Assessment of non-response on the Survey on Adult Population Involvement in Learning Activities 2011 (AES 2011)

1 Introduction

The errors that affect the whole survey can be classified in two large groups: Sampling errors and non-sampling errors. The former can be estimated using statistical procedures, whilst the so-called non-sampling errors, which this document refers to, are hard the measure.

These errors appear in the different stages of the statistical process, and can occur before information is garnered (deficient framework, insufficient definitions or questionnaires, etc.), during the collection of information (incorrect fieldwork by the interviewers, incorrect statements or non-response by the respondents) and, lastly, in operations subsequent to the fieldwork (errors when encoding variables, recording questionnaires, etc.).

As stated previously, the evaluation of these errors presents many difficulties, among other reasons, due to the great variety of causes that may lead to them.

Among these causes, one of the most notable is the **non-response of the respondent units**, which may be caused by a refusal to answer the questionnaire, the absence of answers, the inability to answer of the whole household comprising the respondent unit, or the dwelling being inaccessible at the time of the interview.

The *Survey on Adult Population Involvement in Learning Activities 2011*, is addressed to persons 18 to 64 years old and living in family dwellings.

The incidences occurred during the survey has not been changed, in contrast with EADA-2007. The non-response has been interpreted as a loss of sample. In exchange, the sample of holder persons was boosted.

The analysis of the non-response in the survey has been carried out according to the characteristics, from the Register, of the persons that has not collaborate due to any of the abovementioned reasons.

2. Analysis of the data

Distributions by Autonomous Communities of the theoretical and effective sample (surveyed persons) have been presented in the **table 1**.

TABLA 1. Distribution of theoretical and effective sample by Autonomous Community

Autonomous Communities	Theoretical sample		Effective sample	
	Persons	%	Persons	%
Total	33,216	100.00	17,829	53.68
Andalucía	4,128	100.00	2,314	56.06
Aragón	1,264	100.00	727	57.52
Asturias, Principado de	1,152	100.00	660	57.29
Balears, Illes	1,584	100.00	526	33.21
Canarias	1,616	100.00	806	49.88
Cantabria	960	100.00	549	57.19
Castilla y León	1,712	100.00	938	54.79
Castilla-La Mancha	1,552	100.00	1,015	65.40
Cataluña	3,776	100.00	2,056	54.45
Comunitat Valenciana	2,784	100.00	1,367	49.10
Extremadura	1,136	100.00	752	66.20
Galicia	1,808	100.00	1,038	57.41
Madrid, Comunidad de	4,144	100.00	1,748	42.18
Murcia, Región de	1,312	100.00	806	61.43
Navarra, Comunidad Foral de	960	100.00	531	55.31
País Vasco	1,600	100.00	1,063	66.44
Rioja, La	848	100.00	533	62.85
Ceuta and Melilla	880(*)	100.00	400	45.45

(*)Due to problems beyond the sample process it was imposible to obtain the information in the selected sample of 896 persons.

It can be observed that, on a national level, the effective sample represents 53.7% of the theoretical sample. On an Autonomous Community level, it can be observed that the communities with the highest percentages in the effective sample are País Vasco and Extremadura, showing a 66.4% and 66.2%, respectively. On the other hand, it is worth noting Baleares, showing a 33.2% of the effective sample.

For the analysis of the incidences (**table 2**), apart from the inaccessible dwellings, these have been distributed in three different groups: framework incidences,

incidences of the household resident in the dwelling, and incidences of the selected person.

Two different variables have been considered in the framework incidences group: incidences that affect the dwelling located at the selected person's postal address and incidences that affect the person directly. Unsurveyable dwellings have been considered to be empty dwellings, those dedicated to other purposes, and unlocatable dwellings.

Not taking into account the inaccessible dwellings, it can be observed that out of the three groups of incidences, that with the greatest weight is framework incidences, representing 48% of the total. The second most important group corresponds to the group of household incidences, which accounts for 27% of the total, with the incidences of the selected person being the least quantitatively important, representing only 23%.

TABLE 2. Distribution of the incidences

Type of incidence	Nº	%
Total	33,216	
Surveyed	17,829	**53.68**
Total incidences	15,387	100.00
Inaccessible dwelling	183	1.19
Incidences of the frame	7,413	**48.18**
Non-surveyable dwelling	2,018	13.11
- Empty dwelling	1,317	8.56
- Unlocatable dwelling	568	3.69
- Dwelling dedicated to other purposes	133	0.86
Person out of the study field	54	0.35
Unlocatable person	5,276	34.29
Other incidences of persons	65	0.42
Incidences of the household	4,201	**27.30**
Refusal	958	6.23
Absence	3,227	20.97
Inability to respond	16	0.10
Incidences of the selected person	3,590	**23.33**
Refusal	1,946	12.65
Absence	1,467	9.53
Inability to respond	177	1.15

Considering events regardless of the group they belong to shows that the most relevant corresponds to unlocatable persons, representing 34.3 percent of the total number of events. The second and third most important places correspond to the absence from the household, and the refusal of the selected person, with percentages of 21% and 12.7%, respectively.

At this point, it is important to note, especially if comparing these events with those in other surveys, that the high number of untraceable persons is not only caused by framework defects. It is due, in part, not to the persons who have truly been unlocatable, but rather to the fact that they are registered in the parents' dwelling, but at the time of the survey, are outside of that domicile due to work, studies, etc. These persons are not registered at a different address, as they do not consider it a definitive location. These cases have been considered unlocatable at the postal address established for the selected person.

Table 2bis analyses the distribution of the non-response itself, that is, excluding framework incidences and the inaccessible dwellings. It can be observed that the household incidences have a greater weight than the incidences of the selected person, being the absence in the household the most important quantitatively, because it represents 41.4% of the non-response.

It can be also observed that the percentages of inabilities to answer are practically insignificant, as occurs in other surveys.

TABLE 2bis. Distribution of non-response

Type of incidence	Nº	%
Total	7,791	100.00
Incidences of the household	4,201	**53.92**
Refusal	958	12.30
Absence	3,227	41.42
Inability to respond	16	0.21
Incidences of the selected person	3,590	**46.08**
Refusal	1,946	24.98
Absence	1,467	18.83
Inability to respond	177	2.27

Table 3.1 enables assessing the defects of the framework, whereas Table 3.2 presents the non-response due to refusals, absences or inabilities to answer, either in the selected persons or in the households of which they are a part. Both tables present a breakdown by Autonomous Community.

The **framework incidences** on a national level (**Table 3.1**) represent almost 22.3% of the theoretical sample. On an Autonomous Community level, the percentages vary between almost 9.9% for País Vasco and 34.8% corresponding to Illes Balears.

TABLE 3.1 Distribution of the surveyed persons and of the incidences of frame by Autonomous Communities

Autonomous Communities	Persons							
	Total		Surveyed		With incidence			
					Total		Frame incidence	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	33,216	100.00	17,829	53.68	15,387	46.32	7,413	22.32
Andalucía	4,128	100.00	2,314	56.06	1,814	43.94	835	20.23
Aragón	1,264	100.00	727	57.52	537	42.48	258	20.41
Asturias (Principado de)	1,152	100.00	660	57.29	492	42.71	231	20.05
Balears (Illes)	1,584	100.00	526	33.21	1,058	66.79	551	34.79
Canarias	1,616	100.00	806	49.88	810	50.12	483	29.89
Cantabria	960	100.00	549	57.19	411	42.81	184	19.17
Castilla y León	1,712	100.00	938	54.79	774	45.21	426	24.88
Castilla-La Mancha	1,552	100.00	1,015	65.40	537	34.60	345	22.23
Cataluña	3,776	100.00	2,056	54.45	1,720	45.55	761	20.15
Comunidad Valenciana	2,784	100.00	1,367	49.10	1,417	50.90	720	25.86
Extremadura	1,136	100.00	752	66.20	384	33.80	182	16.02
Galicia	1,808	100.00	1,038	57.41	770	42.59	333	18.42
Madrid (Comunidad de)	4,144	100.00	1,748	42.18	2,396	57.82	1,063	25.65
Murcia (Región de)	1,312	100.00	806	61.43	506	38.57	296	22.56
Navarra (Comunidad Foral de)	960	100.00	531	55.31	429	44.69	183	19.06
País Vasco	1,600	100.00	1,063	66.44	537	33.56	158	9.88
Rioja (La)	848	100.00	533	62.85	315	37.15	150	17.69
Ceuta and Melilla	880	100.00	400	45.45	480	54.55	254	28.86

In **Table 3.2**, the percentages are calculated referring to the surveyable persons, that is, excluding the framework incidences and the inaccessible dwellings; Due to this the percentages of the **surveyable persons** are different (higher, because they are calculated according to a lower sum) to those appearing in Table 3.1. They can be considered as the **response rate** in the survey. On a national level, this percentage reached a value close to 70%, and by Autonomous Community, worth noting with the highest percentage was Castilla-La Mancha, with 84%, and on the other extreme, Illes Balears, with 51%.

Consistent with the above, and continuing with the analysis of Table 3.2, it may be observed that the highest percentage of **total non-response** corresponds to Illes Balears, with 49%, whereas Castilla-La Mancha is the community with the lowest percentage, 15.8%.

Breaking down non-response into its components, the highest percentage of **refusals in households** reaches 6.5 percent, corresponds in Castilla-La Mancha, and Navarra being the Community with the lowest percentage, 1.5 percent. Regarding those **refusals of the selected person**, Navarra is the community with the highest percentage (15.7%), whereas La Rioja has the lowest percentage (3%).

As per **absences**, the highest percentage was in those **of the household** corresponded to Illes Balears, which stood at almost 20%, whilst the lowest percentage corresponded to Castilla-La Mancha, with 4%. In the absences **of the selected person** it is observed that this behaviour is repeated, because the highest percentage corresponds to Illes Balears, with 13.1%, being the lowest again Castilla-La Mancha, 1.7%.

TABLE 3.2 Distribution of the surveyable persons by Autonomous Community

(Continue)

Autonomous Communities	Survayable persons							
	Total		Surveyed		Non-response			
					Refusals			
					of the household		of the selected person	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	25,620	100.00	17,829	69.59	958	3.74	1,946	7.60
Andalucía	3,226	100.00	2,314	71.73	130	4.03	285	8.83
Aragón	1,006	100.00	727	72.27	51	5.07	54	5.37
Asturias (Principado de)	916	100.00	660	72.05	33	3.60	71	7.75
Balears (Illes)	1,032	100.00	526	50.97	49	4.75	103	9.98
Canarias	1,127	100.00	806	71.52	28	2.48	95	8.43
Cantabria	774	100.00	549	70.93	22	2.84	41	5.30
Castilla y León	1,286	100.00	938	72.94	60	4.67	61	4.74
Castilla-La Mancha	1,206	100.00	1,015	84.16	78	6.47	43	3.57
Cataluña	3,008	100.00	2,056	68.35	133	4.42	197	6.55
Comunidad Valenciana	2,048	100.00	1,367	66.75	42	2.05	157	7.67
Extremadura	930	100.00	752	80.86	16	1.72	70	7.53
Galicia	1,474	100.00	1,038	70.42	31	2.10	81	5.50
Madrid (Comunidad de)	3,058	100.00	1,748	57.16	175	5.72	309	10.10
Murcia (Región de)	1,003	100.00	806	80.36	17	1.69	54	5.38
Navarra (Comunidad Foral de)	777	100.00	531	68.34	12	1.54	122	15.70
País Vasco	1,442	100.00	1,063	73.72	45	3.12	98	6.80
Rioja (La)	695	100.00	533	76.69	24	3.45	21	3.02
Ceuta and Melilla	612	100.00	400	65.36	12	1.96	84	13.73

(Conclusion)

Autonomous Communities	Surveyable persons									
	Non response									
	Absences				Inabilities to respond				Total	
	from the household		of the selec. Pers.		of the household		of the selec. Pers.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	3,227	12.60	1,467	5.73	16	0.06	177	0.69	7,791	30.41
Andalucía	306	9.49	167	5.18	3	0.09	21	0.65	912	28.27
Aragón	133	13.22	37	3.68	0	0.00	4	0.40	279	27.73
Asturias (Principado de)	108	11.79	40	4.37	1	0.00	3	0.33	256	27.95
Balears (Illes)	205	19.86	135	13.08	0	0.00	14	1.36	506	49.03
Canarias	124	11.00	52	4.61	1	0.09	21	1.86	321	28.48
Cantabria	127	16.41	32	4.13	0	0.00	3	0.39	225	29.07
Castilla y León	146	11.35	70	5.44	1	0.00	10	0.78	348	27.06
Castilla-La Mancha	48	3.98	21	1.74	0	0.00	1	0.08	191	15.84
Cataluña	454	15.09	147	4.89	3	0.10	18	0.60	952	31.65
Comunidad Valenciana	300	14.65	162	7.91	2	0.10	18	0.88	681	33.25
Extremadura	39	4.19	39	4.19	1	0.11	13	1.40	178	19.14
Galicia	228	15.47	88	5.97	0	0.00	8	0.54	436	29.58
Madrid (Comunidad de)	562	18.38	241	7.88	3	0.10	20	0.65	1,310	42.84
Murcia (Región de)	85	8.47	37	3.69	0	0.00	4	0.40	197	19.64
Navarra (Comunidad Foral de)	51	6.56	56	7.21	0	0.00	5	0.64	246	31.66
País Vasco	183	12.69	51	3.54	1	0.00	1	0.07	379	26.28
Rioja (La)	79	11.37	35	5.04	0	0.00	3	0.43	162	23.31
Ceuta and Melilla	49	8.01	57	9.31	0	0.00	10	1.63	212	34.64

The **inabilities to answer** carried so little weight in non-response that they deserve no mention at all.

As it has been already commented, the analysis of the non-response has been carried out according to the characteristics from the Register to the non-collaborating units. Given that this administrative register does not garner the relationship of persons with activity, it has not been possible to compile a table on the distribution of non-response according to this characteristic.

Table 4 analyses the distribution of non-response and of the persons surveyed in the theoretical survey, according to the sex and age of the selected person. The information in this table has been taken directly from the selected sample, granted that it was included in the same upon making the selection from the Register. This table and the following two (Tables 5 and 6) are considered as the theoretical sample to be the sum of surveyed persons and non-response, that is, they do not include the framework incidences or the inaccessible dwellings. The percentages in these three tables are calculated in comparison with the total of the theoretical sample thus considered.

Firstly, non-response represents 30.4% of the total of the theoretical sample. Analysing it separately for the two sexes, it may be observed that it is slightly higher in men than in women (31.2% as compared with 29.7%). Percentage of refusals is slightly higher for the total of women than that for the total of men (11.9% as compared with 10.8%) and, making a difference by age brackets, the highest are reached for both sexes in *56 to 64 years of age*, being a little higher for men. In the case of absences, the percentages are slightly higher for men than for women (two points and a half), reaching the highest value among men, 23%, in the modality from *26 to 35 years of age*, and among women in the same modality (19%). The inabilities to answer, with such a small minority, deserve no mention at all.

TABLE 4. Distribution of the non-response and of the surveyed persons in the theoretical sample, by sex and age of the selected person

Sex/age	Theoretical sample											
	Total		Surveyed persons		Non-response							
					Total		Refusals		Absences		Inabil. To resp.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	25,620	100.00	17,829	69.59	7,791	30.41	2,904	11.33	4,694	18.32	193	0.75
Men	12,843	100.00	8,843	68.85	4,000	31.15	1,380	10.75	2,514	19.57	106	0.83
From 18 to 25 years of age	1,662	100.00	1,188	71.48	474	28.52	155	9.33	308	18.53	11	0.66
From 26 to 35	3,024	100.00	1,996	66.01	1,028	33.99	308	10.19	703	23.25	17	0.56
From 36 to 45	3,316	100.00	2,263	68.24	1,053	31.76	365	11.01	661	19.93	27	0.81
From 46 to 55	2,881	100.00	2,013	69.87	868	30.13	326	11.32	521	18.08	21	0.73
From 56 to 64	1,960	100.00	1,383	70.56	577	29.44	226	11.53	321	16.38	30	1.53
Women	12,777	100.00	8,986	70.33	3,791	29.67	1,524	11.93	2,180	17.06	87	0.68
From 18 to 25 years of age	1,641	100.00	1,198	73.00	443	27.00	150	9.14	278	16.94	15	0.91
From 26 to 35	2,933	100.00	1,992	67.92	941	32.08	356	12.14	567	19.33	18	0.61
From 36 to 45	3,170	100.00	2,221	70.06	949	29.94	367	11.58	567	17.89	15	0.47
From 46 to 55	2,909	100.00	2,089	71.81	820	28.19	351	12.07	449	15.43	20	0.69
From 56 to 64	2,124	100.00	1,486	69.96	638	30.04	300	14.12	319	15.02	19	0.89

The analysis of non-response in the theoretical sample, according to the highest level of education achieved by the selected person, may be carried out from the data in **Table 5**. In this table, the persons have been classified into the four large groups of educational level used in the Register, as doing so on a greater breakdown level could put at risk the comparison of data from the Register with data from the survey, given the encoding system used in this administrative register, which in many cases does not allow for ascertaining the specific educational level that corresponds to each person, being a very general

classification. The distribution of the persons surveyed has been obtained from the information in the survey itself, as with Table 4.

TABLE 5. Distribution of non-response and of surveyed persons in the theoretical sample, by educational level of the selected person

Educational level	Theorical sample											
	Total		Surveyed persons		Non-response							
					Total		Refusals		Absences		Inabil. To resp.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	25,620	100.00	17,829	69.59	7,791	30.41	2,904	11.33	4,694	18.32	193	0.75
Non stated	351	100.00	222	-	129	36.75	40	11.40	85	24.22	4	-
Total qualified	25,269	100.00	17,607	69.68	7,662	30.32	2,864	11.33	4,609	18.24	189	0.75
Cannot read or write	546	100.00	391	71.61	155	28.39	52	9.52	90	16.48	13	2.38
Qualification lower to the scholarship degree	6,220	100.00	4,505	72.43	1,715	27.57	694	11.16	957	15.39	64	1.03
School degree of equivalent	9,159	100.00	6,431	70.22	2,728	29.78	1,068	11.66	1,601	17.48	59	0.64
Post-second. and 2nd Voc. Train degr. equiv. Or higher qualificat.	9,344	100.00	6,280	67.21	3,064	32.79	1,050	11.24	1,961	20.99	53	0.57

Total non-response accounts for 30.4% of the theoretical sample, the greatest weight within this corresponding to absences, with 18.3%. By educational level, non-response are mainly concentrated in the group of people with an educational level of *Post-secondary degree, 2nd degree Vocational Training or equivalent or higher qualifications* (32.8%), the case being similar for absences (21%) and one of the highest in refusals. Regarding the inabilities to answer, despite their scarce importance in total non-response, it can be observed that its highest percentage (2.4%) is reached in the modality *of Cannot read or write*.

The analysis of non-response considering the nationality of the selected person may be done from **Table 6**.

It can be observed that the percentage of non-response is the highest among those persons with foreign nationality, where it accounts for 37% of the theoretical sample, as compared with the 29.5% among those persons with Spanish nationality. However, the refusals reach their highest percentage (11.5%) in persons with Spanish nationality, as compared with 10.4% for persons with a foreign nationality. In turn, the percentage of absences is much greater in the group of persons with a foreign nationality (25.2% as compared with 17.4% in persons with Spanish nationality). Lastly, the inabilities to answer are concentrated in those persons with a foreign nationality, surely due to the fact that a good number of them do not know the Spanish language, which constitutes one of the causes of the inability to answer.

TABLE 6. Distribution of non-response and of surveyed persons in the theoretical sample by nationality of the selected person

Nationality	Theoretical sample											
	Total		Surveyed persons		Non-response							
					Total		Refusals		Absences		Inabil. To resp.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	25,620	100.00	17,829	69.59	7,791	30.41	2,904	11.33	4,694	18.32	193	0.75
Spanish	22,714	100.00	16,008	70.48	6,706	29.52	2,602	11.46	3,962	17.44	142	0.63
Foreign	2,906	100.00	1,821	62.66	1,085	37.34	302	10.39	732	25.19	51	1.75

3 Estimate of the correction coefficient for differential non-response due to nationality

The correction coefficient for differential non-response measures the different behaviour of the groups of sample elements in terms of non-response. Specifically, it is the quotient of the inverse of the probability of response in each of the groups. If it approaches one, both groups have similar behaviour. Values greater than one represent a greater non-response in the numerator group, and values less than one indicate a greater non-response in the denominator.

In order to perform the estimate, the theoretical sample of persons has been broken down to indicate persons surveyed (effective sample) and incidences. Within the latter, we have distinguished between framework incidences and incidences in persons, including in the latter both those of the selected person and those of the household of which s/he is a part.

The initial approach was to separate persons, both interviewed and affected by an incident, into two groups:

- Extra-community citizens, in other words, persons from outside the UE
- Non extra-community citizens, who were, in turn, divided into two subgroups:
  - Spaniards
  - Non-Spaniard community persons, henceforth referred to as "community citizens"

The previous breakdown has been prepared using the *country of nationality* stated in the Register.

Horizontal percentages (compared with the total number of persons in the theoretical sample with nationality, compared with the total for each type of incidence and compared with the effective sample) and **vertical percentages** (compared with the theoretical sample with nationality in each group of persons), have been calculated, both for extra-community and non-extra-community citizens.

The estimate of the differential non-response correction coefficient has been calculated considering the theoretical sample in four different manners:

- Including all data: theoretical sample = effective sample + all incidences
- Including refusals: theoretical sample = effective sample + refusals
- Including absences: theoretical sample = effective sample + absences

- Including refusals and absences: theoretical sample = effective sample + refusals + absences

Table 7 garners the results obtained, showing that, in the first place, extra-community citizens represent only 11.8% of the total number of persons in the theoretical sample. This percentage is even lower for community citizens, standing at 3%.

It is also worth noting that:

- The highest percentage **of the empty dwellings** (10%) is obtained in the dwellings where the selected person is a community citizen, whereas the lowest corresponds to those with Spanish nationality (3.5%). In the dwellings where the selected person is a extra-community citizen it reaches an intermediate value, 6%.
- In the **unlocatable dwellings** the percentage is much higher in those where the selected person is a community citizen, according to the Register (6.6%), than in the two other types, where it is lower than 2%.
- Worth noting is the difference in percentage existing in **unlocatable persons**, given that their percentage when they are extra-community or community citizens (30% and 29%, respectively) is more than double than when they are Spaniards (13.5%).
- Percentages of **absences from the household** are lot lower when the selected person is a community or an extra-community citizen (between 2 and 2.5 percent) than when it is Spaniard (11 percent).
- By contrast, **refusals from the household** present percentages lot higher when the selected person is a community or an extra-community citizen (above 10%) than in those households where the selected person is Spaniard (1.5%).
- Regarding to the **absences of the persons**, it can be observed that there are not great differences, although percentages are slightly higher when the selected person is a community or a Spanish citizen (around 4.5%) than when it is an extra-community citizen (3.9%).
- There are greater differences in the **refusals from persons**, being the percentage of those with Spanish nationality (6.2 percent) higher than that corresponding to the community and extra-community citizens, whose percentages are around 4 per cent.
- As a result of the large number of incidences recorded, the percentages of **persons surveyed** are quite low, especially in the case of community citizens, which reach a value of 28.5%. The highest percentage has been obtained among Spaniards, which only amount to 56.5%, while the percentage for extra-community citizens stands at 39.3%.
- In the ratios of refusals which have been calculated have been considered both types, and significant differences are observed; In the ratios of refusals plus absences have been also considered both types of incidences, and it can be observed that in this case differences are lot lower.

- Regarding the estimate of the **differential non-response correction coefficient** it is worth noting that it has been considered both types of refusals and absences. It is observed that when all of the incidences are considered, it strays the most from one, reaching a value of 1.41. This is due to the greater weight that the framework incidences carry in the group of extra-community citizens, fundamentally in the *unlocatable person* incidence.

Nevertheless, the inclusion of the calibration by nationality, national and foreign corrects this differential behaviour.

Persons	Total	Extra-community citizens			Non extra-community citizens Total		
			% hor.	% vert.		% hor.	% vert.
Theoretical sample (holders)	33,216	3,910	11.8		29,306	88.2	
-Incidences	15,387	2,373			13,014		
Inaccessible dwellings	183	28	15.3	0.7	155	84.7	0.5
In frame:- Empty dwellings	1,317	238	18.1	6.1	1,079	81.9	3.7
- Dwel. Dedicated to other purp.	133	19	14.3	0.5	114	85.7	0.4
- Unlocatable dwellings	568	74	13.0	1.9	494	87.0	1.7
- Persons out fo the study field	54	4	7.4	0.1	50	92.6	0.2
- Unlocatable persons	5,276	1,164	22.1	29.8	4,112	77.9	14.0
- Other persons' incidences	65	4	6.2	0.1	61	93.8	0.2
In households:							
-Refusals	958	409	42.7	10.5	549	57.3	1.9
-Absences	3,227	82	2.5	2.1	3,145	97.5	10.7
-Inabil. to resp.	16	4	25.0	0.1	12	75.0	0.0
In persons:							
-Refusals	1,946	167	8.6	4.3	1,779	91.4	6.1
-Absences	1,467	151	10.3	3.9	1,316	89.7	4.5
-Inabil. to resp.	177	29	16.4	0.7	148	83.6	0.5
-Surveyed (**effective sample**)	17,829	1,537	8.6	39.3	16,292	91.4	55.6

Persons	Non extra-community citizens Community citizens			Spaniards		
		% hor.	% vert.		% hor.	% vert.
Theoretical Sample (holders)	998	3.0		28,308	85.2	
-Incidences	714			12,300		
Inaccessibles dwellings	9	4.9	0.9	146	79.8	0.5
In frame:- Empty dwellings	100	7.6	10.0	979	74.3	3.5
- Dwel. Dedicated to other purp.	9	6.8	0.9	105	78.9	0.4
- Unlocatable dwellings	66	11.6	6.6	428	75.4	1.5
- Persons out of the study field	1	1.9	0.1	49	90.7	0.2
- Unlocatable persons	287	5.4	28.8	3,825	72.5	13.5
- Otras persons' incidences	0	0.0	0.0	61	93.8	0.2
In households:						
-Refusals	119	12.4	11.9	430	44.9	1.5
-Absences	25	0.8	2.5	3,120	96.7	11.0
-Inabil. to resp.	1	6.3	0.1	11	68.8	0.0
In persons:						
-Refusals	37	1.9	3.7	1,742	89.5	6.2
-Absences	43	2.9	4.3	1,273	86.8	4.5
-Inabil. to resp.	17	9.6	1.7	131	74.0	0.5
-Surveyed (**effective sample**)	284	1.6	28.5	16,008	89.8	56.5

		%
Refusal extra-com. Theoretical sample	576	27.3
Total extra-com.(effect+refusal sample)	2,113	
Refusal. Rest of the theoret. Sample	2,328	12.5
Total rest (effect.+refusal sample)	18,620	
Refusal+ absenc. Extra-com. Theoretical sam	809	34.5
Total extra-com.(effect.+ refus.+ absenc.)	2,346	
Refus. + absenc. Rest of theoretical sample	6,789	29.4
Total rest (effect.+ refus.+absenc.)	23,081	

RATE ESTIMATE (DIFFERENTIAL TENDENCY OF NON-RESPONSE)

	With everything	With refusals	With absences	With refus. and absenc.
Pxt(Extra-com citizens. Theoretial sample.)	3,910	2,113	1,770	2,346
Pxr(Extra-comm. citizens Effective sample.)	1,537	1,537	1,537	1,537
Pyt(Non-comm citizens Theoretical sample.)	29,306	18,620	20,753	23,081
Pyr(Non-comm. citizens. Effective sample)	16,292	16,292	16,292	16,292
Estimate Value (Pxt/Pxr)/(Pyt/Pyr)	1.41	1.20	0.90	1.08