Figure 1 Poverty and deprivation rates by year
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## Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) <br> 2011 \& revised 2010 results

The Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) in Ireland is a household survey covering a broad range of issues in relation to income and living conditions. It is the official source of data on household and individual income and also provides a number of key national poverty indicators, such as the at risk of poverty rate, the consistent poverty rate and rates of enforced deprivation. This report presents the results for 2011, revised results for 2010 and comparable data for previous years.
Table A Summary of main results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2005 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ |
| Income | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ |
| Equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (per individual) | 19,768 | 21,229 | 23,610 | 24,380 | 23,326 | 22,138 | 21,440 |
| At risk of poverty threshold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (60\% of median income) | 10,057 | 10,566 | 11,890 | 12,455 | 12,064 | 11,155 | 10,889 |
| Poverty \& deprivation rates | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| At risk of poverty rate | 18.5 | 17.0 | 16.5 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 16.0 |
| Deprivation rate ${ }^{1}$ | 14.8 | 14.0 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 17.1 | 22.6 | 24.5 |
| Consistent poverty rate | 7.0 | 6.6 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 6.9 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Summary of main findings

- In 2011 average annual equivalised disposable income was $€ 21,440$. This represented a decline of just over $3 \%$ on the 2010 value of $€ 22,138$. See table $A$.
- The Gini coefficient in 2011 was $31.1 \%$, not a statistically significant change on the 2010 value ( $31.6 \%$ ). The Quintile Share Ratio remained at 4.9 in 2011. See table B.
- In 2011, the at risk of poverty rate increased to $16.0 \%$ from $14.7 \%$ in 2010. See table $A$ and figure 1 .
- Almost one quarter ( $24.5 \%$ ) of the population experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation in 2011 up from $22.6 \%$ in 2010. See table $A$ and figure 1.
- The consistent poverty rate was $6.9 \%$ in 2011, not a statistically significant change on the 2010 figure of $6.3 \%$. See table $A$ and figure 1 .

The results previously published for 2010 have been amended following extensive investigation of anomalies in the data. The main effects of the amendment have been a change in the at risk of poverty threshold and in the at risk of poverty rate ( $15.8 \%$ to $14.7 \%$ ). There was no significant change in the deprivation and consistent poverty rates. Indicators of income inequality decreased e.g. the Gini coefficient went from $33.9 \%$ to $31.6 \%$. Earlier years have not been affected. The changes in the main indicators are shown in table B1 in the background notes.

For more information contact Pamela Lafferty on 021453 5268, Marion McCann at 0214535611 or Anne McGrath on 0214535487.

## Income

## Equivalised Income

In 2011 average annual equivalised disposable income was $€ 21,440$. This represented a decline of just over $3 \%$ on the 2010 value of $€ 22,138$ and continued a downward trend from a peak of $€ 24,380$ in 2008. See table A.

An analysis by socio-demographic characteristics showed that individuals with a highest level of educational attainment of third level degree or higher continued to have the highest average income of the categories analysed in 2011, at $€ 33,244$. Those living in accommodation that was rented at below the market rate or rent free had the lowest average income of the categories analysed in 2011, at $€ 13,831$. This group also had the lowest average income in 2010. See table 1.

## Composition of income

Figure 2 Composition of average weekly equivalised gross income by year $€$


In 2011, average weekly equivalised gross income was $€ 522.87$ down from $€ 534.66$ in 2010 and $€ 551.39$ in 2009. See table 2 and figure 2

An analysis of the composition of gross income by year showed that average weekly equivalised direct income in 2011 , at $€ 381.21$, was close to the 2004 value of $€ 379.40$. Average weekly equivalised social transfers increased from $€ 81.51$ in 2004 to $€ 141.65$ in 2011, an increase of almost $74 \%$. See figure 2.

Figure 3 Composition of average weekly equivalised gross income by year


A breakdown of gross income by disposable income, tax and social insurance payments showed a decline in disposable income in 2011 ( $€ 410.88$ ) from a peak of $€ 467.24$ in 2008. The average value in 2011 was close to that of $€ 406.84$ in 2006. See figure 3.

In 2011 the at risk of poverty threshold was $€ 10,889$. This represented a decline of over $2 \%$ on the 2010 value of $€ 11,155$ and continued a downward trend in the threshold from a peak of $€ 12,455$ in 2008 . See table $3 b$.

Equality of Income

Table B Indicators of income equality by year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All individuals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| Indicators of income equality ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gini coefficient (\%) | 31.8 | 32.4 | 32.4 | 31.7 | 30.7 | 29.3 | 31.6 | 31.1 |
| Income distribution (Income quintile share ratio) | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 4.9 |

${ }^{1}$ See Background Notes

In 2011 the Gini coefficient was $31.1 \%$ not a statistically significant change on the value in 2010 (31.6\%). The 2010 value reversed a downward trend in the data evident between 2005 and 2009. A Gini coefficient of $0.0 \%$ would correspond to perfect income equality while higher Gini coefficients indicate a more unequal distribution. See table $B$ and figure 4.

The quintile share ratio remained at 4.9 in 2011 indicating that those in the highest income quintile continued to have an average equivalised income of 4.9 times that of those in the lowest income quintile. See table $B$ and figure 4.

Figure 4 Indicators of income equality
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## Poverty

## At risk of poverty

In 2011 , the at risk of poverty rate increased to $16.0 \%$ from $14.7 \%$ in 2010 . An analysis by socio-demographic characteristics showed that those most at risk of poverty in 2011 were people living in accommodation that was rented at below the market rate or was rent free ( $36.4 \%$ ) and those living in households where there was no one at work (33.2\%). See table 1.

Figure 5 At risk of poverty rate by sex, age group and
year


Between 2010 and 2011 the groups that showed a statistically significant change in their at risk of poverty rate were:
(See table 1 and figure 5)

- Males ( $14.3 \%$ in 2010 to $16.3 \%$ in 2011).
- Those aged $18-64$ ( $14.2 \%$ in 2010 to $15.9 \%$ in 2011).
- Students ( $22.7 \%$ in 2010 to $31.4 \%$ in 2011).
- Those with highest level of educational attainment of higher secondary ( $14.4 \%$ in 2010 to $18.9 \%$ in 2011).
- Persons living in households where no one was at work ( $29.8 \%$ in 2010 to $33.2 \%$ in 2011).
- Those living in accommodation that was rented at below the market rate or rent free ( $26.1 \%$ in 2010 to $36.4 \%$ in 2011).
- Individuals living in urban areas ( $12.5 \%$ in 2010 to $14.2 \%$ in 2011).
- Those living in the Border, Midland, West (BMW) region ( $13.8 \%$ in 2010 to $20.4 \%$ in 2011).
- Persons living in households where three or more people were at work ( $1.8 \%$ in 2010 to $0.0 \%$ in 2011).


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

In 2011, if all social transfers were excluded from income, the at risk of poverty rate would be $50.7 \%$, indicating a steady increase from $39.8 \%$ in 2004. This increase over time demonstrates the increasing dependence of individuals on social transfers to remain above the at risk of poverty threshold. See table 4 and figure 6.

Figure 6 The at risk of poverty rate including and excluding social transfers by year


[^0]
## Deprivation

In 2011, almost one quarter ( $24.5 \%$ ) of the population experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation. This compares with $22.6 \%$ in 2010 and an eight year low of $11.8 \%$ in 2007. See table 4.

An analysis by socio-demographic characteristics showed that those living in households with one adult and one or more children had the highest deprivation rate in 2011 at $56.0 \%$. Those living in accommodation that was rented at below the market rate or rent free ( $52.0 \%$ ) and those describing their Principal Economic Status as unemployed (42.4\%) also had high levels of deprivation in 2011. See Table 1.

## Deprivation by poverty status

The deprivation rate for those at risk of poverty was $43.1 \%$ in 2011, not a significant change from $42.9 \%$ in 2010. The deprivation rate for those NOT at risk of poverty was $21.0 \%$ in 2011, a statistically significant increase from $19.1 \%$ in 2010. See table 4 and figure 7.

Figure 7 Deprivation rates by poverty status


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

## Types of deprivation

At an overall level in 2011, the types of deprivation most commonly experienced were an inability to: See table 6 .

- replace worn out furniture (21.7\%).
- afford a morning/afternoon/evening out (21.1\%).
- have family/friends over for a meal/drink (14.8\%).
- afford heating at some stage in the last year ( $12.2 \%$, up from $10.5 \%$ in 2010 ).

Between 2010 and 2011 the groups that showed a statistically significant change in their deprivation rate were: See table 1.

- Females ( $23.5 \%$ in 2010 to $26.0 \%$ in 2011).
- Those aged 18-64 ( $21.6 \%$ in 2010 to 23.7 in 2011).
- Individuals who were unemployed ( $38.3 \%$ in 2010 to $42.4 \%$ in 2011).
- Those with highest level of educational attainment of third level non-degree ( $12.0 \%$ in 2010 to $18.2 \%$ in 2011).
- Individuals with highest level of educational attainment of third level degree or above (6.9\% in 2010 to $11.2 \%$ in 2011).
- Persons living in households where one person was at work ( $22.4 \%$ in 2010 to $27.5 \%$ in 2011).
- Those living in accommodation that was owner-occupied ( $14.8 \%$ in 2010 to $17.3 \%$ in 2011).
- Individuals living in urban areas ( $22.9 \%$ in 2010 to $26.2 \%$ in 2011).
- Persons living in the Southern and Eastern region ( $20.9 \%$ in 2010 to $23.7 \%$ in 2011).


## Consistent Poverty

The consistent poverty rate in 2011 was $6.9 \%$, not a statistically significant change on the 2010 figure of $6.3 \%$. See table 1.

An individual is considered to be in consistent poverty if they are both at risk of poverty and experiencing deprivation. The at risk of poverty rate increased from $14.7 \%$ in 2010 to $16.0 \%$ in 2011 and the deprivation rate in 2011 was $24.5 \%$ up from $22.6 \%$ in 2010. Despite a statistically significant increase in both indicators there was no statistically significant change in the consistent poverty rate between 2010 and 2011. This was due to the fact that the increase in the deprivation rate was largely among those NOT at risk of poverty. See table 4 and figure 8

Figure 8 Key indicators of poverty and deprivation by year


An analysis by key socio-demographic variables showed that those living in accommodation that was rented at below the market rate or rent free ( $21.5 \%$ ), the unemployed ( $16.5 \%$ ) and those living in lone parent households $(16.4 \%)$ had the highest consistent poverty rates in 2011.

Between 2010 and 2011 the groups that showed a statistically significant change in their consistent poverty rate were: See table 1 and figure 9.

- Those living in accommodation rented at the market rate ( $10.6 \%$ in 2010 to $6.8 \%$ in 2011).
- Persons living in accommodation rented at below the market rate or rent free ( $17.3 \%$ in 2010 to $21.5 \%$ in 2011).
- Individuals living in the Border, Midlands, West (BMW) region (6.1\% to $8.4 \%$ ).

Figure 9 Consistent poverty rate by tenure status and year


TABLES

Table 1 Income ${ }^{1}$ and poverty rates by demographic characteristics and year

|  | Average annual household disposable income |  |  | Average annual equivalised disposable income |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
|  | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ |
| State | 45,959 | 43,151 | 41,819 | 23,326 | 22,138 | 21,440 |
| Sex ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 50,570 | 46,780 | 46,096 | 23,627 | 22,324 | 21,718 |
| Female | 39,413 | 38,425 | 35,936 | 23,029 | 21,955 | 21,167 |
| Age group ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-17 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | n/a | 21,244 | 20,074 | 19,888 |
| 18-64 | 50,772 | 47,408 | 45,589 | 24,678 | 23,420 | 22,447 |
| 65+ | 29,711 | 28,663 | 27,821 | 20,681 | 20,116 | 19,725 |
| Principal Economic Status (aged 16 years and over) ${ }^{\mathbf{2}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| At work | 58,405 | 55,157 | 54,053 | 28,732 | 27,565 | 26,907 |
| Unemployed | 37,450 | 31,254 | 29,910 | 18,239 | 16,265 | 15,383 |
| Student | 31,104 | 27,331 | 28,233 | 19,491 | 18,810 | 16,273 |
| Home duties | 29,237 | 31,329 | 30,821 | 18,331 | 18,536 | 17,061 |
| Retired | 36,183 | 37,271 | 35,102 | 23,691 | 23,080 | 22,481 |
| Not at work due to illness or disability | 31,731 | 24,234 | 22,089 | 17,196 | 15,014 | 15,351 |
| Highest education level attained (aged 16 years and over) ${ }^{\mathbf{2}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary or below | 30,224 | 29,452 | 27,504 | 17,582 | 16,934 | 16,205 |
| Lower secondary | 40,648 | 38,026 | 33,619 | 19,806 | 19,003 | 17,548 |
| Higher secondary | 47,912 | 46,020 | 41,095 | 23,597 | 22,044 | 20,404 |
| Post leaving cert | 49,982 | 41,250 | 39,534 | 23,810 | 21,462 | 19,995 |
| Third level non degree | 65,036 | 53,697 | 49,454 | 27,837 | 26,743 | 25,679 |
| Third level degree or above | 69,401 | 63,912 | 64,715 | 35,552 | 34,521 | 33,244 |
| Household composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 adult aged 65+ | 17,985 | 18,368 | 18,194 | 17,985 | 18,368 | 18,194 |
| 1 adult aged <65 | 25,364 | 22,273 | 23,310 | 25,364 | 22,273 | 23,310 |
| 2 adults, at least 1 aged 65+ | 37,184 | 34,774 | 34,793 | 22,400 | 20,948 | 20,959 |
| 2 adults, both aged <65 | 47,882 | 45,926 | 45,818 | 28,845 | 27,666 | 27,616 |
| 3 or more adults | 68,593 | 68,108 | 56,155 | 25,771 | 26,179 | 21,611 |
| 1 adult with children aged under 18 | 24,898 | 27,934 | 24,934 | 15,162 | 15,686 | 15,995 |
| 2 adults with 1-3 children aged under 18 | 54,138 | 52,047 | 51,448 | 23,956 | 22,170 | 22,516 |
| Other households with children aged under 18 | 70,329 | 61,768 | 57,414 | 21,713 | 18,723 | 18,177 |
| Number of persons at work in the household |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 25,829 | 24,768 | 24,119 | 15,866 | 15,197 | 14,601 |
| 1 | 43,921 | 43,172 | 41,430 | 22,087 | 21,381 | 20,670 |
| 2 | 67,450 | 65,383 | 64,072 | 29,349 | 28,726 | 27,999 |
| 3+ | 96,721 | 89,370 | 80,720 | 31,284 | 29,075 | 27,078 |
| Tenure status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owner-occupied | 50,078 | 47,640 | 46,555 | 25,400 | 24,197 | 23,744 |
| Rented at the market rate | 41,887 | 36,938 | 36,544 | 20,482 | 18,687 | 18,167 |
| Rented at below the market rate or rent free | 28,979 | 26,754 | 25,206 | 15,257 | 14,697 | 13,831 |
| Urban/rural location |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban areas | 49,364 | 46,868 | 44,612 | 24,764 | 23,964 | 22,659 |
| Rural areas | 40,522 | 37,418 | 37,441 | 20,956 | 19,305 | 19,486 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Border, Midland and Western | 38,276 | 37,728 | 35,693 | 19,938 | 19,729 | 18,847 |
| Southern and Eastern | 48,884 | 45,185 | 44,145 | 24,563 | 23,010 | 22,379 |

[^1]Table 1 (contd.) Income ${ }^{1}$ and poverty rates by demographic characteristics and year

| At risk of poverty rate |  |  | Deprivation rate $^{3}$ |  |  | Consistent poverty rate |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |  |
| \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |  |
| 14.1 | 14.7 | 16.0 | 17.1 | 22.6 | 24.5 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 6.9 | State |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sex |
| 14.1 | 14.3 | 16.3 | 16.8 | 21.7 | 23.0 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 6.9 | Male |
| 14.1 | 15.1 | 15.6 | 17.7 | 23.5 | 26.0 | 5.4 | 6.8 | 6.9 | Female |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Age group |
| 18.6 | 18.4 | 18.8 | 23.5 | 30.5 | 32.1 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 0-17 |
| 13.0 | 14.2 | 15.9 | 16.0 | 21.6 | 23.7 | 4.9 | 6.2 | 6.8 | 18-64 |
| 9.6 | 8.7 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 11.3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 65+ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Principal Economic Status (aged 16 years and over) ${ }^{2}$ |
| 5.5 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 7.9 | 12.6 | 15.0 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 2.1 | At work |
| 24.8 | 27.3 | 30.6 | 34.3 | 38.3 | 42.4 | 11.5 | 16.0 | 16.5 | Unemployed |
| 25.9 | 22.7 | 31.4 | 19.4 | 24.4 | 24.7 | 11.4 | 8.2 | 10.6 | Student |
| 19.1 | 19.5 | 21.6 | 20.3 | 25.4 | 27.7 | 6.8 | 8.1 | 8.7 | Home duties |
| 9.6 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.0 | 7.2 | 9.8 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.6 | Retired |
| 21.7 | 19.8 | 22.8 | 35.7 | 42.9 | 35.9 | 8.8 | 12.4 | 11.1 | Not at work due to illness or disability |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Highest education level attained (aged 16 years and over) ${ }^{2}$ |
| 18.6 | 16.3 | 18.6 | 24.0 | 26.5 | 27.8 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 7.4 | Primary or below |
| 19.7 | 18.2 | 21.9 | 21.5 | 24.8 | 26.7 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 9.5 | Lower secondary |
| 12.8 | 14.4 | 18.9 | 13.0 | 19.8 | 20.9 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 6.8 | Higher secondary |
| 9.1 | 12.2 | 14.5 | 15.2 | 22.0 | 22.2 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 5.5 | Post leaving cert |
| 4.9 | 7.3 | 10.8 | 7.9 | 12.0 | 18.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 5.8 | Third level non degree |
| 4.8 | 6.7 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 6.9 | 11.2 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 1.8 | Third level degree or above |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Household composition |
| 9.5 | 8.0 | 9.1 | 13.9 | 15.1 | 14.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1 adult aged 65+ |
| 23.2 | 19.2 | 24.3 | 25.1 | 33.0 | 27.8 | 8.3 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 1 adult aged <65 |
| 9.6 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 10.8 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 2 adults, at least 1 aged 65+ |
| 10.0 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 12.4 | 15.2 | 18.4 | 2.7 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 2 adults, both aged <65 |
| 10.1 | 8.8 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 11.3 | 14.2 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 3 or more adults |
| 35.5 | 24.7 | 28.4 | 44.1 | 50.3 | 56.0 | 16.6 | 13.6 | 16.4 | 1 adult with children aged under 18 |
| 11.4 | 14.4 | 14.6 | 15.4 | 23.9 | 25.9 | 5.4 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 2 adults with 1-3 children aged under 18 |
| 16.1 | 20.7 | 21.2 | 18.3 | 28.6 | 27.2 | 6.3 | 9.9 | 9.3 | Other households with children aged under 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Number of persons at work in the household |
| 31.4 | 29.8 | 33.2 | 33.9 | 37.9 | 37.7 | 14.9 | 16.1 | 15.9 | 0 |
| 12.2 | 14.0 | 14.1 | 17.3 | 22.4 | 27.5 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 5.2 | 1 |
| 3.8 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 9.8 | 10.8 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 2 |
| 1.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 10.4 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3+ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tenure status |
| 10.1 | 11.5 | 10.6 | 9.7 | 14.8 | 17.3 | 2.5 | 3.4 | 3.8 | Owner-occupied |
| 16.5 | 20.0 | 20.6 | 22.1 | 33.3 | 31.4 | 8.3 | 10.6 | 6.8 | Rented at the market rate |
| 31.7 | 26.1 | 36.4 | 50.9 | 52.8 | 52.0 | 17.9 | 17.3 | 21.5 | Rented at below the market rate or rent free |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Urban/rural location |
| 11.8 | 12.5 | 14.2 | 18.7 | 22.9 | 26.2 | 5.0 | 6.6 | 6.8 | Urban areas |
| 17.8 | 18.1 | 18.8 | 14.9 | 22.2 | 21.8 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 7.1 | Rural areas |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Region |
| 16.2 | 13.8 | 20.4 | 18.9 | 27.3 | 26.7 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 8.4 | Border, Midland and Western |
| 13.3 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 16.7 | 20.9 | 23.7 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 6.3 | Southern and Eastern |

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

|  | Household income |  |  | Equivalised income |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| Average Weekly Income ${ }^{1}$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ | $€$ |
| Direct Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee income | 599.70 | 560.89 | 571.72 | 308.68 | 292.83 | 299.13 |
| Employer's social insurance contributions | 64.80 | 64.17 | 62.46 | 33.63 | 33.81 | 33.18 |
| Cash benefits or losses from self-employment | 105.25 | 90.51 | 75.77 | 55.99 | 48.64 | 40.01 |
| Other direct income | 26.40 | 23.33 | 18.75 | 12.58 | 11.46 | 8.90 |
| Total direct income | 796.16 | 738.90 | 728.69 | 410.88 | 386.74 | 381.21 |
| Social Transfers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment related payments | 45.78 | 59.73 | 62.16 | 23.44 | 31.41 | 32.67 |
| Old-age related payments | 63.41 | 68.88 | 65.99 | 26.78 | 29.98 | 28.47 |
| Occupational pension | 52.58 | 53.69 | 50.71 | 23.00 | 23.69 | 22.37 |
| Family/children related allowances | 67.91 | 61.48 | 57.00 | 39.74 | 36.23 | 33.49 |
| Housing allowances | 10.58 | 10.70 | 12.14 | 5.05 | 5.19 | 6.07 |
| Other social transfers | 46.78 | 44.04 | 38.06 | 22.50 | 21.43 | 18.58 |
| Total social transfers | 287.05 | 298.52 | 286.06 | 140.51 | 147.92 | 141.65 |
| Gross Income | 1,083.21 | 1,037.42 | 1,014.75 | 551.39 | 534.66 | 522.87 |
| Tax and Social Contributions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tax on income and social contributions | 133.58 | 139.81 | 146.50 | 68.69 | 73.37 | 76.68 |
| Employer's social insurance contributions | 64.80 | 64.17 | 62.46 | 33.63 | 33.81 | 33.18 |
| Regular inter-household cash transfers paid | 4.05 | 6.48 | 4.35 | 2.04 | 3.23 | 2.12 |
| Total Tax and Social Contributions | 202.43 | 210.46 | 213.31 | 104.36 | 110.40 | 111.99 |
| Net Disposable Income | 880.78 | 826.96 | 801.43 | 447.03 | 424.26 | 410.88 |

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

|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National income definition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total gross household income | 49,320 | 51,078 | 55,075 | 59,820 | 60,581 | 56,522 | 54,133 | 52,949 |
| Total disposable household income | 38,631 | 40,497 | 43,646 | 47,988 | 49,043 | 45,959 | 43,151 | 41,819 |
| National income definition, national equivalence scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equivalised total disposable household income | 18,773 | 19,768 | 21,229 | 23,610 | 24,380 | 23,326 | 22,138 | 21,440 |
| Equivalised total disposable household income including old-age and survivors' benefits but excluding all other social transfers | 16,300 | 17,085 | 18,353 | 20,113 | 20,418 | 18,750 | 17,375 | 16,788 |
| Equivalised total disposable household income excluding all social transfers | 14,513 | 15,132 | 16,338 | 17,897 | 17,982 | 16,067 | 14,423 | 14,161 |

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

Table 3b At risk of poverty thresholds by year

|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National income definition, national equivalence scale At risk of poverty threshold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% of median income | 9,680 | 10,057 | 10,566 | 11,890 | 12,455 | 12,064 | 11,155 | 10,889 |
| 40\% of median income | 6,453 | 6,705 | 7,044 | 7,927 | 8,303 | 8,043 | 7,436 | 7,259 |
| $50 \%$ of median income | 8,067 | 8,381 | 8,805 | 9,908 | 10,379 | 10,053 | 9,295 | 9,074 |
| 70\% of median income | 11,293 | 11,733 | 12,327 | 13,871 | 14,531 | 14,075 | 13,014 | 12,704 |
| Illustrative values ( $60 \%$ level) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 adult, no children | 9,680 | 10,057 | 10,566 | 11,890 | 12,455 | 12,064 | 11,155 | 10,889 |
| 2 adults, 2 children | 22,457 | 23,332 | 24,513 | 27,584 | 28,895 | 27,988 | 25,879 | 25,263 |

## Table 4 Key national indicators of poverty and social exclusion ${ }^{1}$ by year

\% of individuals

| 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| National/NAPS Indicators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| At risk of poverty rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equivalised total disposable income: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Including all social transfers (60\% median income threshold) | 19.4 | 18.5 | 17.0 | 16.5 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 16.0 |
| Including old-age and survivors' benefits but excluding all other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| social transfers (60\% threshold) | 32.7 | 32.1 | 32.2 | 33.1 | 34.6 | 36.0 | 39.1 | 39.8 |
| excluding all social transfers (60\% median income threshold) | 39.8 | 40.1 | 40.3 | 41.0 | 43.0 | 46.2 | 50.2 | 50.7 |
| Including all social transfers (40\% median income threshold) | 4.4 | 4.7 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 4.9 |
| Including all social transfers (50\% median income threshold) | 11.1 | 10.8 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 8.5 |
| Including all social transfers (70\% median income threshold) | 28.7 | 28.2 | 26.7 | 26.8 | 25.7 | 24.5 | 24.7 | 24.1 |
| Relative at risk of poverty gap | 19.8 | 20.6 | 17.5 | 17.4 | 19.2 | 16.2 | 17.7 | 19.6 |
| At risk of poverty anchored at 2004 | 19.4 | 18.0 | 15.7 | 11.5 | 10.4 | 11.0 | 13.2 | 16.1 |
| At risk of poverty anchored at 2005 |  | 18.5 | 16.3 | 11.9 | 10.8 | 12.1 | 13.7 | 16.5 |
| At risk of poverty anchored at 2006 |  | . | 17.0 | 12.8 | 11.6 | 12.8 | 14.5 | 17.6 |
| At risk of poverty anchored at 2007 | . | - | . | 16.5 | 14.4 | 15.6 | 19.6 | 21.2 |
| Deprivation rate ${ }^{2}$ | 14.1 | 14.8 | 14.0 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 17.1 | 22.6 | 24.5 |
| Those at risk of poverty | 33.8 | 37.8 | 38.6 | 31.1 | 29.3 | 38.8 | 42.9 | 43.1 |
| Those NOT at risk of poverty | 9.4 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 11.2 | 13.5 | 19.1 | 21.0 |
| Consistent Poverty rate (60\% median income threshold) | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 6.9 |
| Consistent poverty rate ( $40 \%$ median income threshold) | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.7 |
| Consistent poverty rate (50\% median income threshold) | 4.0 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.3 |
| Consistent poverty rate (70\% median income threshold) | 9.3 | 9.8 | 8.5 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 10.7 |

[^4]Table 5 The number of deprivation items experienced by year

| Number of deprivation items experienced ${ }^{1}$ | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of individuals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 (No deprivation) | 75.8 | 75.4 | 75.0 | 75.6 | 75.1 | 71.4 | 63.9 | 59.8 |
| 1 | 10.1 | 8.8 | 11.0 | 12.6 | 11.1 | 11.5 | 13.5 | 15.7 |
| 2 | 4.6 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 9.2 |
| 3+ | 9.5 | 9.7 | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 14.1 | 15.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 2+ | 14.1 | 14.8 | 14.0 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 17.1 | 22.6 | 24.5 |

$\%$ of individuals at risk of poverty

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 (No deprivation) | 52.5 | 47.9 | 44.1 | 49.7 | 53.5 | 43.4 | 38.1 | 37.3 |
| 1 | 13.7 | 14.3 | 17.3 | 19.2 | 17.2 | 17.8 | 19.0 | 19.5 |
| 2 | 10.4 | 10.8 | 11.5 | 8.3 | 12.2 | 12.9 | 13.2 | 12.9 |
| $3+$ | 23.4 | 27.0 | 27.1 | 22.8 | 17.2 | 25.9 | 29.7 | 30.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2+$ | 33.8 | 37.8 | 38.6 | 31.1 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 2}$ |

\% of individuals NOT at risk of poverty

| 0 (No deprivation) | 81.4 | 81.6 | 81.3 | 80.8 | 78.8 | 76.1 | 68.3 | 64.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 9.8 | 11.3 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 12.6 | 15.0 |
| 2 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 7.7 | 8.4 |
| $3+$ | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 11.4 | 12.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 2+ | 9.4 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 11.2 | 13.5 | 19.1 | 21.0 |

[^5]
## Table 6 Percentage of the population experiencing each type of deprivation by poverty status and year

\% of individuals

| Deprivation Indicators | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

| 5.4 | 6.5 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 7.3 | 10.5 | 12.2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.2 | 10.3 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 11.1 | 14.9 | 19.3 | 21.1 |
| 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 6.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| 5.8 | 6.8 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 7.6 | 7.3 |
| 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 2.2 |
| 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 6.8 | 6.8 |
| 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 13.1 | 13.3 | 16.3 | 20.3 | 21.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.3 | 11.6 | 10.7 | 9.6 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 14.4 | 14.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.5 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 5.8 |

$\%$ of individuals at risk of poverty ${ }^{1}$

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

| 12.6 | 18.1 | 16.7 | 16.4 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 22.3 | 21.7 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25.2 | 28.3 | 25.5 | 20.1 | 21.6 | 29.6 | 36.7 | 35.8 |
| 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 11.4 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 6.7 | 5.2 |
| 11.2 | 11.0 | 13.6 | 10.9 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 11.7 | 9.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.7 | 9.2 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 7.9 | 5.8 |
| 14.2 | 16.1 | 17.2 | 15.2 | 12.2 | 11.0 | 16.1 | 16.3 |
| 6.7 | 7.5 | 4.3 | 8.7 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 5.9 | 4.6 |
| 7.9 | 11.5 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 8.3 | 15.8 | 11.9 |
| 27.8 | 30.5 | 33.0 | 29.5 | 26.0 | 36.6 | 32.7 | 34.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25.7 | 30.2 | 28.3 | 23.1 | 20.4 | 24.6 | 30.8 | 26.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.6 | 12.6 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 4.8 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 13.3 |

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

| 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 8.5 | 10.4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.5 | 6.2 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 9.4 | 12.5 | 16.3 | 18.3 |
| 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 6.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 2.2 |
| 3.8 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 6.1 | 5.6 |
| 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 5.2 | 5.8 |
| 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 12.9 | 18.1 | 19.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 11.5 | 12.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 4.4 |

[^6]Table 7 Profile of population at risk of poverty ${ }^{1}$, experiencing deprivation ${ }^{2}$ and in consistent poverty by demographic characteristics and year

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

[^7]Table A1 Sample size by demographic characteristics and year

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

[^8]
## Background Notes

Purpose of survey

SILC 2010 amendments

The primary focus of the Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) is the collection of information on the income and living conditions of different types of households in Ireland, in order to derive indicators on poverty, deprivation and social exclusion. It is a voluntary (for selected respondents) survey of private households. It is carried out under EU legislation (Council Regulation No 1177/2003) and commenced in Ireland in June 2003. This release presents results based on data collected in the period January 2011 to January 2012.

The results previously published for 2010 have been amended following extensive investigation of anomalies in the data. In 2010 changes had been made to the processing of the data which resulted in an incorrect treatment in some cases of tax, income and pension contributions. This became clear when unusual trends in certain categories between 2010 and 2011 were further analysed. This has now been corrected and changes in the main indicators are shown in table B1 below.

Table B1 SILC 2010 Results: original versus amended

|  | Original | Amended |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Income | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| Annual average household disposable income (per household) | $\mathbf{€}$ | $€$ |
| Annual average equivalised disposable income (per individual) | 43,333 | 43,151 |
| At risk of poverty threshold (60\% of median income) | 22,168 | 22,138 |
| Income inequality | 10,831 | 11,155 |
| Gini coefficient |  |  |
| Quintile share ratio | $33.9 \%$ | $31.6 \%$ |
| Poverty \& deprivation rates | 5.5 | 4.9 |
| At risk of poverty rate | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| Deprivation rate ${ }^{1}$ | 15.8 | 14.7 |
| Consistent poverty rate | 22.5 | 22.6 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation | 6.2 | 6.3 |

## Definitions of Income

## Gross income

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

## Direct Income:

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

## Other direct income:

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


## Social Transfers:

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

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

Other social transfers:

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

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

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

## Equivalised disposable household Income

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

## Indicators

## At risk of poverty rate

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

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

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

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

## Consistent poverty

## Relative at risk of

 poverty gap
## At risk of poverty rate before social transfers

## At risk of poverty rate anchored at a moment

in time

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

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

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

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

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

For a given year, the "at risk of poverty rate anchored at a moment in time" is the share of the population whose income in a given year is below an at risk of poverty threshold calculated in the standard way for a previous base year and then adjusted for inflation. The purpose of this indicator is to get some indication of the changes in 'absolute poverty' over time. In this release four separate base years were used. If the base year is 2004 for example then the at risk of poverty threshold for 2004 is adjusted in line with inflation for each year 2005-2010. The same method is followed for 2005, 2006 and 2007.

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

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

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


[^0]:    - Including all social transfers (60\% median income threshold)

    ■Including old-age and survivors' benefits only
    ■excluding all social transfers

[^1]:    ${ }^{7}$ Disposable household income is averaged over households while equivalised income is averaged over individuals within the household
    ${ }^{2}$ Sex, age group, Principal Economic Status and highest education level attained refers to that of the head of household for average annual household disposable income figures

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Household income is averaged over households while equivalised income is averaged over individuals within the household

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See background notes for more information.
    ${ }^{2}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ An individual is defined as being deprived if they experience two or more forms of enforced deprivation (deprivation rate)

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Including all social transfers, 60\% median income threshold.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Including all social transfers, $60 \%$ median income threshold.
    ${ }^{2}$ Experienced two or more types of enforced deprivation.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Sex, age group, Principal Economic Status and highest education level attained refers to that of the head of household for average annual household
    disposable income figures

