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Luxembourg Income Study (for more information, please look at [http://www.lisproject.org/techdoc/pl/plindex.htm](http://www.lisproject.org/techdoc/pl/plindex.htm))

Eurostat- Statistics on income, social inclusion and living condition
OECD Database on Household Income Distribution and Poverty


**Surveys:** **Polish Household Budget Survey 1975-2001** The following information applies to Atkinson and Micklewright (1992) but is also of general character:

The Polish Household Budget Survey has been led annually since 1957. The survey has always been based on random sampling but the sampling frame and other aspects of survey design underwent a substantial number of changes and was before 1973 excluding big parts of the population. In 1982 a rotating design was adopted with quarterly sampling according to the following method. First, a master sample of addresses was drawn with a multi-stage selection
process, and a brief survey of the households in this sample conducted to establish approximate household income and a range of socio-demographic characteristics. Second, every quarter for the next four years, households were randomly drawn from the master-sample, two thirds being asked to take part in the Budget Survey for four years, one third being asked to take part for one year only. A master sample was again drawn in 1986 and 1989. The Budget Surveys had samples of about 30,000 households. Each non-responding household was substituted using another household with similar characteristics. The Budget Survey was designed to cover the following types of households: households of workers, mixed households (at least one member worker), households of farmers, households of pensioners (defined to include persons retired receiving no pension). Households in which the principal income was from either employment or self-employment in the private non-agricultural sector were excluded (constituting about 10% of the labour force in 1989); households containing members of the police and the armed forces were also excluded. From 1986 rural areas have been over-represented in the survey; the tables in the published reports are based on re-weighted data which correct for the under-representation of urban households.

Participating households were surveyed throughout one quarter, during which the household kept diary of flows of income and expenditure. The interviewers returned twice a month to collect completed diaries and to monitor and advise the households. In addition to the information provided in the diaries and through interview during the relevant quarter, all households were interviewed again at the end of the calendar year to obtain information on annual incomes and occasional incomes not recorded during the household’s survey quarter. Due to the survey design response rates are complicated to count and interpret, but from 1982-1989 they were raging from 58.4-71.0%.
The estimate of the annual income for each household has been made by the statistical office by using a combination of diary data collected for the quarter of intensive survey and the information collected in the end-of-the-year interview. The latter provides information on annual bonuses of profit shares not recorded in the reference quarter. The definition of included income is wide-ranging, embracing income from a variety of sources and some income in-kind in addition to income in-cash. It includes income from employment, from agriculture (including small plots), from social benefits and from property. Employment income includes regular, periodical and occasional payments; a residual category of other income from work distinguishes between the state and non-state sectors. The income from agriculture includes both the cash sales of produce and the value of produce consumed within the household or given to others, taking for this purpose the market prices in the region for fruits and vegetables and the state prices for meat. Agricultural income was taken as net flow of outflows on current expenditure and investment during the reference quarter. Income from social benefits includes in addition to cash benefits the value of free or subsidized holidays, creches and infant schools, railway tickets and part of the value of subsidized medicines. All data on incomes from work provided by respondents were checked with employers. Information on income from farms was checked by inspection of respondents’ bank accounts. In the case of discrepancies, the information provided by the employers and banks were taken as definitive.

The basic data on which Atkinson and Micklewright (1992) draw are in the form of grouped distributions, showing the number of people or households in each of a number of income ranges. As a result, the authors had to interpolate in order to arrive at values for the Gini coefficients, medians and deciles. To do this the authors used the program INEQ written by F.A. Cowell.

In UN 1981, 8 income groups were available. The estimates were
calculated by Deininger & Squire for their old database.

To Milanovic (1998), unit record data for the 1st half of the 1993 survey was available.


An annual enquiry on the distribution of earnings of full-time workers in the socialized sector was held in September of each year until 1990; thereafter all firms employing more than 5 workers were included. In 1989 the socialized sector accounted for two-thirds of the labour force. The remaining one-third represented private sector employment and self-employment (70% working in agriculture). In addition, the armed forces, police, senior government officials and employees in the sector “Political Organisations, trade unions and other” were excluded. The survey covered those working a full month for the enterprise. Up until 1980 the enquiry was a census of employers and from 1981 a sample survey of enterprises. Sampling took place from a list of business enterprises. The selection probability for an enterprise depended on its size and the number of other enterprises in its industry. The procedure resulted in about 20 percent of all enterprises being selected. All employees within the selected enterprise were included in the survey. The information requested from the enterprise was the total persons in a number of discrete earnings bands.

Gross earnings for the month in question were defined to include basic pay, overtime, compensation for hazardous work conditions, additional payments related to job tenure or the holding of a managerial position, profit shares, bonuses and premia. All payments which were not monthly were included in the form of a monthly equivalent.

In the case of Atkinson and Micklewright (1992), different series
of earnings distributions are presented but the table PE2 was chosen for the Ginis as it is based on the published figures and not resulting from interpolation (the difference between the published and interpolated values are however generally small). Only when published figures were not available Ginis were taken from the table PE1. The means and medians were taken from PE1. The medians in this table are calculated using decile information whereas the means are resulting from interpolation. In Rutkowski (1996) the estimates are based on grouped data. In 1993, 35 earnings ranges were available.

**SOCO survey 1989, 1992**

The survey was conducted in 1995 on about 1000 households of five countries. The survey was a part of the project “Social Cost of Economic Transformation in Central Europe”, launched by The Institute for Human Studies, Vienna. The income concept used is gross earnings.

**Data from Transmonee**

Earnings: Based on the earning survey described above.

Incomes: Based on the Household Budget Surveys as described above. The concept of disposable income changed between 1992 and 1993 so the surveys prior to 1993 are not comparable with the later years. In 1990-1992 only net income seems to have been asked including savings and loans. From 1993, gross items and taxes are asked and somewhat more detailed income items are available compared to earlier years. In 1998 the survey methodology also underwent some change, but these changes are not detailed out. The 1992 data is unweighted, for the rest of the years the data is weighted to correct for non-response.