

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and
UN ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR
EUROPE (UNECE)**

**STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
(EUROSTAT)**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN
STATISTICIANS**

Joint UNECE-Eurostat Work Session on Population Censuses
Organized in cooperation with UNFPA
(Geneva, 23-25 November 2004)

Invited paper

**FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS IN THE 2000 ROUND OF CENSUSES
IN ECE MEMBER COUNTRIES**

Submitted by the ECE-Eurostat Task Force on Families and Households *

1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

1. At the October 2003 Meeting of the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians, approval was given to start a joint ECE-Eurostat project on families and households. The proposed project consists of the following tasks:

Task 1: Evaluate household and family issues encountered by ECE member countries in their 2000 population censuses.

Task 2: Evaluate household and family issues encountered by countries in major European surveys such as EU-SILC and LFSs.

Task 3: Develop and propose improved recommendations on families and households for inclusion in the new set of ECE-Eurostat recommendations for the 2010 round of population censuses in the ECE-region.

Task 4: Develop recommendations on families and households for large-scale household surveys.

* This is the second draft of a report on families and households issues in the 2000 round of censuses as experienced by ECE Member countries. The information is largely based upon two sources: responses to the questionnaire regarding the 2000 round of censuses in ECE member countries, as designed by the ECE in Geneva, and information on census tables received from Eurostat. Kevin Kinsella wrote sections 5 and 6, and Nico Keilman wrote sections 1-4 and 7. Comments by Task Force members were taken into account. Ane Seierstad has been of tremendous help in finding inconsistencies in the questionnaires for individual countries.

2. A Task Force on Families and Households was established, which held its first meeting in January 2004. The following countries were represented: Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Hungary, Norway, United Kingdom, and the United States. ECE and Eurostat representatives were also present.

3. At the meeting it was decided that a first draft of a report on Task 1 would be presented and discussed at the Joint ECE/Eurostat Work Session on Population Census in November 2004. This report will serve as a basis for Task 3. As to Task 2, members of the Task Force were invited to seek appropriate funding and/or adequate resources for that purpose. A work plan will be developed once adequate resources are secured.

2. FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS IN THE 2000 ROUND OF CENSUSES

4. Rapid transformations in living arrangements and the emergence of new household types have been noted in many European countries in the recent past. Prominent trends were, for instance, later start of family life, increased cohabitation, larger numbers of one-parent families as a result of divorce, more reconstituted families, and increased proportions living alone in younger ages.

5. To reflect this new reality, recommendations for the 2000 round of censuses in the field of families and households implied a major change compared to the 1990 recommendations. One important revision was that consensual unions were included systematically in the new recommendations. Other important revisions concerned *de jure/de facto* place of residence, the distinction between private and institutional households, the concept of child, and the concept of reconstituted family.

6. The current report focuses primarily on those issues that were new or fundamentally changed in the 2000 recommendations.

3. THE SURVEY

7. During the spring of 2004, the CES Bureau developed a survey questionnaire, in order to evaluate the experiences among ECE member countries with the 2000 census. The questionnaire asked detailed information on compliance with recommended definitions, concepts and classifications for all census items and census tabulations. More general information concerning the census was also included, based on an earlier questionnaire that Eurostat sent out to its member countries in August 2002. ECE member countries that had already responded to this general part were only invited to fill in the recommendations part of the questionnaire.

8. The questionnaire was sent to 55 countries. 46 countries replied to it, including Australia which is not member of the ECE but is member of the Task Force on Families and Households and participated in this exercise. There were three separate replies for England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland.

9. In this section we will focus on recommended definitions for the five issues that underwent major changes in the 2000 recommendations: place of usual residence, private and institutional household, child, couple and consensual union, and reconstituted family. We will also evaluate the concept of family nucleus. In Section 4 we will trace experience of the 46 countries concerning classifications for family and household issues.

10. When analysing the survey responses, many inconsistencies were discovered. Most of these could be resolved with the help of other responses or on the basis of secondary information, but not all (frequently partial non-response). Thus in a few cases we are not certain that the survey responses reflect reality. In addition to logical inconsistencies, one should also note that the tables below are probably somewhat biased towards compliance with the recommendations definitions, although it is unknown to what extent. The reason for this bias is the fact that it was left to the countries to decide whether they had complied with the recommendation on each topic. A deviation was only reported when a country explicitly informed us not to have complied with the recommendation. The alternative definition or

classification was not given when the country stated that it had complied with the recommendation. This makes a bias towards compliance likely.

11. In spite of this bias and the remaining inconsistencies, we believe that on the whole the analysis provided in this report reflects the general trends.

3.1 Place of usual residence

12. In the recommendations this topic was defined as follows:

“Place of usual residence is the geographic place where the enumerated person usually resides; this may be the same as, or different from, the place where he/she actually is at the time of the Census; or it may be his/her legal residence. A person's usual residence should be that at which he/she spends most of his/her daily night-rest.”

13. Of the 46 countries that answered this question, 39 (85 per cent) reported that they complied with this definition. In practice, the share may be higher. Examples are the definitions used in Australia, Canada, the Czech Republic, and Luxembourg. Statistics Canada responded that they employed a different definition: they defined place of usual of residence as "in general, the dwelling where a person lives most of the time, that is, where he or she spends the major part of the year." If the living habits of a respondent haven't changed in a long time, the "reference period" could be several years. In the recommendation the length of this period is left unspecified. Australia uses a period of six months. Otherwise there seems to be little difference between the Canadian and the Australian definition on the one hand, and the recommended definition on the other. In the Czech Republic, the place of usual residence was defined as the address "... where the person has his/her family, parents, flat or job." In Luxembourg, "... the normal place of residence is the place where various persons forming a household live together or the place where a single person forming a household by himself/herself usually lives. The address of this place is usually the address under which the person is registered with their commune."

14. For Scotland, deviation from the recommendation is clear in certain cases, because "... a person's usual residence was preferred to be at their family residence if they worked away from home during the week". In Austria, the usual residence of a person is her/his main residence as registered in the population register. Week commuters are registered at the family's residence, similar to the case of Scotland.

15. We conclude that at least 85 per cent and perhaps even 93 per cent of the countries complied with the definition on place of usual residence.

16. One problem that interferes with the recommended definition is that on intended length of stay. Only a few countries were explicit about the length of the period that is used for deciding at which location the most of daily night-rest is spent: Australia (six months) and the Ukraine (one year). The other countries did not supply this information. For persons who have lived for a certain period at their current address this will be unproblematic. But for newcomers the intended length of stay will be essential. Some countries use a six-month threshold, others one year. Suppose a person moves from A to B shortly before census night, and intends to stay at B during nine months, after which (s)he intends to return to A. A country that uses a six-month threshold will record this person as having usual place of residence at B, whereas in the case of a one-year threshold, the person's usual place of residence is likely to be recorded as A. To avoid problems of this kind, we conclude that the definition of place of usual residence should include a time period, and that this should be seen in connection with the intended length of stay. Note that in the context of *international* migration, the recommendations (para 32) mention a period of one year.

3.2 Private and institutional households

Table B1 in Appendix B gives country-specific details.

17. In the recommendations two different definitions of “private households” were given:

1. The “**housekeeping unit concept**”: a private household is either:
 - “a one-person household, i.e. a person who lives alone in a separate housing unit or who occupies, as a lodger, a separate room (or rooms) of a housing unit but does not join with any of the other occupants of the housing unit to form part of a multi-person household as defined below, or
 - a multi-person household, i.e. a group of two or more persons who combine to occupy the whole or part of a housing unit and to provide themselves with food and possibly other essentials for living. Members of the group may pool their incomes to a greater or lesser extent.
2. The “**household-dwelling concept**”: the private household is equated with the housing unit. It is defined as the aggregate number of persons occupying a housing unit.

18. The question naire asked which of the two concepts had been used.

We received information from 46 countries. One country was ignored because it responded that both the housekeeping definition and the dwelling unit definition had been used. Although in principle this is possible in the data collection phase, it obscures international comparisons of household and family statistics (unless the type of definition is clearly given at each occasion).

19. Sixty two per cent (28 countries) of the 45 responding countries informed us that they used the housekeeping definition, one-third (15 countries) employed the dwelling unit definition, whereas two countries (England & Wales, and Northern Ireland) had based their census on a different definition of the private household. In the latter two countries one regarded as a private household one person living alone, or a group of people (not necessarily related) living at the same address with common housekeeping – that is, sharing either a living room or sitting room, or at least one meal a day. This comes so close to the housekeeping definition that we can conclude that the latter definition was used by two-thirds of the countries, while one-third employed the dwelling unit definition. The large majority (12 out of 15) of the countries that did not base their household information on the housekeeping definition of the private household informed us that they could not estimate the number of housekeeping units. In many cases (e.g. Denmark, Finland, France, Norway, Switzerland) these were countries that based their census, at least partially, on a population register. Obviously, register-based information on households is sufficient to construct households based on the dwelling unit definition, but not on the housekeeping definition.

20. In the recommendations the “institutional household” was defined as follows:

An institutional household comprises persons whose need for shelter and subsistence are being provided by an institution. An institution is understood as a legal body for the purpose of long-term inhabitation and provision of institutionalized care given to a group of persons. The institution's accommodation is by nature of its structure intended as a long-term accommodation for an institutional household.(...)
Members of an institutional household have their place of usual residence at the institution. People who are normally members of private households but who are living in institutions as listed above are only considered as members of institutional households if their absence from the private households exceeds the one-year time limit specified for the place of usual residence topic. Staff members who live alone or with their family at an institution should be treated as members of private one-person or multi-person households

21. A total of 32 or close to seventy per cent of the 46 countries reported that they complied with the recommended definition. In ten cases of non-compliance, the alternative definitions indicated smaller or larger deviations from that definition. An example of large deviations from the recommended definition is Scotland, where the intended duration of stay six is months, rather than one year, and where staff may be included as residents of the institution. Canada uses a time period of six months, too. In Ireland and Switzerland, (persons living in) institutional households were simply defined as (persons in) non-private households. At the same time, little or no difference compared to the recommended definition is to be

expected for the cases of Denmark, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, England and Wales, Northern Ireland, and the USA, judging by the alternative definitions. Thus we conclude that 38 of the 46 countries (83 per cent) have used the recommended definition, or a definition very close to it.

22. In 29 of the 46 countries, some people live in specialized housing estates, such as retirement villages for the elderly. Such places provide living arrangements that have attributes of both private households and institutional dwellings. Upon the question to which type of household people living in such housing arrangements were assigned, 17 countries indicated "private households, 13 answered "institutional households" and 4 "other". Armenia, Canada, Georgia, Malta, and Portugal indicated more than one possibility.

23. Finally, seventeen countries reported that they had collected information on other types of households than private or institutional, most often the homeless.

3.3 Family nucleus

24. Country-specific information is contained in Appendix B, Table B2.

The recommendations contain the following definition of family nucleus :

A family nucleus is defined in the narrow sense as two or more persons within a private or institutional household who are related as husband and wife, as cohabiting partners, or as parent and child. Thus a family comprises a couple without children, or a couple with one or more children, or a lone parent with one or more children.

25. Eighty three per cent (38 out of 46) of the countries responded that they used a definition that complies with the recommendation. The alternative definition used by Canada does not mention cohabiting partners, but rather a couple living common-law. Most probably there is very little or no difference with the recommendation in this respect. A more important difference mentioned by Canada, and also by England & Wales and Northern Ireland is that (a) grandparent(s) living with one or more grandchildren but without the grandchild(ren)'s parents are also regarded as a family. Canada and Ireland restricted the family to those living in private households. Norway complies with the definition when compiling international tables, whereas persons living alone are also counted as families ("one-person families") in national tables. The Swiss census did not include family information. The US restricts families to two or more persons related by birth, by marriage or by adoption to the householder. This differs from the recommended definition in two respects: cohabiting partners who are not married to each other are not counted as families, and a household consisting of a household reference person ("householder") and two or more persons who form a family (according to the UN definition), but who are not related (birth, marriage, adoption) to the reference person, is not considered a family household. Better comparability with previous censuses or with other statistical surveys was mentioned often as the main reason for a different definition.

3.4 Child

26. A child was defined as follows:

A child is defined as any person with no partner and no child who has usual residence in the household of at least one of the parents. 'Children' also includes stepchildren and adopted children, but not foster children. A child that alternates between two households (for instance after the parents' divorce) is counted at only one of these households, for instance on the basis of the de jure place of usual residence or the number of nights spent at either of the households.

27. Only five countries (eleven per cent of the 46 responding countries) deviated from the recommended definition. The census in the Czech Republic required that children be economically dependent ("economically not active") and not older than 25 years of age. There is no restriction on partners or own children. Denmark required that children be less than 25 years old. In Switzerland, sons-in-law and daughters-in-law living in the same household were also considered as children. Moreover,

there was no restriction on marital status in the Swiss definition. Thus, a child could be married and living with his or her spouse in the household of the parent(s). The US did not have any restrictions regarding the child's own children or partner. Comparability with a previous census was given most often as the main reason for not complying with the recommended definition.

3.5 Couple and consensual union

28. Couple was defined in the recommendations as follows:

The term "couple" should include married couples and couples who report that they are living in consensual unions, and where feasible, a separate count of consensual unions and of legally married couples should be given. Two persons are understood as partners in a consensual union when they have usual residence in the same household, are not married to each other, and report to have a marriage-like relationship to each other.

29. Only two out of 46 countries indicated that they had used a different definition. Denmark informed us that they did not comply with the definition, because registered partners were also regarded as a couple. These registered partners are same-sex couples. However, the ECE definition does not require that partners be of opposite sex. Thus we conclude that Denmark also complied with the definition. The US stated that people in consensual unions are not identified separately in Census tabulations. In conclusion, all countries collected information on couples in accordance with the definition, and in all but one of the 46 countries such information can be tabulated.

3.6 Reconstituted family

30. The ECE defined a reconstituted family as follows:

A reconstituted family is a family consisting of a married or cohabiting couple with one or more children, where at least one child is a non-common child i.e. either the natural or adopted child of only one member of the couple. If the child (natural or adopted) of one partner is adopted by the other partner, the resulting family is still a reconstituted family.

31. Only 19 of the 46 countries informed us that they are able to identify reconstituted families using census data. Of those 19 countries, no more than eight have provided data on reconstituted families in their tabulation programme.

32. One possible explanation for the poor performance across countries on this item is the fact that many countries mapped household structures by means of the relationship of each household member to the household reference person, but not by means of the relationship to other household members. For instance, the US commented on this issue as follows:

"Census data on household relationships are made only to the householder, which limits the ability to identify all reconstituted families. For example, if the father was the householder and the mother was his second wife, this family could not be identified as reconstituted since the child is referenced only to the householder. It would be tallied as being a married-couple family with a biological child of the householder but of unknown connection to the wife.

However, if the father were listed as the "husband" of the householder (the householder being the second wife), then this child would be listed as the stepchild of the householder. This family could be identified as a reconstituted family where the householder was not the biological mother of the child. So, in this example, even though all three people are living together and related individually the same way, because of the way the householder may be listed and identified on the roster limits the identification of a reconstituted family."

33. One other reason for the poor performance of complying with the recommendation could very well be related to data quality issues. For instance, tests in Canada have provided mixed results and some concerns about data quality.

34. We conclude that reconstituted families have created problems for many countries. In the discussion on how to improve on this situation for the 2010 round of censuses, the question of whether or not mapping the full matrix of relationships between all household members should receive considerable attention. In this connection it is important to note that of the 44 countries that reported that the relationship of each household member to the household's reference person was asked, 13 reported that also the relationship with other household members had been recorded (see Table 3 to be discussed below): Albania, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, England & Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. Priority should be given to collecting information on the experience these countries had with the relationship matrix.

4. HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

35. We will now present some findings on the household and family characteristics of persons, of families, and of households. One problem that we encountered in analysing the answers was the ambiguity with respect to the definition of the various categories. For example, in the question on type of relationship to reference person, "child of reference person" is one of the categories in the recommended classification. But four of the five countries that indicated that they did not use the recommended definition of "child", have nonetheless reported that they used "child of reference person" as a category, and thus followed the recommended classification in this regard. Thus "child" must be interpreted here as based on the national definition, not the recommended one. Similar problems were encountered for other concepts and definitions that were used in the recommended classifications.

4.1 Reference person

36. Among the 46 countries from which information was received, all but two (Denmark and Norway) reported that they identified a reference person in the household. However, for purposes of household structure mapping, the two countries just mentioned define the oldest person in the household as a point of reference. Countries could indicate more than one possibility for identifying the reference person. In all, the 44 responding countries identified 50 possibilities. In 22 cases, the countries responded that respondents chose the reference person freely, among the adults living in the household. The next most frequently chosen possibility for identifying the reference person was through family determination: 13 cases.

4.2 Relationship to the reference person in private households

37. 44 countries answered this question. Table 1 shows that all or nearly all countries mapped traditional family relationships, such as spouse, father, mother, or child. Partners in consensual unions were also linked to the reference person in all 44 countries. Of other relationships to the reference person (20 countries), grandparent/grandchild, brother/sister, and brother in law/sister in law were frequently mentioned.

38. Information was also provided on relationship to other persons than the reference person in the household: 18 countries recorded relationship with one or both parents and 13 with still other members in the household.

4.3 Household status

39. According to the recommendations, information should be derived for all persons in households on their status or position in the household. 43 countries provided information on private households, and 42 on non-private households, see Table 2. The table lists also the recommended classification for household position. Byelorussia and Ukraine informed us that they did not distinguish people living alone in the last census, and cannot produce tables for this group either (category 1.2.1). Among the countries that indicated that other typologies had been used or could be produced, the homeless and children under 18 years of age (rather than the recommended 25 years) were mentioned.

4.4 Family status

40. Table 3 gives information about the 42 from which we received information. About one fourth of the countries that replied to this question reported that information on partner status is not readily available, but can be produced upon request. Only 16 countries have tabulations on children in lone-parent families, but another 21 countries are able to produce such data.

41. Problems with reconstituted families were described in Section 3.6. These problems are reflected here in family statuses 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 for stepchildren. Only 17 countries have information about the fact whether a child in a two-parent family is the child of both partners, or alternatively a stepchild, in other words a child of the male or female partner only. Since many more countries (29 in all) have information on status 3.1.1 (child of both partners), the problem for statuses 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 must be the sex of the partner, not whether the child is a stepchild. After all, when these 29 countries have data on status 3.1.1 for children under 25, this implies that the remaining children in this age group necessarily must have either status 3.1.2 or 3.1.3. The following 12 countries belong to the 29 that have information on status 3.1.1 but not to the 17 that have information on statuses 3.1.2 or 3.1.3: Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, France, Georgia, Greece, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, and Spain. The argument given above assumes, of course, that all countries noticed the fact that statuses 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 on the one hand, and 3.1.1 on the other, are mutually exclusive. But we cannot disregard the possibility that some countries have misunderstood the question in the questionnaire, or the recommendation (for instance, because the notion of step child was not mentioned explicitly, let alone defined; see item 195 in the recommendations). A similar argument holds for older children (statuses 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3). Albania, Australia, and Poland are the three countries that have information on stepchildren readily available.

42. Among other typologies, the age of 18 was mentioned a number of times for classifying children, rather than the recommended age of 25.

4.5 Family nuclei classification

43. Whereas Sections 5.3 and 5.4 focused on the family and household position of *individuals*, the *family* and the *household* are the units of analysis in this and the next section.

44. For the classification of families, the recommendations distinguished between reconstituted families, and other family nuclei. Concerning reconstituted families, only nine countries (Albania, Australia, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Serbia and Montenegro) reported that they had classified these families according to different types, and two-thirds of these had actually used the recommended classification.

45. Tabulated information on family nuclei broken down by the recommended family classification differs strongly between countries; see Table 4. Family types 1.3, 2.2, 3.2, and 4.2, i.e. families with at least one child aged 25 or older, have received low priority in the design of the census tabulation program (13-16 countries), but such information can be produced in most instances (24-26 countries). Six countries report that no information can be produced on family type 2.0, i.e. cohabiting couples - four of these are former Soviet republics.

4.6 Classification of private households

46. A detailed breakdown of private households in several household types was recommended; see Table 5.

47. Turkey is the only country that reports that it cannot produce information on one-person households. This is remarkable, because in connection with the household status of *individuals* (Section 4.3) Turkey was one of the three countries for which such information could be produced. At the same

time, both Belarus and Ukraine responded that one-person households were included in the tabulation program, whereas these two countries reported that information on persons living in one-person households could not be produced. These inconsistent findings illustrate that some countries must have had large difficulties in answering the questionnaire.

48. Very few countries have data readily available on households with at least one resident child aged 25 or older (household types 2.3, 2.6, 2.8, 2.10), in particular when a further breakdown is required that reflects the possible presence of other persons in the household. But the vast majority of the countries can produce such information upon request.

5. TABULATIONS

49. The Recommendations included a recommended core tabulation programme comprising 24 table shells. Six of these 24 shells dealt specifically with the population living in households and in families, and these 6 recommended tabulations (see Appendix A) are the focus of the Task Force evaluation.

50. As statistical offices began to process their 2000-round census data, it was unclear whether countries would produce tabulations according to the ECE/Eurostat recommendations. In order to satisfy important data needs of Community policies, Eurostat in the summer of 2002 sent a tabulation request to the statistical offices of 32 European nations. Countries were asked to compile 2000-round census data in a standard format for 28 national-level tables, many of which were similar to the 1998 ECE/Eurostat recommended core tabulations but included a greater level of detail. As of July 2004, 27 nations had responded, at least in part, to the Eurostat request. Given that the standard table formats were not necessarily those that a particular country would use, many of the data were recompiled by statistical offices into the desired Eurostat format. In a number of cases, the definitions and/or procedures used to collect national data did not permit the desired recompilation.

51. The ECE/Eurostat Task Force on Households and Families focused on 8 tables (out of the larger set of 28) that dealt specifically with the population living in households and in families. The national data contained in these Eurostat tables were used to evaluate whether countries were able to produce the tabulations that were recommended in the 1998 ECE/Eurostat document.

52. Table 6 indicates the extent to which the 55 ECE countries produced, or could produce, the 6 tabulations that were part of the ECE/Eurostat recommended core tabulation programme. The countries in Table 6 have been split into two groups: Group 1 includes the 32 nations that received the 2003 Eurostat questionnaire; and Group 2 includes the other 23 ECE nations.

53. Of the 32 countries in Group 1, all but 4 have responded to the Eurostat request. Among the 27 countries that provided at least some data, 19 supplied information that basically conformed to the 1998 ECE/Eurostat tabulation recommendations for households and families. 54. In some cases, portions of the recommended tabulations were not available: an example is the category of "Institutional Household," which was missing from the overall household typology in several countries. Eight of the 27 respondent countries supplied only partial information, with the most common omission being data on type of family nucleus.

55. Information for Group 2 countries was obtained from Internet sources, published census documents, and in a few cases from direct communication with national statistical offices. Data for Group 2 countries were generally *not* available for most of the recommended tabulations. Seven of the 23 nations did not conduct a 2000-round census or, as in the case of Macedonia, have not yet processed their results. Another 11 had either not published (either electronically or in book form) household or family-level data, or had made only minimal data available (for example, a breakdown of households by the number of residents therein).

56. It may well be the case that many Group 2 statistical offices could, upon request, produce tabulations akin to the ECE/Eurostat recommendations, but this cannot be determined from existing data

and/or census documentation. Based on a cursory review of selected census questionnaires, it appears unlikely that some countries would be able to generate the household/family linkages that were recommended.

57. In the two North American countries, most of the cross-tabulations could be produced or approximated, though several potential problems were identified that may be relevant to other countries as well. A principal issue is the linking of parents and children. In countries where the relationship links are to the head of household, linkages to others in subfamily coding routines may or may not be possible. Another issue with the ECE/Eurostat tables involves the possibility of having people in multiple statuses. For example, "cohabitant" and "lone parent" may not be mutually exclusive categories in some countries. We might also pay closer attention to the way in which countries conceptualize and tabulate private households versus family nuclei. Looking at the 2003 Eurostat tabulations for Group 1 countries, the number of lone parents in private households and in family nuclei may be the same in one country but quite different in another.

6. BRIEF EMPIRICAL OVERVIEW

58. With an eye toward eventual recommendations for the 2010 round of censuses, the Task Force is interested in emerging topics as well as household/family concepts that are changing over time. A prime example is the idea of a "blended" family that may combine individuals (including children) from no-longer-intact marital unions. We suspect that the importance (prevalence) of certain variables is increasing with time (e.g., cohabiting couples, lone-parent households). In other cases, the Task Force is interested in the usage and comparability of concepts across cultures (e.g., consensual union, institutional household). The intent of this section is not to provide an in-depth analysis of any given data item. Rather, we have made some basic tabulations for as many countries as possible, on the premise that large international fluctuations could indicate the differential use of concepts or tabulation procedures and lead to more harmonized measures. Such comparisons also may give countries an idea of topics to focus on more carefully in future data collection efforts.

59. In particular, the following variables have been examined: cohabitants; single person households; lone parent households; institutional households; and consensual unions. Data also are included on the percent of household members over age 15 who were considered as "children" in national census tabulations.

60. Table 7 summarizes a large amount of national household data, most of which was collected by Eurostat in 2002. The table separates populations into those living in private, institutional, and "other" households. Persons in private households are grouped into six statuses: child; spouse; cohabitant; lone parent; living alone; and other. Several observations emerge from Table 7:

- a) the likelihood of cohabitation shows the most relative variation among the 28 countries, ranging from less than 1 percent of all persons aged 15 and over to more than 13 percent. Five nations in Northern Europe have levels above 10 percent.
- b) In 12 of the 28 nations, 15 percent or more of persons aged 15 and over live in single person households, with the highest level (a remarkable 27 percent) seen in Denmark.
- c) Proportions of lone parents range from 2.6 percent to 8.4 percent.
- d) Approximately 5.74 million persons lived in institutional settings in the 28 countries. The proportion of all persons aged 15 and over living in institutional households was less than 1 percent in 11 nations and as high as 4.6 in Switzerland.
- e) The proportion of persons aged 15 and over who were reported as "children" ranged from less than 6 percent to 25 percent.

61. The 1998 ECE/Eurostat recommendation regarding marital status did not include the category "consensual union." The recommendation for household status included the category "cohabitant." The 2003 Eurostat tabulation request obtained data for both of these categories, albeit in separate tables, and hence we can compare levels across countries as well as the within-country correspondence of the two categories. Table 8 indicates that the percent of persons aged 15 and over living in consensual unions

ranges from less than 2 percent in Croatia and several Mediterranean countries to more than 10 percent in Northern European nations.

62. 23 countries provided data on consensual unions in one tabulation (marital status) and on cohabitation in a separate tabulation (household status). With regard to conceptual similarity, 11 of the 23 countries reported exactly the same number of persons in consensual unions as were in cohabitant status. Five other nations reported numbers that were very similar to each other, such that the population percentage in each category was the same when rounded to one decimal. The other 7 countries had more significant numerical differences that suggest a conceptual difference between the two categories.

63. Slightly fewer countries were able to provide census tabulations based on families rather than households. Table 9 displays a 21-country compilation of family nuclei, by type of family, based on the ECE/Eurostat recommendation (Table A16 in Appendix A). When viewed from this perspective, cohabiting couples constitute a higher proportion of total family nuclei compared with the person-based data for cohabitation in Table 7. We also see the extent to which lone-mother families dominate among the larger lone-parent group. Norway is the only country for which the number of cohabiting couples in Table 9 is exactly equal to half the number of persons living in consensual union or cohabiting in Table 8. Among the remaining 18 countries for which such a comparison is possible, another 14 countries show very small differences compared to both or at least one of the numbers in Table 8.

7. TOWARDS DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2010 ROUND OF CENSUSES

64. The analyses in the previous sections indicate that at least three issues have been problematic in the families and household chapters for the 2000 recommendations: the intended length of stay connected to the notion of place of usual residence (Section 3.1), the distinction between private and institutional households (Section 3.2), and reconstituted families (Section 3.6). We will also take up the issue of de facto and legal marital status, and of the homeless.

65. When place of usual residence is considered as the place where most of the night rest is spent, a certain period of time should be specified. Some countries use one year, others six months, but for many countries we have to assume that this was not specified. In Section 3.1 we argued that such a period of time should be seen in connection with the intended length of stay for recent migrants. Note that the current recommendations specify a one-year period for international migration, and six months for members of institutional households. Registration rules in countries with a population register will have an impact here, too.

66. The distinction between private households and institutions is not always clear. 29 countries reported that they have households that perhaps could be classified as private, perhaps as institution. Service homes for the elderly are an example. The continuous ageing of the populations of ECE member countries increases the importance of having reliable information on the living and housing conditions of elderly people. Not only data on the population living in service institutions, in health care institutions, and in old age care institutions are essential, but also information on the moves people make from private households to these institutions (and sometimes back again). The Task Force could discuss possibilities for finding a sharper distinction between the two types of households, or perhaps introduce an additional type. A related question concerns the classification of institutional households as recommended in the 2000 round. One important classification issue where an explicit recommendation could be useful is that of multiple-purpose "institutional" households, e.g. institutions offering different levels of services to people according to their needs (some of them requiring low level of services).

67. The recommendation on reconstituted families turned out to be problematic for many countries. Only eight of the 46 countries have provided information on such families in their census tabulations, and an additional 11 reported that they are able to produce such information. For 27 countries we thus lack data on reconstituted families. Given the fact that reconstituted families form an increasingly important group in European populations, both for purposes of family policy and family research, an attempt should be made to analyse in detail the reasons why these problems have occurred in so many

countries, and how they could be resolved. Introduction of the household membership matrix was mentioned as a possible solution, but alternatives to a full matrix should also be considered. Perhaps a few categories for key relationships with household members other than the reference person (his or her spouse, for example) could capture the bulk of step relationships.

68. The current definition allows for the possibility that a same sex couple with children is interpreted as a reconstituted family. While this is correct in the strict sense of the definition, it is rather more in the spirit of the recommended definitions to call them "consensual union with children".

69. Question 17 in the questionnaire asked about the use of the concept of de facto marital status (recommendations paras 74-75). In the recommendations this topic was defined as follows: *De facto marital status is defined here as the marital status of each individual in terms of his or her actual living arrangement.*

70. The relevance of this topic in the recommendations is unclear, for two reasons. First, the notion of living arrangement was not defined. More importantly, the information can be derived from other topics in the recommendations. Question 17c suggests that the topic has been introduced in order to map consensual unions and cohabiting couples: "Please specify the items included in the classification adopted (for example: *partner in a consensual union, de facto separated, same-sex partner in a consensual union, etc.*"). However, whether or not a person is a partner in a consensual union is taken up in recommended classifications for relationship to the reference person, for household status, and for family status, after the notion of consensual union has been defined. By tracing the sex of the partners in a consensual union, one is able to identify same-sex couples. Registered partnership can be included in the formal marital status (question 16, paras 68-73 of the recommendations, in particular question 16e/para 70). In our view, the Task Force ought to discuss whether the notion of de facto marital status can be deleted from the 2010 recommendations.

71. A related question is whether the recommended method for collecting data on same-sex couples is reliable. It has been noted that relying on the sex variable may not be the best one. This topic will also be discussed, as part of the discussion on consensual unions.

72. Finally, the homeless were not defined explicitly in the 2000 recommendations. In the January 2004 meeting of the Task Force it was mentioned that separating the homeless from persons living alone could be problematic. One possibility to enumerate the homeless, at least a lower bound, is to identify the enumerated population staying in dwellings such as homeless shelters. It is useful to discuss the experience in the countries represented in the Task Force, and to consider whether improved recommendations are necessary. One could consider a definition similar to the ILO-definition for an unemployed person, for example "A homeless person is a person who is without his or her own (owned, rented, or managed through some other form of tenure) habitable living quarter, seeks actively a possibility to have such a living quarter, and would reside in such a living quarter if/when such an opportunity opens."

73. In the final stage of the work of the Task Force, the implications of changes in the recommendations for the recommended tabulation program should be checked carefully. For instance, in tables A16, A17, and A18, same sex couples are not mentioned as a separate category of households or families.

ANNEX

Table 1. Compliance with recommended classification for type of relationship to the reference person in private households

Type of relationship in to reference person in private household (recommended classification)	Number of countries
1. Spouse	44
2. Reference person's partner in consensual union	44
3. Child of reference person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	43
3.1 Child of reference person only	41
3.2 Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	40
3.3 Child of both	40
4. Spouse or cohabitant of child of reference person	41
5. Father or mother of reference person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	44
6. Other relative of reference person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	44
7. Non-relative of reference person of the household	43
7.1 Foster child	39
7.2 Boarder	39
7.3 Domestic servant	39
7.4 Other	39
8. Other typologies	20

Table 2. Compliance with recommended household status classification

Household status (recommended classification)	Included in the tabulation program (number of countries)	Can be produced (number of countries)
1. Person in a private household	42	1
1.1 Person in a nuclear family household	40	3
1.1.1 Husband	36	8
1.1.2 Wife	36	8
1.1.3 Male partner in a consensual union	30	10
1.1.4 Female partner in a consensual union	30	10
1.1.5 Lone father	36	7
1.1.6 Lone mother	36	7
1.1.7 Child under 25 years of age	24	20
1.1.8 Son/daughter aged 25 or older	18	23
1.1.9 Other persons not a member of the nuclear family, but living in the nuclear family household	25	14
1.2 Person in other private household	39	1
1.2.1 Living alone	39	3
1.2.2 Living with others	39	3
1.2.2.1 Living with relatives	17	20
1.2.2.2 Living with non-relatives	17	20
2. Person not in a private household	40	2
2.1 In institutional household	38	3
2.2 Other not in a private household	16	3
Other typologies, please specify:	6	2

Table 3. Compliance with family status classification

Family status (recommended classification)	Included in the tabulation program (number of countries)	Can be produced (number of countries)
1.0 Partner		
1.1 Husband in a married couple	32	10
1.2 Wife in a married couple	32	10
1.3 Male partner in a consensual union	29	12
1.4 Female partner in a consensual union	29	12
2.0 Lone parent		
2.1 Lone father	37	5
2.2 Lone mother	37	5
3.0 Child		
3.1 Child under 25	24	16
3.1.1 Child of both partners	8	21
3.1.2 Natural or adopted child of male partner only	3	14
3.1.3 Natural/adopted child of female partner only	3	14
3.1.4 Child of lone father	23	15
3.1.5 Child of lone mother	23	15
3.2 Son/daughter aged 25 or over	21	20
3.2.1 Son/daughter of both partners	7	21
3.2.2 Natural or adopted son/daughter of male partner only	3	14
3.2.3 Natural or adopted son/ daughter of female partner only	3	14
3.2.4 Son/daughter of lone father	16	21
3.2.5 Son/daughter of lone mother	16	21
Other typologies, please specify:	7	1

Table 4. Compliance with recommended family type classification

Type of family nucleus (recommended classification)	Included in the tabulation program (number of countries)	Can be produced (number of countries)
1.0 Husband-wife family	36	6
1.1 Without resident children	34	7
1.2 With at least one resident child under 25	18	23
1.3 Youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	13	26
2.0 Cohabiting couple	29	8
2.1 Without resident children	28	9
2.2 With at least one resident child under 25	19	18
2.2 Youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	13	25
3.0 Lone father	34	6
3.1 With at least one resident child under 25	22	19
3.2 Youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	16	24
4.0 Lone mother	34	7
4.1 With at least one resident child under 25	22	19
4.2 Youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	16	24
Other typologies, please specify:	7	0

Table 5. Compliance with recommended household type classification

Type of household (recommended classification)	Included in the tabulation program (number of countries)	Can be produced (number of countries)
1.0 Non-family households	36	6
1.1 One-person households	44	1
1.2 Multi-person households	39	6
2.0 One family - households	43	2
2.1 Husband-wife couples without resident children	36	6
2.1.1 Without other persons	25	14
2.1.2 With other persons	25	14
2.2 Husband-wife couples with at least one resident child under 25	19	22
2.2.1 Without other persons	14	25
2.2.2 With other persons	14	25
2.3 Husband-wife couples, youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	14	26
2.3.1 Without other persons	9	28
2.3.2 With other persons	9	28
2.4 Cohabiting couples without resident children	29	8
2.4.1 Without other persons	19	14
2.4.2 With other persons	18	16
2.5 Cohabiting couples with at least one resident children under 25	17	18
2.5.1 Without other persons	13	21
2.5.2 With other persons	12	22
2.6 Cohabiting couples, youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	12	23
2.6.1 Without other persons	8	25
2.6.2 With other persons	8	25
2.7 Lone fathers with at least one resident child under 25	20	22
2.7.1 Without other persons	15	24
2.7.2 With other persons	14	25
2.8 Lone fathers, youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	15	26
2.8.1 Without other persons	10	28
2.8.2 With other persons	10	28
2.9 Lone mothers with at least one resident child under 25	20	22
2.9.1 Without other persons	15	24
2.9.2 With other persons	14	25
2.10 Lone mothers, youngest resident son/daughter 25 or older	15	26
2.10.1 Without other persons	10	28
2.10.2 With other persons	10	27
3. Two or more family household	32	7

Table 6 (1 of 3)

Did countries produce the 6 recommended ECE/Eurostat tabulations on households and families?

GROUP 1 - RECEIVED EUROSTAT QUESTIONNAIRE**ECE/Eurostat Recommended Tabulations**

	Table A2	Table A4	Table A5	Table A16	Table A17	Table A18**
Austria		Y	Y			
Belgium						no response
Bulgaria		Y	Y			
Cyprus	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Czech Rep.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Denmark	Y	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y
Estonia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Finland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
France	Y	Y	Y (2)	Y (3)	Y (3)	Y
Germany	Y	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y (4)	Y
Greece	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hungary	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Iceland						no response
Ireland		Y	Y			
Italy		Y	Y			
Latvia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Liechtenstein	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lithuania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Luxembourg	Y	Y	Y (2)			Y (5)
Malta						no data; see note
Netherlands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Norway	Y	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y
Poland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Portugal	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Romania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Slovak Rep.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Slovenia	Y	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y
Spain						no response
Sweden		Y				
Switzerland		Y	Y			
Turkey						no response
United Kingdom	Y	Y	Y	Y (4)	Y (4)	Y

Table 6 (2 of 3)**GROUP 2 - DID NOT RECEIVE EUROSTAT QUESTIONNAIRE**

	ECE/Eurostat Recommended Tabulations						
	Table A2	Table A4	Table A5	Table A16	Table A17	Table A18**	
Albania	Y	Y			Y	Y	
Andorra							no census
Armenia		Y	Y (2)	VAR (4)	VAR (4)		
Azerbaijan							
Belarus							no HH data found
Bosnia & Herz.							no census
Canada	Y	Y	C	Y (4)	C	C	
Croatia	Y	Y	Y	Y (3)	Y (3)	Y	
Georgia	Y	Y					
Israel		VAR					census was 1995
Kazakhstan							see note
Kyrgyzstan	Y (6)	Y					
Macedonia							
Moldova							no census
Monaco							no HH data found
Russian Fed.							see note
San Marino							no census
Serbia & Mont.							minimal HH data
Tajikistan	Y (6)	Y					
Turkmenistan							no census
Ukraine	Y						minimal HH data
United States	Y	Y	C	C	C	C	
Uzbekistan							no census

Y = Followed ECE table recommendation

C = Could produce recommended table with special census tabulation

VAR = variant of ECE recommendation was produced

** Eurostat tabulations for Group 1 have no distinction of youngest child's age; presumably this could be generated from existing data.

(1) no institutional data

(2) no cohabitant status

(3) no information on cohabiting couples

(4) truncation of # of children

(5) "2 or more" category NA

(6) no distinction of "private" HHS (i.e., could include institutional HHS)

Table 6 (3 of 3)**COUNTRY-SPECIFIC NOTES**

No consensual unions reported for Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Sweden; Portugal has "total" row only (no age); Poland uses "legal" vs. "de facto" distinction; Kyrgyzstan, Russia and Tajikistan report "registered married" and "non-registered married."

Armenia No consensual union category.

Georgia Website has minimal data, but suggests that tabulations will be available on topics such as different types of HHs, living situation of children under age 18, and collective households. Concept of "consensual union" apparently not used.

Croatia Used the Eurostat institutional categories.
No cohabitating couples in Family Nuclei table, but a full age/sex distribution of consensual unions in another table.

Israel Fairly extensive institutional information for 1995, but different categories.

Malta Census was 1995; question format incompatible with Eurostat request.

Kazakhstan No census data available on website. The "Households" volume from the 1999 census used households as the unit of reference, as opposed to individuals or families.

Kyrgyzstan Reference exists to a census volume IV (Households and families) but unable to locate via U.S. Census Bureau, CISSTAT, or ECE.

Russian Fed. Scattered data on websites (e.g., HH by number of children). Census 2002 volume on Household Size and Structure scheduled for release in September 2004; not available as of 4 October.

Serbia "First results" publication on the web has only total number of HH; excludes Kosovo and Montenegro.

Table 7. Usual Resident Population Aged 15 and Over by Type of Household and Household Status

Country	Total Aged 15+	<u>In Private Households</u>												<u>In Institutional HHs</u>		<u>In Other HHs</u>			
		<u>All Statuses</u>		<u>Child</u>		<u>Spouse</u>		<u>Cohabitant</u>		<u>Lone Parent</u>		<u>Living Alone</u>		<u>Other</u>		Total	Percent	Total	Percent
		Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent				
26-Country Aggregate**	358,250,632	352,347,598	98.4	58,893,006	16.4	191,796,200	53.5	16,923,040	4.7	16,474,601	4.6	51,888,636	14.5	16,372,115	4.6	5,712,814	1.6	190,220	0.1
Austria	6,679,444	6,592,996	98.7	1,089,288	16.3	3,261,828	48.8	446,730	6.7	351,872	5.3	1,119,910	16.8	323,368	4.8	86,448	1.3	-	-
Bulgaria	6,691,552	6,652,871	99.4	1,065,875	15.9	3,843,404	57.4	313,896	4.7	290,001	4.3	662,242	9.9	477,453	7.1	38,681	0.6	-	-
Cyprus	540,702	536,516	99.2	112,665	20.8	345,984	64.0	5,131	0.9	13,999	2.6	35,613	6.6	23,124	4.3	4,186	0.8	-	-
Czech Republic	8,571,715	8,502,952	99.2	1,688,391	19.7	4,415,755	51.5	250,392	2.9	576,251	6.7	1,274,909	14.9	297,254	3.5	68,763	0.8	-	-
Denmark	4,354,699	4,288,207	98.5	328,326	7.5	2,049,704	47.1	585,448	13.4	145,446	3.3	1,174,849	27.0	4,434	0.1	66,492	1.5	-	-
Estonia	1,121,141	1,107,146	98.8	172,426	15.4	447,410	39.9	122,349	10.9	94,536	8.4	194,812	17.4	75,613	6.7	11,453	1.0	2,542	0.0
Finland	4,244,782	4,153,005	97.8	512,521	12.1	1,900,832	44.8	524,494	12.4	188,263	4.4	856,746	20.2	170,149	4.0	34,169	0.8	57,608	1.4
France	47,537,564	46,227,889	97.2	6,929,848	14.6	28,223,933	59.4	-	-	1,984,590	4.2	7,379,539	15.5	1,709,979	3.6	1,212,592	2.6	97,083	0.2
Germany	69,755,700	68,971,300	98.9	8,576,300	12.3	38,715,400	55.5	4,391,000	6.3	2,355,300	3.4	13,504,900	19.4	1,428,400	2.0	784,400	1.1	-	-
Greece	9,017,545	8,688,635	96.4	1,802,047	20.0	4,954,877	54.9	152,167	1.7	351,164	3.9	723,660	8.0	704,720	7.8	328,910	3.6	-	-
Hungary	8,503,379	8,271,370	97.3	1,561,097	18.4	4,250,300	50.0	543,135	6.4	530,877	6.2	1,012,467	11.9	373,494	4.4	227,474	2.7	4,535	0.1
Ireland	3,029,336	2,971,184	98.1	693,535	22.9	1,385,970	45.8	155,232	5.1	153,863	5.1	277,263	9.2	305,321	10.1	58,152	1.9	-	-
Italy	48,892,559	48,494,878	99.2	10,591,693	21.7	27,038,236	55.3	1,020,502	2.1	2,100,961	4.3	5,427,621	11.1	2,315,865	4.7	397,681	0.8	-	-
Latvia	1,947,035	1,926,632	99.0	370,837	19.0	697,772	35.8	67,426	3.5	162,878	8.4	200,299	10.3	427,420	22.0	20,403	1.0	-	-
Liechtenstein	27,647	26,204	94.8	4,189	15.2	14,166	51.2	1,208	4.4	931	3.4	4,321	15.6	1,389	5.0	987	3.6	456	1.6
Lithuania	2,803,661	2,783,770	99.3	157,532	5.6	1,450,425	51.7	110,434	3.9	114,676	4.1	387,980	13.8	562,723	20.1	18,677	0.7	1,214	0.0
Luxembourg	356,342	349,560	98.1	55,778	15.7	204,455	57.4	-	-	14,474	4.1	50,375	14.1	24,478	6.9	6,782	1.9	-	-
Netherlands	13,008,255	12,796,061	98.4	1,626,560	12.5	6,883,618	52.9	1,347,588	10.4	396,317	3.0	2,306,767	17.7	235,211	1.8	212,194	1.6	-	-

Table 7. Usual Resident Population Aged 15 and Over by Type of Household and Household Status

Country	Total Aged 15+	<u>In Private Households</u>										<u>In Institutional HHs</u>		<u>In Other HHs</u>					
		<u>All Statuses</u>		<u>Child</u>		<u>Spouse</u>		<u>Cohabitant</u>		<u>Lone Parent</u>		<u>Living Alone</u>		<u>Other</u>		Total	Percent	Total	Percent
		Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent				
Norway	3,615,215	3,581,386	99.1	522,102	14.4	1,668,808	46.2	408,264	11.3	172,575	4.8	739,563	20.5	70,074	1.9	33,829	0.9	-	-
Poland	31,283,909	30,899,317	98.8	7,437,656	23.8	16,459,261	52.6	394,729	1.3	2,030,008	6.5	3,296,190	10.5	1,281,473	4.1	384,592	1.2	-	-
Portugal	8,699,952	8,606,113	98.9	1,775,992	20.4	5,032,644	57.8	373,107	4.3	366,760	4.2	631,687	7.3	425,923	4.9	93,402	1.1	437	0.0
Romania	17,860,462	17,573,765	98.4	3,357,151	18.8	10,197,726	57.1	826,679	4.6	856,513	4.8	1,382,611	7.7	953,085	5.3	286,697	1.6	-	-
Slovak Republic	4,316,438	4,251,254	98.5	1,008,798	23.4	1,119,772	25.9	29,025	0.7	241,559	5.6	579,733	13.4	1,272,367	29.5	38,839	0.9	26,345	0.6
Slovenia	1,663,869	1,649,468	99.1	398,707	24.0	819,121	49.2	84,182	5.1	104,292	6.3	149,757	9.0	93,409	5.6	14,401	0.9	-	-
Switzerland	6,043,350	5,767,737	95.4	715,026	11.8	3,132,892	51.8	387,938	6.4	162,321	2.7	1,120,878	18.5	248,682	4.1	275,613	4.6	-	-
United Kingdom	47,684,379	46,677,382	97.9	6,338,666	13.3	23,281,907	48.8	4,381,984	9.2	2,714,174	5.7	7,393,944	15.5	2,566,707	5.4	1,006,997	2.1	-	-
Armenia	2,432,968	2,427,100	99.8	617,070	25.4	1,411,757	58.0	n/a	n/a	148,916	6.1	85,270	3.5	164,087	6.7	5,868	0.2	-	-
Croatia	3,682,826	3,657,842	99.3	818,775	22.2	2,063,736	56.0	64,272	1.7	188,002	5.1	307,017	8.3	216,040	5.9	24,984	0.7	-	-

** 26-country aggregate based on Eurostat table 1, and excludes Armenia and Croatia.

Table 8.
Comparison of Consensual Union and Cohabitant Status among Usual Resident Population
Aged 15 and Over

	Total Pop.15+	Consensual Union		Total Pop.15+	Cohabitant	
		Total	Percent		Total	Percent
Austria	6,679,444	446,730	6.7	6,679,444	446,730	6.7
Bulgaria	6,712,060	313,896	4.7	6,691,552	313,896	4.7
Cyprus	542,087	5,146	0.9	540,702	5,131	0.9
Czech Republic	8,571,715	250,392	2.9	8,571,715	250,392	2.9
Denmark	4,354,699	604,733	13.9	4,354,699	585,448	13.4
Estonia	1,121,141	122,391	10.9	1,121,141	122,349	10.9
Finland	4,244,782	525,426	12.4	4,244,782	524,494	12.4
France	47,440,481	4,819,452	10.2	47,537,564	-	-
Germany	68,970,900	4,519,400	6.6	69,755,700	4,391,000	6.3
Greece	9,273,198	153,912	1.7	9,017,549	152,167	1.7
Hungary	8,503,379	258,912	3.0	8,503,379	543,135	6.4
Ireland	3,029,336	155,232	5.1	3,029,336	155,232	5.1
Italy	48,892,559	552,884	1.1	48,892,559	1,020,502	2.1
Latvia	-	-	-	1,947,039	67,429	3.5
Liechtenstein	27,191	1,208	4.4	27,647	1,209	4.4
Lithuania	2,803,661	110,496	3.9	2,803,661	110,434	3.9
Netherlands	13,008,255	1,347,588	10.4	13,008,255	1,347,589	10.4
Norway	3,615,215	408,264	11.3	3,615,215	408,264	11.3
Poland	31,283,909	-	-	31,283,909	394,729	1.3
Portugal	8,699,515	380,853	4.4	8,699,952	373,107	4.3
Romania	17,860,462	826,679	4.6	17,860,462	826,679	4.6
Slovak Republic	4,316,438	84,278	2.0	4,316,439	29,029	0.7
Slovenia	1,663,869	84,182	5.1	1,663,869	84,182	5.1
Switzerland	6,043,350	387,938	6.4	6,043,350	387,938	6.4
United Kingdom	47,684,360	4,072,075	8.5	47,684,379	4,381,984	9.2
Croatia	3,682,826	64,272	1.7	3,682,826	64,272	1.7
Russia**	118,839,448.0	6,627,294	5.6		n/a	

Except for Croatia and Russia, data for Consensual Unions are from Eurostat Table 2. Data for Cohabitants are from Eurostat Table 1.

** Data for Russia refer to the population aged 16 and over.

Table 9. Family Nuclei, by Type

	Total Family Nuclei	Husband & Wife Family		Cohabiting Couple		Lone Mother		Lone Father	
		Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
20-country aggregate**	97,815,275	77,088,624	78.8	7,272,229	7.4	11,562,765	11.8	1,891,657	1.9
Cyprus	189,913	173,316	91.3	2,573	1.4	12,315	6.5	1,709	0.9
Czech Republic	2,910,013	2,208,323	75.9	125,269	4.3	487,842	16.8	88,579	3.0
Denmark	1,440,433	1,028,370	71.4	290,999	20.2	104,731	7.3	16,333	1.1
Estonia	379,592	223,792	59.0	61,223	16.1	85,500	22.5	9,077	2.4
Finland	1,401,963	950,887	67.8	262,713	18.7	159,432	11.4	28,931	2.1
France	16,096,782	14,112,183	87.7	n/a	n/a	1,691,901	10.5	292,698	1.8
Germany	23,866,300	19,357,700	81.1	2,153,300	9.0	1,982,000	8.3	373,300	1.6
Greece	2,904,863	2,477,566	85.3	76,123	2.6	292,485	10.1	58,692	2.0
Hungary	2,868,694	2,125,152	74.1	271,641	9.5	413,473	14.4	58,428	2.0
Latvia	624,305	388,609	62.2	33,361	5.3	181,518	29.1	20,817	3.3
Liechtenstein	8,560	7,039	82.2	595	7.0	152	1.8	774	9.0
Lithuania	986,678	725,303	73.5	55,253	5.6	187,817	19.0	18,305	1.9
Netherlands	4,512,133	3,441,857	76.3	673,960	14.9	334,990	7.4	61,326	1.4
Norway	1,211,112	834,404	68.9	204,132	16.9	141,682	11.7	30,894	2.6
Poland	10,457,617	8,230,097	78.7	197,381	1.9	1,798,331	17.2	231,808	2.2
Portugal	3,069,745	2,517,039	82.0	185,917	6.1	317,526	10.3	49,263	1.6
Romania	6,369,494	5,098,869	80.1	414,061	6.5	723,686	11.4	132,878	2.1
Slovak Republic	1,414,381	1,137,557	80.4	30,466	2.2	213,983	15.1	32,375	2.3
Slovenia	555,945	409,561	73.7	42,092	7.6	89,682	16.1	14,610	2.6
United Kingdom	16,546,749	11,641,000	70.4	2,191,170	13.2	2,343,719	14.2	370,860	2.2
Canada	8,371,020	5,901,420	70.5	1,158,410	13.8	1,065,365	12.7	245,825	2.9

Notes:

**Aggregate excludes Canada.

Table 9 (except for Canada) based on first column of Eurostat table 21.

France: any cohabiting couples are included in the "husband & wife" category.

Liechtenstein: reported data for lone mothers and lone fathers may have been reversed.

Canada: Data from Pierre Turcotte, 20% census sample. Cohabiting couples include opposite-sex couples and same-sex couples.

Appendix A

Relevant items on Families and Households from the ECE/Eurostat **RECOMMENDED CORE TABULATION PROGRAMME**

Table A2. Private households

No. of Households	One-person	Multi-person	Total
-------------------	------------	--------------	-------

Table A4. Population aged 15 and over by sex, age group and legal marital status

Age group and sex	Single	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Other (including not stated)	Total
15-19 Male Female Total						
20-24 Male Female Total						
etc. up to 90-94						
95 and over Male Female Total						
Total Male Female						

Table A17. Family nuclei in private households with at least one child aged under 25, by type of family nucleus and number of children aged under 25

Type of family nucleus	Number of children aged under 25					Total family nuclei with children aged under 25	Total population
	1	2	3	4	5 or more		
1.0 Husband-wife families 2.0 Cohabiting couples 3.0 Lone father 4.0 Lone mother Total							

Table A18. Private households by type and number of persons

Type of household	Households	Persons
1.0 Non-family households 1.1 One-person households 1.2 Multi-person households 2.0 One-family households 2.1 Couples with no children 2.2 Couples with children 2.2.1 With youngest child aged under 6 2.2.2 With youngest child aged 6-18 2.2.3 With youngest child aged 19-24 2.2.4 With youngest child aged 25 and over 2.3 One-parent families 2.3.1 Lone father with youngest child aged under 6 2.3.2 Lone father with youngest child aged 6-18 2.3.3 Lone father with youngest child aged 19-24 2.3.4 Lone father with youngest child aged 25 and over 2.3.5 Lone mother with youngest child under 6 2.3.6 Lone mother with youngest child aged 6-18 2.3.7 Lone mother with youngest child aged 19-24 2.3.8 Lone mother with youngest child aged 25 and over 3.0 Multi-family households All households		

Table B1. Information on households

Variable	Private				Institutional		Reasons for deviation						Other types of households/ person not living in household		
	Housekeeping unit concept	Household-dwelling concept	Other, specify	Can estimate number of housekeeping units (Y/N)?	Compliance with definition	Definition	Legislation	Users' needs	Comparability with previous census	Consistency with statistical surveys	Register	Acceptable to respondents	Other	Information recorded	Details
Malta		X		N	Y									Y	homeless, elderly etc
Netherlands		X		N	N	Note 8			X	X	X			N	
Norway		X		N	Y									N	
Poland	X				Y									N	
Portugal	X				Y									N	
Romania	X				Y	Note 9								Y	homeless
Russian Federation	X				Y									Y	homeless
Serbia and Montenegro	X				N	Note 10			X					N	
Slovakia				Y	Y									N	
Slovenia	X				Y									N	
Spain		X		Y	Y									N	
Switzerland		X		N	N	Note 11			X				Note 16	Y	Note 21
The fYR of Macedonia	X				Y									N	
Turkey		X		N	N	Note 12								N	
Ukraine	X				Y									Y	homeless
UK - England and Wales			X, see text	Y	N	Note 13			X		X	Note 17		Y	Note 22
UK - Scotland	X				N	Note 14		X	X	X				Y	homeless
UK - Northern Ireland			X, see text	Y	N	Note 15			X					Y	Note 22
United States		X		N	N	See note 2 hyperlinks - USA	X	X	X	X		X		Y	Note 23

Notes for table B1:

1. Institutional. collective dwellings are general hospitals and hospitals with emergency, other hospitals and related institutions, nursing homes, residences for senior citizens, facilities for persons with a disability, establishments for delinquents and young offenders, establishments for children and minors, penal and correctional institutions, jails, shelters for persons lacking a fixed address, other shelters and lodging and rooming with assistance services.
2. Persons living in institutions were counted only as individuals.
3. Addresses marked as institutional households in the dwelling register plus addresses with more than 6 persons belonging to 6 different families.
4. A private household is defined as 'one person living alone, or a group of related / unrelated people living at same address with common housekeeping arrangements. All other households were defined as 'non-private households'.
5. The above definition, except for:
 - the absence from the private household was not required to exceed any period of time;
 - an institution is defined as such if the number of residents it is meant to accommodate is five or more.
6. An institutional household comprises persons who are not related as husband and wife, as cohabiting partners, or as parent and child, but normally cohabiting for religious or military reasons, etc., such as for need of care and attendance. Members of an institutional household have their place of usual residence at the institution. According to national law, people who are normally members of private household but who are living in hospitals, convalescence establishments and establishments for the disabled are only considered as members of the listed institutions if their absence from the private household exceeds two-years time limited specified for the place of usual residence topic. Moreover, persons who are living in correctional and penal institutions are considered as members of the listed institutions only if their sentence is definitive.
7. Institutional (collective) households are identified as groups of people permanently residing in infant's homes, child's homes, boarding schools for orphans and children without parental support, nursing and care houses for disabled and aged people, mental hospitals and other stationary disease prevention institutions intended for a long staying of patients, religious institutions, prisons and work farms, barracks and other similar institutions, i.e. jointly residing, usually with the general aim, general rules and collective eating (except service staff).
8. We do not have a duration threshold above which people are considered not to be part of the household any longer. Our criterium is the administrative place of residence.
9. The duration of absence from the private households was established at 6 months.
10. Criteria of the stay length was not considered.
11. The institutional households are all those that are not considered as private.
12. No institutional household collected.
13. An institutional household (termed a 'communal establishment') is defined as an establishment providing managed residential accommodation. 'Managed' means full-time or part-time supervision of the accommodation.
14. 6 months rather than 1 year - staff may be included as residents of institution.
15. An institutional household (termed a 'communal establishment') is defined as an establishment providing managed residential accommodation. 'Managed' means full-time or part-time supervision of the accommodation.
16. Corresponding to the specific definitions of housing units and residence.
17. Definition provided for easier identification of households, by enumerators, in multi-occupied dwellings.
18. Homeless persons are not included in the number of household-dwelling units.
19. Homeless persons were enumerated where they spent census night.
20. Homelessness - data collected from municipalities. Soldiers with no families in Israel, who live in the military camp - data collected from the IDF.
21. Collecting of such information was intended, but the result of incoming information was not satisfying...
22. Information was collected on people sleeping rough. These were classified as separate category within the institutional population.
23. As part of the group quarters enumeration, the Census Bureau developed a specialized operation to enumerate people at selected locations that serve people without conventional housing. These locations included emergency and transitional shelters, soup kitchens, regularly scheduled mobile food vans, and targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations.

Table B2. Information on families

Variable	Family nucleus		Reason for deviation					Children					Couples		Reconstituted family		
	Compliance with definition	Definition	Users' needs	Comparability with prev.census	Consistency with stat. surveys	Acceptable to respondents	Other	Compliance with definition	Definition	Users' needs	Comparability with prev.census	Consistency with stat. surveys	Register	Compliance with definition	Definition	Identification from census data	Data in tab. programme
Tot. Ans.	46	7	2	3	2	2	2	46	6	1	4	2	1	46	3	46	18
Tot. "Y"	38							41						44		19	8
Tot. "N"	8							5						2		27	10
Albania	Y							Y						Y		Y	
Armenia	Y							Y						Y		N	
Australia	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
Austria	Y							Y						Y		N	
Azerbaijan Republic	Y							Y						Y		N	
Belarus	Y							Y						Y		N	
Belgium	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
Bulgaria	Y							Y						Y		N	
Canada	N	Note 1				X		Y	Note 9					Y	Note 17	N	
Croatia	Y							Y						Y		N	
Cyprus	Y							Y						Y		N	
Czech Republic	Y							N	Note 10		X			Y		N	
Denmark	Y							N	Note 11					N	Note 18	Y	N
Estonia	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
Finland	Y							Y						Y		Y	
France	Y							Y						Y		N	
Georgia	Y							Y						Y		N	
Greece	Y							Y						Y		Note 20	N
Hungary	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
Ireland	N	Note 2		X		X	Note 7	Y						Y		N	
Israel	Y							Y						Y		N	
Italy	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
Kazakhstan	Y							Y						Y		N	N
Kyrgyzstan	Y							Y						Y		N	
Latvia	Y							Y						Y		N	
Lithuania	Y							Y						Y		Y	N
Luxembourg	N						Note 8	Y						Y		N	
Malta	Y							Y						Y		N	

Table B2. Information on families

Variable	Family nucleus		Reason for deviation				Children					Couples		Reconstituted family			
	Compliance with definition	Definition	Users' needs	Comparability with prev.census	Consistency with stat. surveys	Acceptable to respondents	Other	Compliance with definition	Definition	Users' needs	Comparability with prev.census	Consistency with stat. surveys	Register	Compliance with definition	Definition	Identification from census data	Data in tab. programme
Netherlands	Y							N	Note 12		X	X	X	Y		Y	N
Norway	N	Note 3	X	X	X			Y						Y		N	
Poland	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
Portugal	Y							Y						Y		Y	N
Romania	Y							Y						Y		N	
Russian Federation	Y							Y						Y		N	
Serbia and Montenegro	Y							Y						Y		N	
Slovakia	Y							Y						Y		N	
Slovenia	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
Spain	Y							Y						Y		N	
Switzerland	N	Note 4						N	Note 13		X			Note 15		N	
The fYR of Macedonia	Y							Y						Y		Y	N
Turkey	Y							Y						Y		N	
Ukraine	Y							Y						Y		N	
UK - England and Wales	N	Note 5						Y						Y		Y	N
UK - Scotland	Y							Y						Y		Y	Y
UK - Northern Ireland	N	Note 5						Y						Y		Y	N
United States	N	Note 6	X	X	X			N	Note 14	X	X	X		Note 16	Note 19	See text	N

Notes for table B2 :

1. Refers to a married couple (with or without children of either or both spouses), a couple living common-law (with or without children of either or both partners) or a lone parent of any marital status, with at least one child living in the same dwelling. A couple living common-law may be of opposite or same sex. Children in a census family include grandchildren living with their grandparent(s) but with no parents present.
2. A family nucleus was defined as two or more people within a PRIVATE household related as husband and wife, as cohabiting partners, or as parent and child. A child was defined as a never-married child.
3. Definition for national tables: Following para 191, but a person living alone is also counted as a family nucleus. Definition for international tables: Following para 191.
4. Swiss census of the year 2000 did not ask respondents to indicate any family nucleus. Thus a distinction between one or more family nuclei in the same household is not possible.
5. A family also includes a married or cohabiting couple with their grandchild(ren) or a lone grandparent with his or her grandchild(ren) where there are no children in the intervening generation in the household. Cohabiting couples include same sex couples. Children in couple families need not belong to both members of the couple.
6. A family includes a householder and one or more other people living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. All people in a household who are related to the householder are regarded as members of his or her family. A family household may contain people not related to the householder, but those people are not included as part of the householder's family in census tabulations. Thus, the number of family households is equal to the number of families, but family households may include more members than do families. A household can contain only one family for purposes of census tabulations. Not all households contain families since a household may be comprised of a group of unrelated people or of one person living alone.
7. The relationship question is not asked of persons in non-private households.
8. Question not asked in the census.
9. Published data include grandchildren but these can be identified and eliminated to respect the definition above.
10. The recommended definition and national definition of "dependend child" were used. "Dependent child" is each person that has a relation with the person who is the head of the census household - a son, daughter, is economically not active and in the age of 0-25 years.
11. Only children under 25 are counted as children.
12. Children that alternate are counted at the administrative place of residence.
13. The definition adopted for children did not contain any restriction about their age or marital status. Stepson and son-in-law are considered as sons (the same is valdi for daughters). Foster children were to be indicated as 'Other member of household'.
14. A child is a son or daughter by birth, a stepchild, or an adopted child of the householder, regardless of the child's age or marital status. The category excludes sons-in-law, daughters-in-law, and foster children.
15. If the two persons of a couple are married, but not to each other, this situation cannot be clearly distinguished from a couple in which the persons are married together.
16. People in consensual unions are not identified separately in Census tabulations.
17. The term 'couple' includes same-sex unions.
18. Plus registered partnerships.
19. Spouse (husband/wife). A spouse (husband/wife) is a person married to and living with a householder. People in formal marriages, as well as people in common-law marriages are included.
20. Only if there is a nucleus family.

Table B3. Reference person (1 of 9)

	Tot. Ans.	Tot. "X"	Tot. "Y"	Tot. "N"	Albania	Armenia	Australia
Identification of reference person							
Freely chosen among adults	22	21	1	0	X	X	
Household head	5	5	0	0			
Highest income contributor	3	3	0	0			
Identified through admin. registers	4	4	0	0			
Through criteria for family identification	13	13	0	0			X
Other criteria	3	3	0	0			
Relationship to the reference person							
Reference person	44	0	43	1	Y	Y	Y
Spouse	44	0	40	4	Y	Y	Y
Reference person's partner in consensual union	44	0	32	12	Y	N	Y
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	43	0	33	10	Y	Y	Y
Child of reference person only	41	0	24	17	Y	Y	Y
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	40	0	13	26	Y		Y
Child of both	40	0	14	26	Y		Y
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	41	0	34	7	Y	Y	N
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	44	0	39	5	Y	Y	N
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	44	0	38	6	Y	Y	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	43	0	39	4	Y	Y	Y
Foster child	39	0	6	33	N	N	N
Boarder	39	0	4	35	N	N	N
Domestic servant	39	0	2	37	N	N	N
Other	39	0	18	21	Y	N	Y
Other typologies	20	0	0	0		Grandparents, grandson, granddaughter, brother, sister, co-roomer (institutional)	Provision was made for a write-in answers which could have included the categories listed under 'no' above
Reference number							
One or both parents	44	0	18	26	Y	Y	N
Relationship with other household members							
Information recorded	44	0	13	31	Y	N	N
Details	12	0	0	0	by codes		

Table B3. Reference person (2 of 9)

	Austria	Azerbaijan Republic	Belarus	Belgium	Bulgaria	Canada	Croatia
Identification of reference person							
Freely chosen among adults	X	X	X			X	X
Household head		X			X		
Highest income contributor	X				X		
Identified through admin. registers				X			
Through criteria for family identification							
Other criteria							
Relationship to the reference person							
Reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spouse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reference person's partner in consensual union	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Child of reference person only	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Child of both	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	Y
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Foster child	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Boarder	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Domestic servant	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Other	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Other typologies	Reference person of other household in dwelling; Member of other household in dwelling ??			Other parent of reference person			Grandchild, brother/sister
Reference number							
One or both parents	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Relationship with other household members							
Information recorded	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Details							

Table B3. Reference person (3 of 9)

	Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France
Identification of reference person						
Freely chosen among adults	X			X		
Household head						
Highest income contributor					X	
Identified through admin. registers						
Through criteria for family identification						X
Other criteria		X				
Relationship to the reference person						
Reference person	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Spouse	Y	Y		N	Y	Y
Reference person's partner in consensual union	Y	Y		N	Y	Y
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Child of reference person only	N	N		N	Y	Y
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	N	N		N	Y	Y
Child of both	N	N		N	Y	Y
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	Y	Y		N	Y	Y
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Foster child	N	N		N	N	N
Boarder	N	N		N	N	N
Domestic servant	Y	N		N	N	N
Other	Y	N		N	Y	N
Other typologies	Grandchild, brother/sister, brother/sister in law			Grandparent of reference person of his/her spouse/cohabitant; Grandchild of reference person of his/her spouse/cohabitant	all the persons living in the same dwelling, who are not parents, children or spouses	
Reference number						
One or both parents	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Relationship with other household members						
Information recorded	Y	N		Y	N	N
Details	Spouse reference number			Reference number of legal spouse, ref nr of partner in consensual union, ref nr of mother, ref nr of father		

Table B3. Reference person (4 of 9)

	Georgia	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Israel
Identification of reference person					
Freely chosen among adults	X	X		X	
Household head		X			
Highest income contributor					
Identified through admin. registers					
Through criteria for family identification		X	X		X
Other criteria					
Relationship to the reference person					
Reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spouse	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Reference person's partner in consensual union	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Child of reference person only	N		Y	Y	N
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	N		Y	N	N
Child of both	N		Y	N	N
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	Y		Y	N	Y
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y		N	Y	Y
Foster child	N			N	N
Boarder	N			N	Y
Domestic servant	N			N	N
Other	N	Y		Y	Y
Other typologies	Son-in-law, daughter-in-law, grandmother, grandfather, grandson, granddaughter, brother, sister	Grandchild, grandparent, brother/sister, brother/sister-in-law, nephew/niece		Mother, father, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, mother-in-law, father-in-law, grandmother, grandfather, grandchild, brother, sister, aunt, uncle, niece, nephew	1. Partner-used for both marriage and consensual union couples 2. Brother or sister 3. Brother-in-law or sister-in-law 4. Grandchild
Reference number					
One or both parents	Y	N	N	N	N
Relationship with other household members					
Information recorded	N	Y	Y	N	N
Details		In relation with the previous member	Specific question on family status		

Table B3. Reference person (5 of 9)

	Italy	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Latvia	Lithuania	Luxembourg
Identification of reference person						
Freely chosen among adults		X		X	X	
Household head						
Highest income contributor						
Identified through admin. registers	X					
Through criteria for family identification			X			X
Other criteria						
Relationship to the reference person						
Reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spouse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Reference person's partner in consensual union	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child of reference person only	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	Y	NN	N	N	N	N
Child of both	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Foster child	N	N	N	N	N	N
Boarder	N	N	N	N	N	N
Domestic servant	N	N	N	N	N	N
Other	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Other typologies	Parent (or parent spouse) of reference person; step parent of r.p.; brother/sister of r.p.; brother/sister of spouse/cohabitant; spouse of brother/sister of r.p. or spouse of brother/sister of spouse/cohabitant of r.p.; nephew (son of son) of r.p. and/or of spouse/cohabitant; nephew (son of brother/sister) of r.p. and/or of spouse/cohabitant				grandparent, grandchild, brother, sister	
Reference number						
One or both parents	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Relationship with other household members						
Information recorded	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Details					Respondents were asked to identify the reference number of spouse/cohabitant, mother and father.	

Table B3. Reference person (6 of 9)

	Malta	NetherlandsNorway	Poland	Portugal	Republic of Romania Moldova
Identification of reference person					
Freely chosen among adults	X			X	X
Household head			X	X	
Highest income contributor					
Identified through admin. registers		X			
Through criteria for family identification					
Other criteria					
Relationship to the reference person					
Reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spouse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reference person's partner in consensual union	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Child of reference person only	Y		Y		Y
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	N		Y		N
Child of both	N		Y		N
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person		Y	Y	Y	Y
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Foster child	Y			Y	N
Boarder	N			N	N
Domestic servant	N			Y	N
Other	N			Y	
Other typologies	grandchild, brother/sister, son/daughter in law				
Reference number					
One or both parents	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Relationship with other household members					
Information recorded	N	N	N	Y	N
Details				Father Mother and spouse	

Table B3. Reference person (7 of 9)

	Russian Federation	Serbia and Montenegro	Slovakia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland
Identification of reference person							
Freely chosen among adults	Y			X			
Household head							
Highest income contributor							
Identified through admin. registers					X		
Through criteria for family identification		X	X				
Other criteria							X
Relationship to the reference person							
Reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N
Spouse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N
Reference person's partner in consensual union	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N
Child of reference person only	N	Y	N	N	Y		N
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	N	N	N	N	N		N
Child of both	N	N	N	N	N		N
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N
Foster child	N	N	N	Y	Y		N
Boarder	N	N	Y	N	N		N
Domestic servant	N	N	N	N	N		N
Other	Y	N	N	N	N		N
Other typologies	sister, brother, mother-in-law, father-in-law, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, grandmother, grandfather, granddaughter, grandson						
Reference number							
One or both parents	Y	N	N	N	N		N
Relationship with other household members							
Information recorded	Y	Y	N	N	N		N
Details	Number of mother (father) if she (he) lives in the same household with respondent and Number of Wife (husband) if she (he) lives in the same household with respondent	They were suppose to clarify relations (kinship) with the head of household					

Table B3. Reference person (8 of 9)

	The fYR of Macedonia	Turkey	Ukraine	UK - England and Wales	UK - Scotland
Identification of reference person					
Freely chosen among adults	X		X		
Household head					
Highest income contributor					
Identified through admin. registers					
Through criteria a for family identification		X		X	X
Other criteria					
Relationship to the reference person					
Reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Spouse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reference person's partner in consensual union	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Child of reference person only	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Child of both	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Foster child	Y	N		N	N
Boarder	N	N		N	N
Domestic servant	N	N		N	N
Other	N	Y		Y	Y
Other typologies		Brother/sister of reference person only; Daughter-in-law/son-in-law of reference person only		Grandchild of reference person/spouse; Grandparent of reference person/spouse	
Reference number					
One or both parents	N	N	N	Y	Y
Relationship with other household members					
Information recorded	N	N	N	Y	Y
Details				Relationship matrix asked relationship of each household member to every other household member, identifying: Husband or wife, Partner, Son or daughter, Step-child, Brother or sister, Father or mother, Step-father or step-mother, Grandchild, Grandparent, Other related, Unrelated	We had a full relationship matrix for the first 5 members of household and then for the preceeding two people and Person number 1

Table B3. Reference person (9 of 9)

	UK - Northern Ireland	United States
Identification of reference person		
Freely chosen among adults		
Household head		
Highest income contributor		
Identified through admin. registers		
Through criteria for family identification	X	
Other criteria		X
Relationship to the reference person		
Reference person	Y	Y
Spouse	Y	Y
Reference person's partner in consensual union	Y	Y
Child of ref. person and/or of spouse/cohabitant	Y	N
Child of reference person only	Y	Y
Child of reference person's spouse/cohabitant	Y	N
Child of both	Y	N
Spouse or cohabitant of child of ref. person	Y	Y
Father or mother of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y
Other relative of ref. person, of spouse, or of cohabitant of reference person	Y	Y
Non-relative of reference person of the household	Y	Y
Foster child	N	Y
Boarder	N	Y
Domestic servant	N	N
Other	Y	Y
Other typologies	Grandchild of reference person/spouse; Grandparent of reference person/spouse	Son-in-law/daughter-in-law, parent-in-law, grandchild, brother/sister, housemate/roommate, unmarried partner
Reference number		
One or both parents	Y	N
Relationship with other household members		
Information recorded	Y	N
Details	Relationship matrix asked relationship of each household member to every other household member, identifying: Husband or wife, Partner, Son or daughter, Step-child, Brother or sister, Father or mother, Step-father or step-mother, Grandchild, Grandparent, Other related, Unrelated	
