	19,4	17,9		28,2	20,9
Never	31,6	17,6	0,56	5,9	61,8	6,5	25,6		58,4	18,1	36,8	33,1	33,7		17,9	36,3
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0		100,0	100,0

	simple average			IS	IT	LT	LU	LV	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SI	SK	UK
	mean	StDev	cv													
<b>Main family composition</b>																
PM010	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Lived with both parents	85,2	5,7	0,07	83,2	91,5	78,7	89,1	68,0	89,8	90,1	88,0	84,6	82,1	82,5	90,5	83,8
Lived with single mother	9,1	4,1	0,44	8,4	4,5	14,8	6,8	22,9	5,3	6,5	8,3	7,9	10,2	12,2	7,2	8,8
Lived with single father	1,3	0,4	0,29	0,9	0,9	1,1	1,2	1,2	0,8	1,5	1,2	1,2	2,1	1,6	0,8	1,8
Lived with mother&mother new partner	1,6	1,1	0,70	4,1	1,4	2,4	0,7	3,8	1,6	0,3	0,7	0,7	2,9	1,1	0,7	2,9
Lived with father&father new partner	0,4	0,2	0,53	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,4	0,6	0,6	0,0	0,2	0,4	0,9	0,3	0,2	0,7
in antoher private household, foster-home	1,7	1,0	0,60	2,8	0,7	1,8	1,0	2,5	0,8	1,2	1,2	4,3	1,7	2,1	0,5	1,6
Lived in collective household or institution	0,7	0,4	0,58	0,1	0,7	0,8	0,7	0,9	1,1	0,3	0,4	0,9	0,1	0,3	0,1	0,5
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
<b>Financial problems in household when young teenager</b>																
PM100	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Most of the time	10,5	4,9	0,46	4,3	18,9	16,1	9,1	13,8	5,9	3,5	13,3		5,6	18,2	19,0	11,8
Often	14,7	6,4	0,44	5,7	22,5	23,2	11,3	21,0	9,0	5,8	18,6		7,0	24,3	24,3	12,0
Occasionally	24,1	7,8	0,33	15,6	28,1	26,8	20,0	25,0	16,7	15,3	29,6		13,7	29,6	32,1	22,4
Rarely	19,1	4,5	0,24	15,6	17,2	14,7	15,2	15,2	17,5	25,7	13,8		20,1	15,0	18,8	19,0
Never	31,6	17,6	0,56	58,9	13,4	19,2	44,5	24,9	51,0	49,8	24,7		53,7	12,9	5,8	34,8
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0		100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

**Table A.4 Distribution of 'filled' values for main variables (cont.)**

(excluding simple numerical variables, and other variables with numerous codes)

	simple average			AT	BE	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IE
	mean	StDev	cv													
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by father</b>																
PM040	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than primary education	15,4	15,0	0,98		17,1	30,6				1,9	26,1	7,5	6,7	31,9	1,5	3,1
Primary education	33,8	18,6	0,55	0,2	32,7	42,3	0,7	2,0		22,3	54,3	24,1	56,2	46,0	26,1	68,9
Lower secondary education	20,4	13,9	0,68	59,7	15,7	6,4	20,4	12,9	41,8	27,5	5,6	39,9	21,7	9,0	23,4	11,1
Upper secondary education	24,0	17,1	0,71	35,4	17,5	13,5	70,1	51,1	39,1	29,9	5,5	14,1	6,4	5,3	37,7	7,0
Post-secondary education	4,2	4,8	1,13	0,3	2,1	0,8	1,0	1,6	4,4	5,4	0,4	0,7	0,3	2,3	3,3	2,6
First stage of tertiary education	10,6	6,2	0,59	4,5	14,9	6,4	7,7	32,3	14,7	13,0	8,1	13,7	8,7	5,6	8,0	7,3
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
<b>Main activity status of father</b>																
PM060	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Employee	73,9	14,8	0,20	69,8	69,4	56,3	95,9	80,9	66,1	97,8	69,8	57,6	73,3	36,3	90,5	65,3
Self-employed	22,2	14,4	0,65	26,2	20,4	42,6	2,4	14,9	27,2	0,5	28,0	33,0	24,4	62,6	5,5	30,4
Unpaid family-worker	0,4	0,6	1,53	0,7	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,5	0,2	0,4	3,0	0,2	0,1		0,1
Unemployed	0,5	0,6	1,24	0,5	0,6	0,1	0,0	0,6	1,2	0,1	0,3	0,0	0,4	0,2	0,2	2,3
Retired, early retired	1,2	1,1	0,89	1,6	1,0	0,1	1,4	2,0	0,1	0,7	0,8	3,9	0,4	0,5	2,2	0,5
Full time housework	0,2	0,2	0,99	0,1	0,4		0,0	0,1	0,0	0,3	0,0	0,4	0,0		0,1	0,1
Other	1,6	2,2	1,33	1,2	8,1	0,8	0,2	1,4	4,9	0,4	0,6	2,1	1,4	0,2	1,5	1,4
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

	simple average			IS	IT	LT	LU	LV	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SI	SK	UK
	mean	StDev	cv													
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by father</b>																
PM040	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than primary education	15,4	15,0	0,98	3,3	18,8	11,5	6,2	3,9			17,3	43,1	1,1	6,1		54,6
Primary education	33,8	18,6	0,55	20,5	51,2	40,0	47,9	18,7	33,0		41,2	48,2	50,6	39,4	11,1	
Lower secondary education	20,4	13,9	0,68	16,4	16,2	18,0	4,4	36,3	31,9	35,8	0,7	3,3	22,5	11,0	29,4	10,4
Upper secondary education	24,0	17,1	0,71	35,0	10,8	11,7	24,0	25,7	18,0	29,0	35,7	2,5	9,5	35,6	51,1	3,5
Post-secondary education	4,2	4,8	1,13	13,0		10,3	5,6	5,1		14,6	0,5	0,1	2,6	3,6		17,3
First stage of tertiary education	10,6	6,2	0,59	11,8	3,1	8,4	11,9	10,3	17,0	20,6	4,6	2,8	13,7	4,3	8,4	14,2
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
<b>Main activity status of father</b>																
PM060	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Employee	73,9	14,8	0,20	61,5	55,3	96,0	77,0	96,8	74,9	72,3	65,5	68,5	71,9	76,4	94,8	82,5
Self-employed	22,2	14,4	0,65	37,9	29,0	1,0	21,2	1,0	20,3	26,3	32,5	29,5	25,5	19,6	1,7	14,6
Unpaid family-worker	0,4	0,6	1,53	0,1	0,3	0,6	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,4	0,7	0,7	0,3	0,1	0,0
Unemployed	0,5	0,6	1,24	0,1	2,1	0,1	0,2	0,1	0,6	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,3	0,7	0,3	1,0
Retired, early retired	1,2	1,1	0,89	0,2	5,0	0,5	1,2	0,9	0,5	1,2	1,2	0,7	1,3	1,7	1,7	0,7
Full time housework	0,2	0,2	0,99	0,1	0,0	0,4	0,1	0,2	0,2		0,1	0,1	0,1	0,6	0,1	0,2
Other	1,6	2,2	1,33	0,2	8,2	1,3	0,3	0,8	3,2	0,1	0,1	0,4	0,3	0,7	1,3	1,1
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

**Table A.4 Distribution of 'filled' values for main variables (cont.)**

(excluding simple numerical variables, and other variables with numerous codes)

	simple average			AT	BE	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IE
	mean	StDev	cv													
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother</b>																
PM050	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than primary education	18,9	18,9	1,00		18,5	43,4				2,6	30,4	6,4	7,5	38,6	1,9	2,4
Primary education	35,4	20,1	0,57	3,4	37,8	35,7	1,5	3,6	0,1	23,7	56,7	26,2	62,4	45,1	30,5	66,5
Lower secondary education	25,7	19,3	0,75	72,9	17,0	5,7	42,3	37,4	68,8	28,0	5,4	40,7	18,0	6,7	33,9	13,0
Upper secondary education	19,0	13,1	0,69	19,4	15,2	11,3	52,5	46,8	20,0	27,1	3,8	16,5	6,7	4,7	25,5	9,8
Post-secondary education	2,5	2,5	0,99	2,0	2,0	0,5	0,7	2,1		5,8	0,2	0,5	0,3	2,0	3,9	2,7
First stage of tertiary education	6,8	4,9	0,72	2,3	9,4	3,4	3,0	10,2	11,0	12,7	3,5	9,7	5,2	2,9	4,2	5,7
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
<b>Main activity status of mother</b>																
PM080	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Employee	46,4	23,7	0,51	28,4	22,8	23,0	85,5	41,4	52,1	91,3	19,5	52,1	36,2	15,0	64,0	18,6
Self-employed	8,3	8,0	0,97	8,3	5,5	7,0	0,7	3,7	4,8	0,1	8,1	24,1	7,3	14,6	1,5	4,1
Unpaid family-worker	4,2	4,8	1,14	8,0	5,2	9,7	1,1	3,7	4,7	0,2	3,6	6,3	7,2	23,7		1,2
Unemployed	0,3	0,3	1,20	0,1	0,5	0,0	0,3	0,4	1,3	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,2
Retired, early retired	1,9	5,9	3,12	0,4	0,5		1,0	0,6	30,1	0,3	0,1	2,5	0,1	0,5	1,7	
Full time housework	37,6	23,7	0,63	54,1	62,3	60,0	11,3	49,3	4,5	8,0	67,6	11,6	48,5	45,7	31,4	75,4
Other	1,7	4,3	2,52	0,6	3,1	0,3	0,2	1,0	2,5	0,2	1,0	3,3	0,7	0,4	1,2	0,5
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

	simple average			IS	IT	LT	LU	LV	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SI	SK	UK
	mean	StDev	cv													
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother</b>																
PM050	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than primary education	18,9	18,9	1,00	3,7	23,5	14,8	8,5	6,4			19,3	53,6	1,8	8,2		67,7
Primary education	35,4	20,1	0,57	28,7	54,0	41,4	61,4	20,0	39,3		46,5	40,7	52,9	58,2	13,2	
Lower secondary education	25,7	19,3	0,75	38,2	13,3	14,6	7,1	33,2	41,8	42,8	0,7	2,1	23,0	5,2	42,6	13,8
Upper secondary education	19,0	13,1	0,69	21,5	8,0	10,5	15,1	26,7	12,1	32,2	29,3	1,3	9,0	24,0	40,2	3,6
Post-secondary education	2,5	2,5	0,99	1,7		11,1	0,7	5,2			1,1	0,1	3,4	2,6		4,3
First stage of tertiary education	6,8	4,9	0,72	6,2	1,3	7,6	7,2	8,4	6,8	25,0	3,0	2,2	9,9	1,8	4,0	10,7
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
<b>Main activity status of mother</b>																
PM080	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Employee	46,4	23,7	0,51	46,3	14,8	81,0	24,9	88,3	21,5	71,2	44,5	35,5	57,6	47,8	72,7	50,0
Self-employed	8,3	8,0	0,97	10,8	7,1	0,5	6,2	0,5	2,6	25,9	29,7	19,7	6,8	10,2	0,5	4,4
Unpaid family-worker	4,2	4,8	1,14	1,0	2,4	0,6	7,1	0,3	3,4	0,1	6,1	3,7	2,0	3,6	0,1	0,6
Unemployed	0,3	0,3	1,20		0,4	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1	0,5	0,1	0,2	1,2	0,5	0,7
Retired, early retired	1,9	5,9	3,12	0,4	0,8	0,2	0,2	0,5	0,0	0,7	0,8	0,5	0,7	0,9	1,4	0,2
Full time housework	37,6	23,7	0,63	40,9	73,4	16,6	61,4	10,0	71,6	2,1	18,4	40,0	32,3	35,7	2,0	43,5
Other	1,7	4,3	2,52	0,6	1,2	1,0	0,2	0,4	0,9	0,0	0,1	0,5	0,4	0,7	22,7	0,7
	100,0			100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0



**Table A.5. Identifying values in individual countries which differ considerably from the corresponding simple average over all countries**

(identifies empty cells, and values below 1/3 the average, and values over 3 times the average)

	simple average			AT	BE	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IE	IS	IT	LT	LU	LV	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SI	SK	UK	
	mean	StDev	cv																											
<b>Main family composition</b>																														
PM010	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Lived with both parents	85,2	5,7	0,07																											
Lived with single mother	9,1	4,1	0,44																											
Lived with single father	1,3	0,4	0,29																											
Lived with mother&mother new	1,6	1,1	0,70			0,2					0,1		0,2		0,4									0,3						
Lived with father&father new partner	0,4	0,2	0,53																				0,0							
in antoher private household, foster-home	1,7	1,0	0,60										0,3		0,6														0,5	
Lived in collective household or institution	0,7	0,4	0,58										0,1			0,1									0,1		0,1			
	100,0																													
<b>Financial problems in household when young teenager</b>																														
PM100	%			%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Most of the time	10,5	4,9	0,46																											
Often	14,7	6,4	0,44																											
Occasionally	24,1	7,8	0,33																											
Rarely	19,1	4,5	0,24																											
Never	31,6	17,6	0,56	5,9		6,5																							5,8	
	100,0																													
	simple average			AT	BE	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IE	IS	IT	LT	LU	LV	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SI	SK	UK	
	mean	StDev	cv																											
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by father</b>																														
PM040	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than primary education	15,4	15,0	0,98							1,9				1,5	3,1	3,3					3,9					1,1			54,6	
Primary education	33,8	18,6	0,55	0,2			0,7	2,0																				11,1		
Lower secondary education	20,4	13,9	0,68			6,4					5,6										4,4			0,7	3,3					
Upper secondary education	24,0	17,1	0,71								5,5		6,4	5,3	7,0											2,5			3,5	
Post-secondary education	4,2	4,8	1,13	0,3		0,8	1,0				0,4	0,7	0,3				13,0						14,6	0,5	0,1			17,3		
First stage of tertiary education	10,6	6,2	0,59					32,3										3,1							2,8					
	100,0																													
<b>Main activity status of father</b>																														
PM060	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Employee	73,9	14,8	0,20																											
Self-employed	22,2	14,4	0,65				2,4		0,5					5,5					1,0		1,0							1,7		
Unpaid family-worker	0,4	0,6	1,53	0,0	0,1		0,1				3,0				0,1	0,1				0,1				0,1					0,0	
Unemployed	0,5	0,6	1,24			0,1	0,0		0,1		0,0		0,0		2,3	0,1	2,1	0,1		0,1	0,1		0,1	0,1	0,1	0,2				
Retired, early retired	1,2	1,1	0,89			0,1		0,1			3,9						0,2	5,0												
Full time housework	0,2	0,2	0,99				0,0	0,0		0,0		0,0						0,0									0,6			
Other	1,6	2,2	1,33	8,1			0,2	4,9	0,4					0,2		0,2	8,2		0,3				0,1	0,1	0,4	0,3				
	100,0																													

**Table A.5. Identifying values in individual countries which differ considerably from the corresponding simple average over all countries (cont.)**

(identifies empty cells, and values below 1/3 the average, and values over 3 times the average)

	simple average			AT	BE	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IE	IS	IT	LT	LU	LV	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SI	SK	UK		
	mean	StDev	cv																												
<b>Highest ISCED level of education attained by mother</b>																															
PM050	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Less than primary education	18,9	18,9	1,00							2,6					1,9	2,4	3,7										1,8			67,7	
Primary education	35,4	20,1	0,57	3,4			1,5	3,6	0,1																						
Lower secondary education	25,7	19,3	0,75			5,7					5,4			6,7						7,1				0,7	2,1		5,2				
Upper secondary education	19,0	13,1	0,69								3,8			4,7												1,3			3,6		
Post-secondary education	2,5	2,5	0,99			0,5	0,7				0,2	0,5	0,3							11,1	0,7					0,1					
First stage of tertiary education	6,8	4,9	0,72																1,3				25,0		2,2		1,8				
	100,0																														
<b>Main activity status of mother</b>																															
PM080	%			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Employee	46,4	23,7	0,51											15,0				14,8													
Self-employed	8,3	8,0	0,97				0,7			0,1					1,5				0,5		0,5	2,6	25,9	29,7				0,5			
Unpaid family-worker	4,2	4,8	1,14				1,1			0,2				23,7		1,2	1,0		0,6		0,3		0,1					0,1	0,6		
Unemployed	0,3	0,3	1,20			0,0			1,3	0,0		0,0	0,1	0,1					0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1		0,1		1,2				
Retired, early retired	1,9	5,9	3,12	0,4	0,5			0,6	30,1	0,3	0,1		0,1	0,5			0,4		0,2	0,2	0,5	0,0			0,5				0,2		
Full time housework	37,6	23,7	0,63				11,3		4,5	8,0		11,6									10,0		2,1					2,0			
Other	1,7	4,3	2,52			0,3	0,2			0,2				0,4		0,5				0,2	0,4		0,0	0,1	0,5	0,4	22,7				
	100,0																														