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Presentation outline

- **Background** – why it is worth to check if EU-SILC is a good source for such analysis?
- **Theoretical arguments** – experience and analysis of economists
- **Review of previous studies and our approach** – some data exist what can be added and so what we additionally did?
- **Data and methods used in this study**
  - Age variable
  - Material situations
  - Living conditions
    - *Situation of household with an older member* (based on household interview)
    - *Situation of older persons* (based on personal interview)
- **Empirical results** – some with discussion and possible follow-up
- **Conclusions and recommendations**

Jolanta Perek-Białas, Warsaw School of Economics
Background

- A lot of publications on this topic for Western European countries not so much for CEE countries
- Aim is to: analyze Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Latvia and Estonia
  - As SHARE only till 2006 included only PL and CZ
- Aim:
  - if EU-SILC surveys could be used for more in-depth analysis about overall presentation of situation of older persons in these countries?
- Still missing data for BULGARIA and ROMANIA (i.e. 2007)
Theoretical arguments…

- Economics of ageing and so socio-economic analysis of population ageing phenomena (Schulz, 1995)
- Topics in interest of scientists (Wise, 2009, 2010, Clark et all) include:
  - Economics status of the Aged
  - Economic situation (Housing)
  - Aged Income
  - To work or not to work
  - Pension systems
  - Health, and Disability -> Care needs
Review of other analysis and studies

- First database of the EUROSTAT
  - Age is one of key variable
  - In most indicators (like poverty, employment, health)
- Secondly analysis of the topic not only based on EU-SILC
  - A lot of analysis but with no COMPARISON of the situation of these countries
  - From Red to Grey
  - Zaidi A. – different and complex analysis of i.e. poverty
  - Some analysis in Atkinson (2010), like:
    - Older people (Iacovou, Skew, 2010)
    - Age, gender and education (Fusco, Guio, Marlier, 2010)
    - Social participation and social isolation (Lelkes, 2010) etc.
Our approach – data and variables used

- **Datasets:**
  - EU-SILC 2007 (only this data here) cross-sectional
  - EU-SILC 2008

- **Interviews:**
  - Household interviews
  - Person responsible for a questionnaire (matched with data on personal file)
  - **HX060: Household type:**
    - Single household aged 65+
    - 2 adults, no dependent children, at least one adult 65 years or more
  - Personal interviews (age from year of the personal interview, year of birth and so age at the end of the reference income period)

- **Variables – a lot but some worth to present**
  - Age, Economic situation, Material situation, Housing and Living conditions
Some empirical results

The effect of coding as "1926" for born in 1926 or before, so only up to 80 and then 80+.
Some empirical results – marital status among 65+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35,3%</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>43,2</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>40,2%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>46,1%</td>
<td>41,3%</td>
<td>7,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43,4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>46,2%</td>
<td>46,4%</td>
<td>2,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>52,1%</td>
<td>40,3%</td>
<td>3,9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other categories not mention here like never married or separated then give the total 100%
Comparison of economic situation based on SHARE 2006/EU-SILC 2007 (Poland)
Comparison of economic situation based on SHARE 2006/EU-SILC 2007 (Cz)
Working at least one hour among 60+ and 65+ only for Hungary and Poland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>60+</th>
<th></th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not possible analysis for other countries: CZ, EE, LT, LV, SK

- A person is considered as working if he/her did any work for pay or profit during the reference week or was not working but had a job or business from which he/she was absent during the reference week.

- Was not working but had a job or business from which he/she was absent during the reference week (LFS definition)
Material deprivation NO – cannot afford single 65+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washing machine</th>
<th>Computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5% CZ</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9% EE</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8% HU</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8% LT</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.8% LV</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8% PL</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9% SK</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general single older households do not have computer i.e. in CZ 4.5% YES and LT 1.8%
Living condition/Housing

MH080: Overall (DIS)satisfaction with dwelling

In general not big differences than for other groups

Answers: very dissatisfied and somewhat dissatisfied
Ability to make ends meet with great difficulty and with difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single adult aged 65+</th>
<th>Couple with at least one 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CZ</strong></td>
<td>32,3%</td>
<td>20,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EE</strong></td>
<td>23,8%</td>
<td>11,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HU</strong></td>
<td>42,6%</td>
<td>32,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT</strong></td>
<td>47,1%</td>
<td>29,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LV</strong></td>
<td>64,4%</td>
<td>53,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL</strong></td>
<td>52,5%</td>
<td>37,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SK</strong></td>
<td>50,5%</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGULAR INTER-HOUSEHOLD CASH TRANSFER for single adult 65+

- CZ
- EE
- HU
- LT
- LV
- PL
- SK

- NO INCOME RECEIVED
- NO INCOME PAID
Conclusions

- **EU-SILC results:**
  - Analysis confirm different situations of older generations among analyzed countries
  - Differences are the biggest among EE, LT, LV and others

- **EU-SILC advantages:**
  - A lot of information which we missed so far
  - Possible combination of data with analysis of persons and household with older adult

- **EU-SILC disadvantages:**
  - Not all information available for all interesting countries
  - Errors due to mode of collecting data (especially in CEE countries, as example different result of meetings end compared to PL HBS and EU-SILC - 10% of difference)

- **Possible follow up:**
  - Need to monitor the changes of the socio-economic situation among older generations/population ageing (2008 and longitudinal)
  - Adding information and using options of complex sample
Some recommendations

- Not only income situation but as well intra and inter family transfers and help to present especially with showing the productivity of older persons in these countries.
- More checking with other sources like with SHARE or HBS, incl. Complex sample analysis.
- Differences in analysis due to the process of fieldwork, mode of interviewing and the length of the questionnaire (ie. CZ and PL as an example):
  - In CZ shorter than in PL.
  - In some countries missings of variable names in questionnaire (again CZ).
  - Missing some questions like PL035 (working at least one hour).
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