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## Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) Preliminary results 2010

The Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) in Ireland is a household survey covering a broad range of issues in relation to income and living conditions. It is the official source of data on household and individual income and also provides a number of key national poverty indicators, such as the at risk of poverty rate, the consistent poverty rate and rates of enforced deprivation. This report presents the preliminary results for 2010 and comparable data for previous years. Further data and analysis will become available in the near future.

## Table A Summary of main results

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ |
| Equivalised disposable income (per individual) | 21,229 | 23,610 | 24,380 | 23,326 | 22,168 |
| At risk of poverty threshold ( $60 \%$ of median income) | 10,566 | 11,890 | 12,455 | 12,064 | 10,831 |
| Poverty \& deprivation rates | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| At risk of poverty rate | 17.0 | 16.5 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 15.8 |
| Deprivation rate ${ }^{1}$ | 13.8 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 17.1 | 22.5 |
| Consistent poverty rate | 6.5 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 6.2 |

## Summary of main findings

- Average annual equivalised disposable income (i.e. household income adjusted for household composition) in 2010 was $€ 22,168$, a drop of $5.0 \%$ on the 2009 figure of $€ 23,326$. See table $A$ and figure 1 above.
- There was an increase in income inequality between 2009 and 2010 as shown by the quintile share ratio. The ratio showed that the average income of those in the highest income quintile was 5.5 times that of those in the lowest income quintile. The ratio was 4.3 one year earlier. See table B.
- The at risk of poverty threshold decreased by more than $10 \%$ from $€ 12,064$ in 2009 to $€ 10,831$ in 2010, following a decrease of $3.1 \%$ in the threshold between 2008 and 2009.
- Although there was a decrease in the at risk of poverty threshold of more than $10 \%$, the at risk of poverty rate at state level rose from $14.1 \%$ in 2009 to $15.8 \%$ in 2010.
- In 2010 the deprivation rate (those experiencing two of more types of enforced deprivation) was almost $23 \%$ compared with just over $17.0 \%$ in 2009. This increase was largely attributable to an increase in the deprivation rate, of those NOT at risk of poverty, from $13.7 \%$ in 2009 to $19.3 \%$ in 2010 while there was no significant change in the deprivation rate for those at risk of poverty. See figure 1 .
- The consistent poverty rate was $6.2 \%$ in 2010 , representing no statistically significant change on the 2009 figure.


## Income

Average annual equivalised disposable income in 2010 was $€ 22,168$ (or $€ 424.83$ weekly), a drop of $5 \%$ on the 2009 figure of $€ 23,326$ (or $€ 447.03$ weekly). Equivalised total direct income fell by almost $9 \%$ while social transfers increased by $4 \%$ between 2009 and 2010. The increase in social transfers was largely attributable to increases in unemployment related payments and old-age related payments. The definition of unemployment related payments in SILC includes job seekers benefits and jobseekers allowances but also includes redundancy payments which largely accounted for the increase in the average weekly amounts between 2009 ( $€ 23.44$ ) and 2010 ( $€ 31.41$ ). A similar situation arose in relation to old age related payments and the inclusion of lump-sum retirement payments. See tables 1,2 and $3 a$ and figure 2 below.

Figure 2 Average annual equivalised disposable


Equivalised disposable income
_Equivalised disposable income excluding all social transfers
—At risk of poverty threshold

The at risk of poverty threshold decreased by more than $10 \%$ in 2010 from $€ 12,064$ in 2009 to $€ 10,831$ in 2010. The threshold increased annually up to 2008 after which it began to fall. A second consecutive fall in 2010 reflected an overall decline in income.

## Income Inequality

Table B Indicators of income equality by year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |

${ }^{1}$ See Background Notes

There was an increase in income inequality in 2010 as shown by the income quintile share ratio and the Gini coefficient. The quintile share ratio indicated that the average income of those in the highest income quintile was 5.5 times that of those in the lowest income quintile. This ratio was 4.3 one year earlier thus signifying greater inequality in the income distribution in 2010. The Gini coefficient showed a similar pattern increasing from 29.3\% in 2009 to $33.9 \%$ in 2010. A Gini coefficient of $0 \%$ corresponds to perfect equality while higher Gini coefficients indicate a more unequal distribution. The Gini coefficient and the quintile share ratio indicate that the income distribution has become more unequal between 2009 and 2010 and reverses the downward trend evident since 2005. See table $B$ and figures $3 a$ and $3 b$

Figure 3a Gini coefficient by year


Figure 3b Income quintile share ratio by year


## At risk of poverty

Although there was a decrease in the at risk of poverty threshold of more than $10 \%$, the at risk of poverty rate at state level rose from $14.1 \%$ in 2009 to $15.8 \%$ in 2010. This increase reflects the change in the income distribution between 2009 and 2010 and the widening of the gap between those in the highest and those in the lowest income quintiles. It also reverses the downward trend in the poverty rate evident since 2004. See tables 1 and 4 and figure 1 .

The groups most at risk poverty remained broadly consistent between 2009 and 2010. The at risk of poverty rate for those of working age (18-64) increased from $13.0 \%$ in 2009 to $15.3 \%$ in 2010. Almost one in five children were at risk of poverty in 2010 compared with almost one in ten of the elderly population. See figure 4.

Figure 4 At risk of poverty rate by age group and year


The at risk of poverty rate for households composed of one adult with children remained high at $20.5 \%$. However, this represented a significant decrease when compared with 2009 (35.5\%). As the equivalised income of this group tends to fluctuate around the at risk of poverty threshold from year to year, changes in the threshold can have a disproportionate impact on the at risk of poverty rate of this group. See figure 5.

Figure 5 At risk of poverty rate by household composition and year


## Household composition

## Impact of social transfers on the at risk of poverty rate

In 2010 if all social transfers were excluded from income the at risk of poverty rate would be $51.0 \%$, indicating a steady increase from $39.8 \%$ in 2004. This increase over time demonstrates the increasing dependence of individuals on social transfers to remain above the at risk of poverty threshold. See table 4 and figure 6.

Figure 6 At risk of poverty rate by income composition and year


## Deprivation

## Overall

In 2010 the deprivation rate (those experiencing two of more types of enforced deprivation) was almost $23 \%$ compared with just over $17 \%$ in 2009. The deprivation rate for those at risk of poverty was $39.4 \%$ in 2010 representing no statistically significant change from the 2009 figure. The deprivation rate for those NOT at risk of poverty was $19.3 \%$, a significant increase from the $13.7 \%$ recorded in 2009. Since 2007 the deprivation rate among this group has more than doubled (from 8.0\%). See tables 1, 5, 6, C and figure 7.

Figure 7 Deprivation rate by poverty status and year

——Deprivation rate
——Deprivation rate for individuals at risk of poverty
——Deprivation rate for individuals NOT at risk of poverty

Type of deprivation
Some of the most notable changes across the eleven deprivation items between 2009 and 2010 were an inability to:

- replace worn out furniture ( $16.3 \%$ to $20.3 \%$ )
- afford a morning/afternoon/evening out ( $14.9 \%$ to $19.3 \%$ )
- have family/friends over for a meal/drink ( $9.4 \%$ to $14.4 \%$ )
- afford heating at some stage in the last year ( $7.3 \%$ to $10.6 \%$ )

Similar patterns (although at different levels) could be observed for those at risk of poverty and those NOT at risk of poverty across the eleven deprivation items.

Age group
An analysis of deprivation by age group in 2009 and 2010 showed a significant increase in the deprivation rate for children (aged $0-17$ ) which was $30.2 \%$ up from $23.5 \%$ in 2009 . The change in the rate for children at risk of poverty was not statistically significant, therefore the increase in deprivation for children overall was due to changes in the rate for those NOT at risk of poverty ( $27.4 \%$ in 2010 up from $18.2 \%$ in 2009). The situation of those of working age was similar to that of children, in that the increase in their overall deprivation rate (between 2009 and 2010) could again be attributed to an increase in the level of deprivation experienced by those NOT at risk of poverty. See table C below.

Table C Deprivation ${ }^{1}$ rate by age group and year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% of individuals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | 0-17 |  | 18-64 |  | 65+ |  | Total |  |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2009 | 2010 | 2009 | 2010 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Deprivation rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Individuals at risk of poverty | 46.7 | 42.0 | 37.6 | 41.5 | 11.7 | 9.3 | 38.8 | 39.4 |
| Individuals not at risk of poverty | 18.2 | 27.4 | 12.8 | 17.9 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 13.7 | 19.3 |
| All Individuals | 23.5 | 30.2 | 16.0 | 21.5 | 9.5 | 9.6 | 17.3 | 22.5 |

${ }^{T}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation.

## Consistent Poverty

The consistent poverty rate in 2010 was $6.2 \%$ representing no statistically significant change on the 2009 figure. Although there was a significant increase in the at risk of poverty rate and the deprivation rate (2 or more types of enforced deprivation ) between 2009 and 2010, there was no statistically significant change in the consistent poverty rate due to the fact that the increase in deprivation was experienced by those NOT at risk of poverty. See table 1, 5 and figure 1 (repeated below).

Figure 1 Poverty and deprivation rates by year


Table 1 Individual income and poverty rates demographic characteristics and, by year ${ }^{1}$


[^0]Table 2 Composition of household income and equivalised income, by year

|  | Household income |  | Equivalised income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Average Weekly Income | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ |
| Direct Income |  |  |  |  |
| Employee income | 599.70 | 554.20 | 308.68 | 287.81 |
| Employer's social insurance contributions | 64.80 | 62.21 | 33.63 | 32.64 |
| Cash benefits or losses from self-employment | 105.25 | 80.12 | 55.99 | 43.40 |
| Other direct income | 26.40 | 23.37 | 12.58 | 11.39 |
| Total direct income | 796.16 | 719.90 | 410.88 | 375.25 |
| Social Transfers |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment related payments | 45.78 | 59.86 | 23.44 | 31.41 |
| Old-age related payments | 74.32 | 79.00 | 37.31 | 40.11 |
| Occupational pension | 41.67 | 41.29 | 12.47 | 12.29 |
| Family/children related allowances | 67.91 | 61.94 | 39.74 | 36.33 |
| Housing allowances | 10.58 | 10.72 | 5.05 | 5.18 |
| Other social transfers | 46.78 | 43.21 | 22.50 | 20.86 |
| Total social transfers | 287.05 | 296.00 | 140.51 | 146.18 |
| Gross Income | 1,083.21 | 1,015.91 | 551.39 | 521.43 |
| Tax and Social Contributions |  |  |  |  |
| Tax on income and social contributions | 133.58 | 116.72 | 68.69 | 60.72 |
| Employer's social insurance contributions | 64.80 | 62.21 | 33.63 | 32.64 |
| Regular inter-household cash transfers paid | 4.05 | 6.53 | 2.04 | 3.23 |
| Total Tax and Social Contributions | 202.43 | 185.46 | 104.36 | 96.60 |
| Net Disposable Income | 880.78 | 830.45 | 447.03 | 424.83 |

Table 3a Average income measures by year ${ }^{1}$

|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National income definition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total gross household income | 49,320 | 51,078 | 55,075 | 59,820 | 60,581 | 56,522 | 53,010 |
| Total disposable household income | 38,631 | 40,497 | 43,646 | 47,988 | 49,043 | 45,959 | 43,333 |
| National income definition, national equivalence scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equivalised total disposable household income | 18,773 | 19,768 | 21,229 | 23,610 | 24,380 | 23,326 | 22,168 |
| Equivalised total disposable household income including old-age and survivors' benefits but excluding all other social transfers | 16,300 | 17,085 | 18,353 | 20,113 | 20,418 | 18,750 | 17,429 |
| Equivalised total disposable household income excluding all social transfers | 14,513 | 15,132 | 16,338 | 17,897 | 17,982 | 16,067 | 14,534 |

${ }^{1}$ Gross and disposable household income is averaged over households, while equivalised income is averaged over individuals within the household.

Table 3b At risk of poverty thresholds by year

|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National income definition, national equivalence scale At risk of poverty threshold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% of median income | 9,680 | 10,057 | 10,566 | 11,890 | 12,455 | 12,064 | 10,831 |
| 40\% of median income | 6,453 | 6,705 | 7,044 | 7,927 | 8,303 | 8,043 | 7,220 |
| $50 \%$ of median income | 8,067 | 8,381 | 8,805 | 9,908 | 10,379 | 10,053 | 9,026 |
| 70\% of median income | 11,293 | 11,733 | 12,327 | 13,871 | 14,531 | 14,075 | 12,636 |
| Illustrative values (60\% level) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 adult, no children | 9,680 | 10,057 | 10,566 | 11,890 | 12,455 | 12,064 | 10,831 |
| 2 adults, 2 children | 22,457 | 23,332 | 24,513 | 27,584 | 28,895 | 27,988 | 25,127 |

Table 4 Key national indicators of poverty and social exclusion by year

|  |  |  |  |  |  | \% of individuals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| National/NAPS Indicators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| At risk of poverty rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equivalised total disposable income: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Including all social transfers (60\% median income threshold) | 19.4 | 18.5 | 17.0 | 16.5 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 15.8 |
| Including old-age and survivors' benefits but excluding all other social transfers ( $60 \%$ threshold) | 32.7 | 32.1 | 32.2 | 33.1 | 34.6 | 36.0 | 39.7 |
| excluding all social transfers (60\% median income threshold) | 39.8 | 40.1 | 40.3 | 41.0 | 43.0 | 46.2 | 51.0 |
| Including all social transfers (40\% median income threshold) | 4.4 | 4.7 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 5.0 |
| Including all social transfers (50\% median income threshold) | 11.1 | 10.8 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 8.5 |
| Including all social transfers (70\% median income threshold) | 28.7 | 28.2 | 26.7 | 26.8 | 25.7 | 24.5 | 25.1 |
| Relative at risk of poverty gap | 19.8 | 20.6 | 17.5 | 17.4 | 19.2 | 16.2 | 18.9 |
| At risk of poverty anchored at $2004{ }^{1}$ | 19.4 | 18.0 | 15.7 | 11.5 | 10.4 | 11.0 | 15.6 |
| Deprivation rate ${ }^{2}$ | 14.2 | 14.9 | 13.8 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 17.1 | 22.5 |
| Consistent Poverty rate | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 6.2 |

[^1]Table 5 The number of deprivation items experienced, by year

| Number of deprivation items experienced | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 2009 | 2010 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| \% of individuals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 (No deprivation) | 75.8 | 75.3 | 74.8 | 75.6 | 75.1 | 71.4 | 63.8 |
| 1 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 11.4 | 12.6 | 11.1 | 11.5 | 13.7 |
| 2 | 4.6 | 5.1 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 7.4 | 8.3 |
| $3+$ | 9.5 | 9.8 | 9.1 | 7.8 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 14.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| $2+$ | 14.1 | 14.9 | 13.8 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 17.1 | 22.5 |

\% of individuals at risk of poverty

| 0 (No deprivation) | 52.5 | 47.9 | 44.0 | 49.7 | 53.5 | 43.4 | 42.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13.8 | 14.2 | 17.8 | 19.2 | 17.2 | 17.8 | 18.6 |
| 2 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 11.1 | 8.3 | 12.2 | 12.9 | 14.9 |
| $3+$ | 23.4 | 27.3 | 27.0 | 22.8 | 17.2 | 25.9 | 24.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 2+ | 33.8 | 37.9 | 38.1 | 31.1 | 29.3 | 38.8 | 39.4 |

\% of individuals not at risk of poverty

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 (No deprivation) | 81.4 | 81.6 | 81.3 | 80.8 | 78.6 | 75.7 | 67.9 |
| 1 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 9.8 | 11.2 | 10.3 | 10.6 | 12.8 |
| 2 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 6.8 | 7.0 |
| $3+$ | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 12.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| $2+$ | 9.4 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 11.1 | 13.7 | 19.3 |

Table 6 Percentage of the population experiencing each type of deprivation, by year

| Deprivation Indicators | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of individuals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Without heating at some stage in the last year | 5.4 | 6.5 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 7.3 | 10.6 |
| Unable to afford a morning, afternoon or evening out in the last fortnight | 10.2 | 10.3 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 11.1 | 14.9 | 19.3 |
| Unable to afford two pairs of strong shoes | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 2.9 |
| Unable to afford a roast once a week | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 5.5 |
| Unable to afford a meal with meat, chicken or fish every second day | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 3.0 |
| Unable to afford new (not second-hand) clothes | 5.8 | 6.8 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 7.6 |
| Unable to afford a warm waterproof coat | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
| Unable to afford to keep the home adequately warm | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 6.8 |
| Unable to afford to replace any worn out furniture | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 13.1 | 13.3 | 16.3 | 20.3 |
| Unable to afford to have family or friends for a drink or meal once a month | 11.3 | 11.6 | 10.7 | 9.6 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 14.4 |
| Unable to afford to buy presents for family or friends at least once a year | 4.5 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 5.1 |

$\%$ of individuals at risk of poverty ${ }^{1}$
Without heating at some stage in the last year Unable to afford a morning, afternoon or evening out in the last fortnight
Unable to afford two pairs of strong shoes
Unable to afford a roast once a week
Unable to afford a meal with meat, chicken or fish every second day
Unable to afford new (not second-hand) clothes Unable to afford a warm waterproof coat Unable to afford to keep the home adequately warm Unable to afford to replace any worn out furniture Unable to afford to have family or friends for a drink or meal once a month
Unable to afford to buy presents for family or friends at least once a year

| 12.6 | 18.1 | 16.7 | 16.4 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 17.9 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25.2 | 28.3 | 25.5 | 20.1 | 21.6 | 29.6 | 32.0 |
| 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 11.4 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 5.5 |
| 11.2 | 11.0 | 13.6 | 10.9 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 10.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.7 | 9.2 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 5.8 |
| 14.2 | 16.1 | 17.2 | 15.2 | 12.2 | 11.0 | 13.9 |
| 6.7 | 7.5 | 4.3 | 8.7 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 4.6 |
| 7.9 | 11.5 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 8.3 | 12.2 |
| 27.8 | 30.5 | 33.0 | 29.5 | 26.0 | 36.6 | 30.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25.7 | 30.2 | 28.3 | 23.1 | 20.4 | 24.6 | 28.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.6 | 12.6 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 4.8 | 8.2 | 7.1 |

## \% of individuals not at risk of poverty

Without heating at some stage in the last year Unable to afford a morning, afternoon or evening out in the last fortnight Unable to afford two pairs of strong shoes Unable to afford a roast once a week Unable to afford a meal with meat, chicken or fish every second day
Unable to afford new (not second-hand) clothes Unable to afford a warm waterproof coat Unable to afford to keep the home adequately warm Unable to afford to replace any worn out furniture Unable to afford to have family or friends for a drink or meal once a month
Unable to afford to buy presents for family or friends at least once a year

| 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 9.2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.5 | 6.2 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 9.4 | 12.5 | 17.0 |
| 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 4.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 2.4 |
| 3.8 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 6.4 |
| 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.5 |
| 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 5.8 |
| 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 12.9 | 18.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 11.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 4.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]Table 7 Profile of population at risk of poverty ${ }^{1}$, experiencing deprivation ${ }^{2}$ and in consistent poverty by demographic characteristics and year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^3]Table A1 Sample size by demographic characteristics and year


## Background Notes

Purpose of survey
The primary focus of the Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) is the collection of information on the income and living conditions of different types of households in Ireland, in order to derive indicators on poverty, deprivation and social exclusion. It is a voluntary (for selected respondents) survey of private households. It is carried out under EU legislation (Council Regulation No 1177/2003) and commenced in Ireland in June 2003. This report presents results based on data collected in the period January 2010 to December 2010.

## Definitions of Income

Gross income
Income details are collected at both a household and individual level in SILC. In analysis, each individual's income is summed up to household level and in turn added to household level income components to calculate gross household income. The components of gross household income are:

## Direct Income:

Employee income:
Gross employee cash or near cash income
Gross non-cash employee income
Employer's social insurance contributions
Gross cash benefits or losses from self-employment

## Other direct income:

- Value of goods produced for own consumption
- Pension from individual private plans
- Income from rental of property or land
- Regular inter-household cash transfers received
- Interests, dividends, profit from capital investments in unincorporated business
- Income received by people aged under 16


## Social Transfers:

Unemployment related payments
Old-age related payments
Family/children related allowances:

- Maternity/adoptive benefit
- Child benefit
- Single parent allowances
- Carers' benefit
- Housing allowances:
- Rent supplement
- Free phone/electricity etc
- Fuel allowances
- Exceptional needs payments


## Other social transfers:

- Survivors' benefits
- Sickness benefits
- Disability benefits
- Education-related allowances
- Social exclusion not elsewhere classified

Disposable income

## Equivalence scales

Equivalised
disposable household
Income
Tax and social insurance contributions are also summed to household level and subtracted from the gross household income to calculate the total disposable household income. The components of disposable household income are gross household income less:

Employer's social insurance contributions
Regular inter-household cash transfer paid
Tax on income and social insurance contributions
Equivalence scales are used to calculate the equivalised household size in a household. Although there are numerous scales, we focus on the national scale in this release. The national scale attributes a weight of 1 to the first adult, 0.66 to each subsequent adult (aged 14+ living in the household) and 0.33 to each child aged less than 14. The weights for each household are then summed to calculate the equivalised household size.

Disposable household income is divided by the equivalised household size to calculate equivalised disposable income for each person, which essentially is an approximate measure of how much of the income can be attributed to each member of the household. This equivalised income is then applied to each member of the household.

## Indicators

At risk of poverty rate
This is the share of persons with an equivalised income below a given percentage (usually $60 \%$ ) of the national median income. It is also calculated at $40 \%, 50 \%$ and $70 \%$ for comparison. The rate is calculated by ranking persons by equivalised income from smallest to largest and then extracting the median or middle value. Anyone with an equivalised income of less than $60 \%$ of the median is considered at risk of poverty at a $60 \%$ level.

Deprivation rate Those who may be excluded and marginalised from participating in activities which are considered the norm for other people in society are considered to be deprived. The identification of the marginalised or deprived is currently achieved on the basis of a set of eleven basic deprivation indicators:

1. Two pairs of strong shoes
2. A warm waterproof overcoat
3. Buy new (not second-hand) clothes
4. Eat meat with meat, chicken, fish (or vegetarian equivalent) every second day
5. Have a roast joint or its equivalent once a week
6. Had to go without heating during the last year through lack of money
7. Keep the home adequately warm
8. Buy presents for family or friends at least once a year
9. Replace any worn out furniture
10. Have family or friends for a drink or meal once a month
11. Have a morning, afternoon or evening out in the last fortnight for entertainment

Individuals who experience two or more of the eleven listed items are considered to be experiencing enforced deprivation. This is the basis for calculating the deprivation rate.

Consistent poverty The consistent poverty measure looks at those persons who are defined as being at risk of poverty and experiencing enforced deprivation (experiencing two or more types of deprivation).

An individual is defined as being in 'consistent poverty' if they are:

- Identified as being at risk of poverty and
- Living in a household deprived of two or more of the eleven basic deprivation items listed above (Note that it is enforced deprivation that is relevant in this context. For example, a household may not have a roast once a week. The household is classified as deprived of this basic indicator only if the reason they didn't have it was because they could not afford it).


## Relative at risk of

 poverty gapAt risk of poverty rate before social transfers

Gini coefficient This is the relationship between cumulative shares of the population arranged according to the level of income and the cumulative share of total income received by them. If there was perfect equality (i.e. each person receives the same income) the Gini coefficient would be $0 \%$. A Gini coefficient of $100 \%$ would indicate there was total inequality and the entire national income was in the hands of one person.

Inequality of income distribution (S80/S20 quintile share ratio

This is the difference between the median equivalised income of persons below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold and the at-risk-of-poverty threshold, expressed as a percentage of the at-risk-of-poverty threshold. The purpose of the indicator is to measure how far below the poverty threshold the median income of people at risk of poverty is. The closer the median income is to the threshold the smaller the percentage will be.

This indicator is calculated based on two alternative measures of equivalised income. The first calculates equivalised income as the total disposable household income including old-age and survivors' benefits but excluding all other social transfers. The second excludes all social transfers. Any person with an equivalised income before social transfers of less than $60 \%$ of the median after social transfers is considered at risk of poverty before social transfers (i.e. the same threshold is used for calculating the rate before and after social transfers).

This is the ratio of total equivalised income received by the $20 \%$ of persons with the highest income (top quintile) to that received by the $20 \%$ of persons with the lowest income (lowest quintile).

For more information contact pamela.lafferty@cso.ie or marion.mccann@cso.ie or call 021 4535485.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Equivalised income is averaged over all individuals in each household.
    ${ }^{2}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation.

    * Sample size is too small for estimation

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ See background notes for more information.
    ${ }^{2}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Including all social transfers, 60\% median income threshold.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Including all social transfers, $60 \%$ median income threshold.
    ${ }^{2}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation.

