

EU-SILC UDB sample design variables: syntax update 2018

Lorena Zardo Trindade

The box below summarizes the changes in the syntax used to construct EU-SILC UDB sample design variables for 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016 when compared to 2011 (Goedemé, 2013).

Czech Republic
Up to EU-SILC 2011, DB060 was not unique across panels. As a result, PSUs were identified on the basis of a combination DB060 and DB075. Since EU-SILC 2012, DB060 is unique across panels.
Hungary
Up to EU-SILC 2014, DB060 was partially lacking for Hungary and could not be used when identifying PSUs. For EU-SILC 2015 and 2016, DB060 seems to be complete and could be used to identify PSUs.
France
In the 2011 EU-SILC for France, elements of panel 6 received the same PSU code. Because of that, the country required individual treatment when identifying PSUs, setting the variable <i>psutest</i> to missing value when the DB075 was equal to 6. In EU-SILC 2012 and 2013 this has been corrected. As previously noted, DB060 is largely missing for 2013, but not for 2012, 2014, 2015 and 2016. Therefore, for EU-SILC 2013, the constructed PSU variable is mainly based on household IDs instead of DB060.
Italy
From EU-SILC 2014 onwards, the coding of the flag variable for DB060 has changed in line with the suggestions from Goedemé (2013b). The flag DB060_F==2 identifies which PSUs remain in the sample for the entire duration of the EU-SILC. In this case, an adjustment in the codes is required and the condition "if <i>npanels</i> >=2" must be replaced by "DB060_F ==2".
United Kingdom
As previously noted, prior to EU-SILC 2012, all households for cross-sectional and longitudinal EU-SILC originated from the General Lifestyle Survey (GLF) sample. Since EU-SILC 2012, cross-sectional and wave 1 respondents from the longitudinal panel have been selected from the Family Resources Survey (FRS). When describing the sample size for the 2012 Cross-sectional data, UK's Quality Report 2012 only provides information about the 1 st rotational group, which is composed by the entire sample. This explains the fact that DB075 has only one value (Table 3), which required changes in the syntax for EU-SILC 2012 and 2013. Before EU-SILC 2012, the self-representing PSU for Northern Ireland was identified according to three conditions: the PSU had to appear in all 4 panels; PSU had to have the largest weighted number of households; and DB070 should not be filled. From EU-SILC 2012 onwards, the test had to be modified once the country's cross-sectional sample only provides information for one rotational group (DB075) due to the changes in the survey instrument. Now the identification of Northern Ireland is considerably simplified, due to the availability of DB040. In addition, until 2011, if households had moved to

another postcode sector, they would be represented by a new DB060 code. This has been corrected for the EU-SILC 2012, 2013 and 2014 versions.

Republic of Serbia

EU-SILC 2013 provides, for the first time, information on the Republic of Serbia. This addition did not require any changes in the syntax and the excel output tables were automatically adjusted to include the new country. The country's quality report has been released. Without official information on the sample design used for the country, we assume a simple random sample of PSUs. This gives the most conservative sampling variance estimates. Alternatively, one could assume a simple random sample of households, which would be less conservative.

It is important to highlight that for EU-SILC 2013, version 1, DB060 seems to be partially lacking when compared to later versions of the same year and to EU-SILC 2014, 2015 and 2016. Therefore, when using EU-SILC 2013, version 1, the syntax would require some adjustment.

References

Goedemé, T. (2013). **'How much Confidence can we have in EU-SILC? Complex Sample Designs and the Standard Error of the Europe 2020 Poverty Indicators'** in *Social Indicators Research*, 110(1): 89-110, doi:10.1007/s11205-011-9918-2.

Zardo Trindade, L. and Goedemé, T. (2016) **Notes on updating the EU-SILC UDB sample design variables 2012-2014**, *CSB Working Paper 16/02*, Antwerp: Herman Deleeck Centre for Social Policy, University of Antwerp.