

**The Importance of Housing Systems
In Safeguarding Social Cohesion in Europe**

**SOCOHO
HPSE-CT-2001-00060**

Final Report - Annex

Vienna, August 2004

7. Annex

Index of Tables	1
Tables	5
Discussion on the Concept of Social Cohesion	88
List of Project Deliverables	111

Index of Tables for Part ...

A) The three focal Points of the Crisis of Social Cohesion

Table 1	Extent of poverty.....	5
Table 2	Extent of social inequality.....	6
Table 3	Economic situation of immigrant households	7
Table 4	Change of household members.....	8
Table 5	Change in economic activity of reference persons.....	9
Table 6	Stability of current employment situation of reference persons	10
Table 7	Stability of income situation of individual households	11
Table 8	Change of income in the different types of household	12
Table 9	Change in household or employment	13
Table 10	Change in household or employment and stability of income.....	14
Table 11	Divorce rates and present marital status of reference persons.....	15
Table 12	Share of single parents	16
Table 13	Economic situation of single parents	17
Table 14	Share of young adults	18
Table 15	Type of activity of young adults (a, b)	19
Table 16	Change in age of starting working life	21
Table 17	Economic situation of young adults	22
Table 18	Shares of senior citizens and their households	23
Table 19	Economic situation of senior citizen households	24

B) Housing Problems

Table 1	Monthly rent of the poor	25
Table 2	Effects for the disposable income of the poor in rented accommodation	26
Table 3	Share of monthly rent of household income of the poor.....	27
Table 4	Share of poor households with outstanding loan or mortgage for accommodation.....	28
Table 5	Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all poor owners with outstanding loan	29
Table 6	Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all poor owners of dwellings.....	30
Table 7	Share of poor households unable to pay scheduled rent or mortgage payment during the past 12 months.....	31

Table 8	Share of poor households for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden	32
Table 9	Index of dwelling quality of the poor	33
Table 10	Occupancy density of the poor	34
Table 11	Share of poor households living in buildings in bad condition	35
Table 12	Share of poor households living in buildings with low quality of residential environment	36
Table 13	Share of poor households living in buildings with low quality of social environment.....	37
Table 14	Index of the total quality of the housing situation of the poor	38
Table 15	Share of poor households with low satisfaction with housing situation.....	39
Table 16	Risk of homelessness	40
Table 17	Over- and under-representation of the three income groups in the different housing sectors.....	41
Table 18	Over- and under-representation of the three income groups in dwellings with low quality of social environment.....	42
Table 19	Connection between job mobility and housing mobility	43
Table 20	Housing consequences of reduced income.....	44
Table 21	Monthly rent of single parents	45
Table 22	Share of monthly rent of household income of single parents	46
Table 23	Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all single parents who are owners of dwellings	47
Table 24	Share of single parents for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden.....	48
Table 25	Index of dwelling quality of single parents	49
Table 26	Occupancy density of single parents	50
Table 27	Index of the total quality of the housing situation of single parents	51
Table 28	Share of young adults who have not established an own household	52
Table 29	Monthly rent of young couples with child(ren)	53
Table 30	Share of monthly rent of household income of young couples with child(ren).....	54
Table 31	Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all young couples with child(ren) who are owners of dwellings.....	55
Table 32	Share of young couples with child(ren) for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden	56

Table 33	Index of dwelling quality of young couples with child(ren).....	57
Table 34	Occupancy density of young couples with child(ren).....	58
Table 35	Index of the total quality of the housing situation of young couples with child(ren)	59
Table 36	Monthly rent of senior citizen households.....	60
Table 37	Share of monthly rent of household income of senior citizens.....	61
Table 38	Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all senior citizen households who are owners of dwellings.....	62
Table 39	Share of senior citizen households for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden	63
Table 40	Index of dwelling quality of senior citizen households	64
Table 41	Occupancy density of senior citizen households	65
Table 42	Index of the total quality of the housing situation of the senior citizens	66
Table 43	Age-dependent under-occupancy.....	67
Table 44	Social isolation of senior citizen households	68

C) The Housing System

TABLES BASED ON ECHP-DATA

Table 1	Level of housing costs.....	69
Table 2	Cost differences between the individual sectors with rental dwellings.....	70
Table 3	Rent level in relation to level of monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage	71
Table 4	Rent level in relation to level of household income of vulnerable households	72
Table 5	Size and structure of the stock of affordable rented dwellings.....	73
Table 6	Number of affordable rented dwellings in relation to the number of vulnerable households	74
Table 7	Share of households with housing allowance.....	75
Table 8	Relevance of housing allowance for all households in rented dwellings	75
Table 9	Effects of the housing allowance for the rent burden of the poor.....	76
Table 10	Effects of the housing allowance for the poverty rate.....	77
Table 11	Shares of the most important housing sectors	78
Table 12	Relation of housing costs between tenancy agreements with longer and shorter terms until now	79
Table 13	Average length of occupancy in rented dwellings	80

TABLES BASED ON OTHER SOURCES

Table 14	Volume and structure of housing subsidies	81
Table 15	Rent regulation for private and social rented accommodation	82
Table 16	Income dependence of monthly housing costs in rental sector	83
Table 17	Initial payments in rental sector.....	84
Table 18	Frequency of fixed term tenancies	85
Table 19	Statutory protection from eviction in rental sector	86
Table 20	Conditions for Housing improvement.....	87

Part A - Table 1: Extent of poverty

COUNTRY	disposable income ¹⁾ 1997 median (in pps)	poverty threshold (60% of the median) (in pps)	number of households	number of poor households	rate of poor households ²⁾ (in %)	average disposable income of the poor ³⁾ (in pps)	difference between poverty threshold and average disp. income of poor (in pps)	poverty gap ⁴⁾ (in %)
DEN	13.442	8.065	2.423.208	385.741	15,9	6.224	1.842	22,8
NL	13.673	8.204	6.655.891	829.661	12,5	5.852	2.351	28,7
BEL	13.896	8.338	4.178.680	648.795	15,5	6.090	2.247	27,0
FR	12.700	7.620	23.728.449	4.429.830	18,7	5.391	2.229	29,2
IRE	10.518	6.311	1.237.362	274.095	22,2	5.114	1.196	19,0
IT	9.756	5.854	21.458.828	4.006.717	18,7	3.972	1.882	32,1
GRE	7.569	4.541	3.833.124	863.251	22,5	2.934	1.608	35,4
SP	8.197	4.918	12.626.130	2.239.610	17,7	3.305	1.614	32,8
POR	6.850	4.110	3.287.000	752.361	22,9	2.761	1.350	32,8
AU	13.636	8.182	3.199.700	508.349	15,9	6.097	2.085	25,5
SW	10.962	6.577	4.540.607	751.591	16,6	4.692	1.885	28,7
GER	13.573	8.144	36.867.000	6.022.980	16,3	5.656	2.488	30,5
UK	13.228	7.937	24.285.000	6.121.422	25,2	5.401	2.536	32,0
EU	11.982	7.189	148.320.979	27.834.403	18,8	4.964	2.225	31,0

1) our disposable income is the income **without** housing allowance, standardised (PPP) and equivalised, modified oecd scale)

2) our rate of poor households is the proportion of poor **households** among the total number of **households** (and not the proportion of poor people)
rate of poor households for EU: Proportion of all households, that are poor in their country, among all European households

3) it is again the annual disposable, standardised and equivalised income without housing allowance

4) when calculating this indicator, it is the percentage of the difference between the poverty threshold and the average disposable income of the poor against the poverty threshold

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 2: Extent of social inequality

COUNTRY	share ratio S80/S20 ¹⁾	share of the top 20% ²⁾	share of the bottom 20% ³⁾
DEN	3,8	34,7	9,2
NL	4,4	38,5	8,7
BEL	5,8	44,2	7,7
FR	4,8	37,6	7,8
IRE	5,4	41,6	7,7
IT	5,3	38,4	7,3
GRE	7,2	42,5	5,9
SP	6,0	41,5	7,0
POR	7,7	45,8	5,9
AU	4,1	35,7	8,8
SW	3,9	34,4	8,7
GER	4,7	37,9	8,1
UK	6,6	41,7	6,3
EU	5,2	39,1	7,5

1) the %-share of entire income (of all households) received by the top 20% to that of the bottom 20%

2) the %-share of entire income (of all households) received by the top 20%

3) the %-share of entire income (of all households) received by the bottom 20%

figures for the EU are the means of the figures for the single countries

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 3: Ethnic composition and economic situation of immigrant households

COUNTRY	number of households	% -share of immigrant households ¹⁾	% -share of households that are immigrant and bottom 20% ²⁾	immigrant households, which are poor	
				% among the poor households	% among the immigrant households
DEN	2.371.226	2,9	0,5	2,3	13,2
NL					
BEL	4.034.614	3,6	1,2	6,7	30,2
FR	23.645.275	6,5	2,5	13,1	37,7
IRE	1.228.638	0,7	0,0	0,1	2,6
IT	19.742.636	0,9	0,1	0,5	12,1
GRE					
SP	12.553.752	0,6	0,2	1,1	29,8
POR	3.272.650	2,2	0,5	2,1	21,5
AU	3.199.699	6,5	1,9	9,7	23,9
SW					
GER					
UK	22.919.207	0,3	0,1	0,2	21,1
EU	92.967.697	2,5	0,9	3,9	32,1

1) reference person born abroad and last foreign residence outside EU

2) reference person abroad and last foreign residence outside EU and income of household bottom 20%

The Netherlands, Greece, Sweden and Germany are confidential or not applicable or not asked

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 4: Change of household members

COUNTRY	households without change of persons	households with ...			together
		change of persons by birth ¹⁾	change of persons by moving in/out	change of persons by birth and moving in/out	
DEN	86,4	3,8	9,3	0,5	100,0
NL	85,4	2,3	12,1	0,2	100,0
BEL	91,8	2,3	5,8	0,1	100,0
FR	89,2	2,9	7,8	0,2	100,0
IRE	86,9	3,5	9,3	0,3	100,0
IT	91,2	2,5	6,0	0,3	100,0
GRE	91,8	2,1	5,9	0,2	100,0
SP	91,1	1,9	6,8	0,2	100,0
POR	90,2	2,3	7,2	0,3	100,0
AU	90,1	2,3	7,4	0,2	100,0
SW					
GER	90,8	1,9	7,2	0,1	100,0
UK	87,0	2,2	10,6	0,3	100,0
EU	89,6	2,3	7,9	0,2	100,0

all figures in %

1) without number of members died (not available for The Netherlands and France)

Sweden not applicable

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 5: Change in economic activity of reference persons

COUNTRY	actual normally working ¹⁾			actual inactive ³⁾		sum
	without employment change ²⁾	with employment change ²⁾	change ²⁾ from economic inactivity ³⁾ to job	with change ²⁾ from job to economic inactivity	without change ²⁾ from job to economic inactivity	
DEN	52,0	11,2	2,3	8,3	26,1	100,0
NL	61,9	10,0	1,8	3,4	23,0	100,0
BEL	54,7	4,7	1,5	3,5	35,5	100,0
FR	66,1	1,6	1,2	0,2	30,9	100,0
IRE	55,8	6,9	3,6	6,7	27,0	100,0
IT	57,4	3,8	1,2	5,9	31,7	100,0
GRE	58,6	9,2	2,1	6,7	23,5	100,0
SP	57,6	6,3	6,3	8,3	21,5	100,0
POR	67,3	4,9	2,2	6,4	19,1	100,0
AU	56,8	5,3	2,3	7,1	28,5	100,0
SW						
GER	50,1	6,0	2,6	9,6	31,7	100,0
UK	44,6	12,6	0,0	6,2	36,6	100,0
EU	54,6	6,6	2,0	6,3	30,4	100,0

all figures in %

1) reference person normally working (15+ hours / week)

2) change since 1997

3) inactivity: less than 15 hours / week, unemployed, discouraged, inactive, (old age) pensioner

Sweden not applicable

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 6: Stability of current employment situation of reference persons

COUNTRY	number of households	employment situation of reference person ¹⁾				together
		permanent employment	fixed-term or short-term contract	casual work with no contract	some other working arrangement	
DEN	1.187.068	89,5	4,8	4,6	1,0	100,0
NL	3.704.121	90,5	2,8	0,4	6,3	100,0
BEL	1.626.588	91,4	6,0	0,5	2,1	100,0
FR	11.391.035	92,5	7,5	0,0	0,0	100,0
IRE	468.324	90,6	3,1	4,3	2,0	100,0
IT	6.446.289	90,7	5,4	2,8	1,1	100,0
GRE	1.247.893	80,1	6,8	13,0	0,1	100,0
SP	5.980.586	73,0	21,5	2,5	3,0	100,0
POR	1.395.677	88,6	5,1	2,4	3,9	100,0
AU	1.457.598	93,3	4,6	0,5	1,6	100,0
SW	2.173.845	92,5	5,7	1,6	0,2	100,0
GER	16.520.095	92,5	6,8	0,6	0,0	100,0
UK	9.629.213	94,6	3,5	1,9	0,0	100,0
EU	63.228.332	90,3	7,2	1,5	1,0	100,0

figures in %

1) only households with the reference person working in paid employment (15+ hours / week)

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 7: Stability of income situation of individual households

COUNTRY	number of households	income situation compared to last year			together
		improved	remained the same	deteriorated	
DEN	2.421.773	24,4	57,7	18,0	100,0
NL	6.651.057	35,1	48,7	16,2	100,0
BEL	4.163.646	21,7	61,1	17,1	100,0
FR	23.724.263	16,2	55,8	27,9	100,0
IRE	1.231.101	33,7	48,6	17,7	100,0
IT	21.458.828	9,4	61,8	28,8	100,0
GRE	3.833.125	10,7	61,3	28,0	100,0
SP	12.571.452	14,4	66,2	19,4	100,0
POR	3.285.714	12,7	63,8	23,4	100,0
AU	3.193.347	14,0	64,2	21,7	100,0
SW	4.438.408	22,0	49,3	28,7	100,0
GER					
UK	22.723.521	25,3	65,6	9,0	100,0
EU	109.696.235	18,2	60,4	21,5	100,0

figures in %

No information available for Germany

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 8: Change of income in the different types of household

The Netherlands	income of the household compared to last year				relation impr./deter.
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Type of household					
Single adult without child; <65	42,2%	39,3%	18,4%	99,9%	2,3
Single adult without child; >64	15,7%	69,6%	14,6%	99,9%	1,1
2 adults without child; <65	42,7%	44,3%	13,0%	100,0%	3,3
2 adults without child; >64	16,7%	68,8%	14,6%	100,1%	1,1
Single parents	26,8%	42,2%	31,0%	100,0%	0,9
2 adults with child	42,2%	40,4%	17,4%	100,0%	2,4

France	income of the household compared to last year				relation impr./deter.
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Type of household					
Single adult without child; <65	22,0%	50,6%	27,4%	100,0%	0,8
Single adult without child; >64	2,1%	67,6%	30,3%	100,0%	0,1
2 adults without child; <65	24,1%	52,1%	23,8%	100,0%	1,0
2 adults without child; >64	3,7%	58,8%	37,5%	100,0%	0,1
Single parents	17,8%	44,6%	37,6%	100,0%	0,5
2 adults with child	21,6%	56,2%	22,2%	100,0%	1,0

Spain	income of the household compared to last year				relation impr./deter.
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Type of household					
Single adult without child; <65	17,1%	61,3%	21,6%	100,0%	0,8
Single adult without child; >64	1,8%	79,3%	18,9%	100,0%	0,1
2 adults without child; <65	23,3%	58,5%	18,2%	100,0%	1,3
2 adults without child; >64	5,6%	76,7%	17,7%	100,0%	0,3
Single parents	18,8%	50,0%	31,2%	100,0%	0,6
2 adults with child	18,0%	61,7%	20,3%	100,0%	0,9

Austria	income of the household compared to last year				relation impr./deter.
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Type of household					
Single adult without child; <65	17,9%	62,4%	19,7%	100,0%	0,9
Single adult without child; >64	7,3%	74,8%	17,9%	100,0%	0,4
2 adults without child; <65	15,3%	65,7%	19,0%	100,0%	0,8
2 adults without child; >64	6,4%	74,3%	19,3%	100,0%	0,3
Single parents	16,5%	56,6%	26,9%	100,0%	0,6
2 adults with child	19,1%	55,9%	25,0%	100,0%	0,8

United Kingdom	income of the household compared to last year				relation impr./deter.
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Type of household					
Single adult without child; <65	39,0%	52,5%	8,5%	100,0%	4,6
Single adult without child; >64	4,1%	86,7%	9,2%	100,0%	0,4
2 adults without child; <65	33,4%	58,3%	8,3%	100,0%	4,0
2 adults without child; >64	5,7%	82,5%	11,8%	100,0%	0,5
Single parents	29,8%	64,5%	5,7%	100,0%	5,2
2 adults with child	36,9%	54,6%	8,5%	100,0%	4,3

EU	income of the household compared to last year				relation impr./deter.
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Type of household					
Single adult without child; <65	26,5%	52,8%	20,7%	100,0%	1,3
Single adult without child; >64	4,5%	74,0%	21,5%	100,0%	0,2
2 adults without child; <65	26,2%	55,8%	18,0%	100,0%	1,5
2 adults without child; >64	5,7%	69,5%	24,8%	100,0%	0,2
Single parents	22,5%	55,0%	22,5%	100,0%	1,0
2 adults with child	22,8%	57,7%	19,5%	100,0%	1,2

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 9: Change in household or employment

COUNTRY	number of households	change of household members and/or employment change ¹⁾ of reference person in household				together
		no kind of change	employment change	only change of members	both kinds of change	
DEN	1.929.128	69,0	16,8	9,4	4,8	100,0
NL	4.882.817	73,2	12,3	11,7	2,8	100,0
BEL	2.565.886	82,3	7,9	8,7	1,1	100,0
FR	15.122.154	87,5	1,8	10,0	0,7	100,0
IRE	933.669	72,8	14,1	11,2	1,9	100,0
IT	12.538.100	81,7	9,3	7,7	1,2	100,0
GRE	2.671.464	75,7	16,2	6,6	1,4	100,0
SP	9.597.799	73,5	17,1	6,9	2,4	100,0
POR	2.410.204	79,1	10,7	7,9	2,3	100,0
AU	2.250.997	78,3	12,1	7,6	1,9	100,0
SW						
GER	28.482.541	74,4	15,4	7,7	2,5	100,0
UK	18.142.880	71,6	14,6	10,0	3,7	100,0
EU	101.527.639	76,9	12,2	8,7	2,3	100,0

figures in %

¹⁾ Change from job to job or from job to inactivity or from inactivity to job.

Sweden not applicable

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 10: Change in household or employment and stability of income

The Netherlands	income of the household compared to last year				relation impr./deter.
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Kind of change					
No kind of change	35,2%	51,3%	13,5%	100,0%	2,6
Only employment change	53,0%	25,9%	21,1%	100,0%	2,5
Only change of household members	32,9%	45,4%	21,7%	100,0%	1,5
Both kinds of change	47,6%	30,4%	22,0%	100,0%	2,2

France	income of the household compared to last year				improved/ deteriorated
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Kind of change					
No kind of change	14,9%	58,9%	26,2%	100,0%	0,6
Only employment change	41,5%	33,0%	25,5%	100,0%	1,6
Only change of household members	19,8%	51,1%	29,1%	100,0%	0,7
Both kinds of change	34,2%	29,1%	36,7%	100,0%	0,9

Spain	income of the household compared to last year				improved/ deteriorated
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Kind of change					
No kind of change	13,3%	69,3%	17,4%	100,0%	0,8
Only employment change	20,1%	51,9%	28,0%	100,0%	0,7
Only change of household members	17,2%	61,4%	21,4%	100,0%	0,8
Both kinds of change	10,2%	50,4%	39,4%	100,0%	0,3

Austria	income of the household compared to last year				improved/ deteriorated
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Kind of change					
No kind of change	13,7%	68,0%	18,3%	100,0%	0,7
Only employment change	14,0%	45,4%	40,6%	100,0%	0,3
Only change of household members	20,4%	48,7%	30,8%	99,9%	0,7
Both kinds of change	28,8%	31,1%	40,1%	100,0%	0,7

United Kingdom	income of the household compared to last year				improved/ deteriorated
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Kind of change					
No kind of change	21,0%	68,8%	10,2%	100,0%	2,1
Only employment change	40,5%	54,6%	4,9%	100,0%	8,3
Only change of household members	32,1%	57,7%	10,2%	100,0%	3,1
Both kinds of change	53,9%	39,6%	6,5%	100,0%	8,3

EU	income of the household compared to last year				improved/ deteriorated
	improved	the same	deteriorated	together	
Kind of change					
No kind of change	16,8%	63,8%	19,4%	100,0%	0,9
Only employment change	29,9%	48,5%	21,6%	100,0%	1,4
Only change of household members	23,2%	54,3%	22,6%	100,1%	1,0
Both kinds of change	36,9%	40,7%	22,4%	100,0%	1,6

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 11: Divorce rates and present marital status of reference persons

COUNTRY	development of divorce rates ²⁾		present marital status of reference person of household (figures in %) ³⁾						
	divorces per 1.000 people		number of households	married	separated ¹⁾	divorced	widowed	never married	together
	1989	1998							
DEN	3,0	2,5	2.370.258	49,8	1,7	9,3	12,8	26,4	100,0
NL	1,9	2,1	6.477.268	52,5	-	10,0	11,5	25,9	100,0
BEL	2,0	2,6	4.034.615	54,7	2,8	9,8	16,1	16,6	100,0
FR	1,9	2,0	23.645.274	54,2	0,1	8,2	13,6	23,9	100,0
IRE			1.228.639	56,4	5,2	0,7	15,4	22,2	100,0
IT	0,5	0,6	19.740.650	66,5	2,6	1,9	19,2	9,8	100,0
GRE	0,6	0,8	3.821.525	68,6	0,6	3,1	16,4	11,3	100,0
SP	0,6	0,9	12.553.752	66,9	2,1	1,3	10,2	19,5	100,0
POR	1,0	1,5	3.271.119	71,6	1,9	3,2	15,9	7,3	100,0
AU	2,0	2,2	3.174.258	53,5	1,1	9,9	16,1	19,4	100,0
SW	2,2	2,3	4.459.729	37,6	0,8	14,6	10,1	36,9	100,0
GER	2,2	2,3	36.678.853	52,5	2,6	10,2	14,3	20,4	100,0
UK	2,9	2,7	22.913.234	49,3	2,9	11,4	17,0	19,5	100,0
EU	1,7	1,8	144.369.174	55,9	1,9	7,8	14,8	19,5	100,0

1) for The Netherlands the category "separated" does not exist and is included under married

2) source: Eurostat yearbook 2001, page 8

GER: includes in both years data on the former GDR

IRE: divorce was not allowed before 1996

3) source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 12: Share of single parents

COUNTRY	single parents with one or more dependent child		
	number of households	% among all households	% among households with dependent children
DEN	44.959	1,9	7,2
NL	123.267	1,9	7,0
BEL	121.516	3,0	9,6
FR	693.352	2,9	8,7
IRE	50.040	4,0	9,2
IT	434.233	2,0	5,4
GRE	63.477	1,7	4,5
SP	157.379	1,2	2,8
POR	74.927	2,3	5,0
AU	105.830	3,3	9,8
SW	293.458	6,5	21,9
GER	1.045.503	2,9	11,2
UK	1.255.989	5,2	17,5
EU	4.463.930	3,0	9,3

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 13: Economic situation of single parents

COUNTRY	% of AEI ¹⁾ of single parents with 1+ dept. child of AEI ¹⁾ of all households	single parents ²⁾ who are poor		Poverty Risk Index of single parents ³⁾
		% among poor households	% among single parent households ²⁾	
DEN	85,3	2,1	17,8	112
NL	76,9	6,5	43,9	352
BEL	65,1	4,6	24,7	159
FR	68,8	5,4	34,4	184
IRE	54,1	9,7	53,3	241
IT	84,0	2,0	18,1	97
GRE	108,9	0,9	12,6	56
SP	96,1	2,8	39,4	222
POR	85,7	3,5	35,3	154
AU	72,3	7,1	34,1	214
SW	72,3	11,2	28,8	174
GER	56,2	9,0	52,1	319
UK	63,7	9,4	45,9	182
EU	69,0	6,4	39,7	212

1) AEI: average equivalised income

2) single parents with 1 or more dependent child

3) The poverty risk index of a special sub-population is the poverty risk of that group divided by the overall poverty risk (multiplied by 100)

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 14: Share of young adults

COUNTRY	number of persons ¹⁾	% of persons between		number of households	% of households with reference person between		Relation between the shares of reference persons and persons ²⁾	
		16 and 25	26 and 35		16 and 25	26 and 35	16 and 25	26 and 35
DEN	4.292.242	13,1	18,8	2.371.225	6,6	19,4	0,5	1,0
NL	12.370.713	13,3	21,0	6.477.267	5,4	21,2	0,4	1,0
BEL	8.138.037	13,2	19,8	4.034.615	1,5	18,0	0,1	0,9
FR	46.194.899	13,3	19,2	23.645.275	4,2	18,3	0,3	1,0
IRE	2.829.800	20,5	19,7	1.228.639	3,3	17,1	0,2	0,9
IT	47.841.684	15,2	19,1	19.742.636	0,7	11,9	0,0	0,6
GRE	8.569.507	15,0	18,0	3.821.526	2,6	13,5	0,2	0,8
SP	32.497.196	19,1	20,0	12.553.752	2,7	20,7	0,1	1,0
POR	8.071.499	19,0	19,4	3.272.650	2,6	15,9	0,1	0,8
AU	6.457.297	15,0	21,8	3.199.700	5,0	20,9	0,3	1,0
SW	6.843.930	15,6	18,2	4.540.607	9,8	19,3	0,6	1,1
GER	68.063.999	11,3	18,4	36.678.854	2,9	17,9	0,3	1,0
UK	45.064.000	13,8	17,5	22.919.206	4,5	15,9	0,3	0,9
EU	297.234.803	14,2	18,9	144.485.952	3,5	17,2	0,2	0,9

1) population above 16

2) In the two last columns, for each of the two age groups of young adults (16-25 and 26-35 years), the respective share of household reference persons (from the respective age groups) among the total of all household reference persons is set against the respective share of persons (from the respective age group) among the sum of all persons. The higher the respective level, the stronger is the tendency towards establishing households.

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 15: Type of activity of young adults

a) Young adults between 16 and 25 years

COUNTRY	number of people ¹⁾	working with an employer in paid employment 15+ hours / week	working less than 15 hours / week	self-employment or unpaid work in a family enterprise 15+ hours / week	unemployed, retired, doing housework or other economic inactivity	working with an employer in paid apprenticeship or in training under special schemes 15+ hours / week	in education or training	in community or military service	together
DEN	561.950	38,6	0,3	0,1	8,5	12,0	39,9	0,6	100,0
NL	1.631.433	42,2	-	0,5	5,8	4,4	47,0	-	100,0
BEL	1.069.927	24,5	0,0	1,4	6,9	3,5	63,6	-	100,0
FR	6.151.938	25,7	2,8	0,5	18,7	2,6	47,9	1,9	100,0
IRE	578.862	46,1	0,2	1,2	13,0	4,3	35,2	-	100,0
IT	7.278.383	20,8	0,2	3,4	26,7	2,6	44,5	1,6	100,0
GRE	1.288.226	24,8	0,4	8,3	24,7	0,8	35,6	5,4	100,0
SP	6.211.677	22,0	1,0	2,9	19,8	2,8	50,2	1,3	100,0
POR	1.530.511	47,3	0,1	4,0	9,2	0,7	38,0	0,8	100,0
AU	970.798	43,9	0,0	1,6	7,7	13,7	30,5	2,5	100,0
SW	1.066.664	30,8	5,7	1,6	13,7	-	47,2	1,1	100,0
GER	7.668.223	25,7	1,1	0,5	8,8	21,0	39,1	3,8	100,0
UK	6.230.284	61,3	0,9	2,0	21,1	0,3	14,3	-	100,0
EU	42.238.876	31,9	1,1	2,0	17,2	5,9	40,0	1,7	100,0

figures in %

1) population above 16

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 15: Type of activity of young adults

b) Young adults between 26 and 35 years

COUNTRY	number of people ¹⁾	working with an employer in paid employment 15+ hours / week	working less than 15 hours / week	self-employment or unpaid work in a family enterprise 15+ hours / week	unemployed, retired, doing housework or other economic inactivity	working with an employer in paid apprenticeship or in training under special schemes 15+ hours / week	in education or training	in community or military service	together
DEN	806.765	76,0	0,1	4,3	9,5	1,7	8,4	-	100,0
NL	2.568.492	75,1	0,3	4,1	16,5	1,4	2,5	-	100,0
BEL	1.611.549	69,7	0,7	10,5	16,5	0,7	1,9	-	100,0
FR	8.847.305	69,7	4,3	4,1	19,1	0,6	2,2	-	100,0
IRE	558.703	60,4	0,1	8,0	27,7	2,8	1,1	-	100,0
IT	9.134.959	48,6	0,5	13,2	30,7	1,4	5,5	0,1	100,0
GRE	1.541.909	48,2	0,2	23,4	26,8	0,3	0,7	0,4	100,0
SP	6.497.655	50,3	1,3	10,6	31,9	1,0	4,7	0,2	100,0
POR	1.564.706	66,9	0,3	14,4	16,5	0,4	1,6	-	100,0
AU	1.406.958	69,9	0,6	9,3	15,7	0,6	3,8	0,1	100,0
SW	1.244.829	71,3	1,3	6,2	14,1	-	7,0	-	100,0
GER	12.413.009	68,0	1,1	4,2	18,7	1,7	6,2	0,1	100,0
UK	7.908.288	68,6	2,1	6,8	21,1	-	1,4	-	100,0
EU	56.105.127	63,1	1,5	8,0	22,4	1,0	4,0	0,1	100,0

figures in %

1) population above 16

2) total amount 100 percent

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 16: Change in age of starting working life

COUNTRY	number of people ¹⁾	Age of starting working life for people older than 40 ²⁾					average age of starting working life
		started between 14 and 19	started between 20 and 24	started between 25 and 29	started after 29	has never worked	
DEN	2.410.147	81,4	10,1	5,5	1,6	1,3	17,9
NL	6.767.644	36,8	10,6	2,5	6,3	43,9	19,7
BEL	4.330.692	55,4	23,9	5,5	2,9	12,3	19,2
FR	21.441.071	67,8	14,9	3,7	1,9	11,7	18,2
IRE	1.346.452	81,0	9,2	0,8	1,3	7,7	17,4
IT	24.186.060	43,4	17,2	9,4	9,8	20,2	20,8
GRE	4.662.268	37,7	22,5	12,8	9,7	17,3	21,5
SP	12.543.156	59,5	11,1	5,1	5,9	18,5	19,0
POR	2.581.341	58,5	13,9	6,6	10,4	10,6	19,9
AU	3.149.486	84,7	8,7	3,3	2,6	0,7	17,7
SW							
GER	41.328.201	83,8	7,5	4,2	2,8	1,8	17,8
UK	24.933.838	82,9	9,5	1,6	3,5	2,5	17,8
EU	149.680.356	67,9	12,0	4,9	4,6	10,6	18,6

COUNTRY	number of people ¹⁾	Age of starting working life for people between 30 and 40 ²⁾					average age of starting working life	ascent of average age of starting working life
		started between 14 and 19	started between 20 and 24	started between 25 and 29	started after 29	has never worked		
DEN	884.860	66,9	24,6	6,3	1,1	1,1	18,7	104
NL	2.690.355	47,4	26,3	8,5	9,6	8,1	20,7	105
BEL	1.805.897	38,4	48,5	8,7	1,8	2,6	20,5	107
FR	7.752.083	49,2	28,3	5,5	0,5	16,6	19,1	105
IRE	610.885	80,4	13,5	1,7	0,9	3,5	17,6	101
IT	9.151.217	40,3	25,1	12,9	7,4	14,4	21,0	101
GRE	1.578.695	31,4	33,1	19,9	7,7	7,8	22,0	103
SP	6.304.946	56,2	22,3	12,3	3,0	6,1	19,7	103
POR	1.380.217	59,9	23,3	7,1	3,5	6,2	19,2	97
AU	1.405.899	78,5	14,5	5,2	1,2	0,6	18,0	102
SW								
GER	13.870.674	75,7	16,6	6,1	1,3	0,3	18,3	103
UK	8.551.474	69,2	18,6	7,8	3,2	1,1	18,9	106
EU	55.987.202	58,8	22,7	8,6	3,3	6,5	19,4	104

1) population above 16

2) total amount 100 percent

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 17: Economic situation of young adults

COUNTRY	young households ¹⁾ between 16 and 25, which are poor		young households ¹⁾ between 26 and 35, which are poor		Poverty Risk Index of young adults ²⁾	
	% among poor households	% among young households between 16 and 25	% among poor households	% among young households between 26 and 35	16-25	26-35
DEN	15,6	38,3	10,3	8,6	240	54
NL	25,3	60,1	20,2	12,2	482	98
BEL	2,1	22,5	10,4	9,3	145	60
FR	13,1	58,0	14,5	14,9	311	80
IRE	5,9	39,9	13,8	18,0	180	81
IT	1,0	28,1	9,5	16,1	150	86
GRE	2,3	19,7	6,2	10,4	87	46
SP	5,7	37,0	19,0	16,4	208	92
POR	2,2	19,1	7,4	10,7	84	47
AU	8,5	27,1	17,0	12,9	171	81
SW	25,7	43,2	18,1	15,5	261	94
GER	7,4	42,0	16,6	15,2	257	93
UK	7,5	44,4	9,4	15,9	176	63
EU	8,0	44,6	13,2	14,8	238	79

1) "young households ..." means "young households with reference person ..."

2) The poverty risk index of a special sub-population is the poverty risk of that group divided by the overall poverty risk (multiplied by 100)

Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 18: Shares of senior citizens and their households

COUNTRY	development of senior citizen proportions ¹⁾ people aged 65 or more as % of total population			% of households with reference person aged 65 or more ²⁾	% of households with reference person between 65 and 74	% of households with reference person aged 75 or more
	1960	1999	1960=100			
DEN	10,6	14,9	141	24,3	48,4	51,6
NL	9,0	13,4	149	22,1	55,4	44,6
BEL	12,0	16,5	138	29,7	53,3	46,7
FR	11,6	15,8	136	27,3	52,7	47,3
IRE	10,9	11,3	104	25,3	52,7	47,3
IT	9,0	17,4	193	33,9	56,0	44,0
GRE	8,1	15,8	195	28,4	61,8	38,2
SP	8,2	16,6	202	22,3	56,2	43,8
POR	-	15,2		26,9	61,7	38,3
AU	12,2	15,4	126	24,2	56,2	43,8
SW	11,8	17,8	151	23,3	53,0	47,0
GER	10,8	16,6	154	26,7	53,7	46,3
UK	11,7	15,7	134	31,3	48,3	51,7
EU	10,1	16,2	160	27,9	53,5	46,5

1) Source: OECD in figures 2001

1960: former West Germany only, Portugal not available

1999: Belgium, Portugal, Austria, United Kingdom figures for 1998, The Netherlands for 1997, Greece for 1996

2) Source: ECHP 1998

Part A - Table 19: Economic situation of senior citizen households

COUNTRY	% of AEI ¹⁾ of households with reference person betw. 65 and 74	% of AEI ¹⁾ of households with reference person aged 75 or more	% of AEI ¹⁾ of households with reference person aged 65 or more of AEI ¹⁾ of all households	old households between 65 and 74, which are poor		old households aged 75 or more, which are poor		old households aged 65 or more, which are poor		Poverty Risk Index of senior citizen households ²⁾	
				% among poor households	% among old households between 65 and 74	% among poor households	% among old households between 75 or more	% among poor households	% among old households between 65 or more	65-74	75 +
DEN	83,1	67,0	74,8	18,9	26,2	39,5	51,3	58,5	39,2	165	323
NL	98,4	84,6	92,2	6,7	7,0	7,7	10,0	14,5	8,4	57	81
BEL	103,4	91,6	97,9	16,7	17,0	19,3	22,3	36,0	19,5	109	144
FR	97,1	85,3	91,5	14,7	19,1	19,2	27,8	33,9	23,2	102	149
IRE	88,3	67,2	78,4	14,2	23,8	20,7	38,6	34,9	30,8	108	174
IT	99,1	85,6	93,2	16,6	17,7	16,9	23,0	33,5	20,0	95	123
GRE	82,1	62,9	74,8	23,3	30,0	22,3	46,3	45,6	36,3	133	206
SP	85,3	83,1	84,3	12,2	17,3	7,7	14,0	19,9	15,9	98	79
POR	89,0	66,0	80,2	22,4	31,1	23,7	52,8	46,1	39,4	136	231
AU	92,0	79,7	86,6	18,9	22,0	20,4	30,6	39,2	25,8	139	193
SW	98,5	77,2	88,5	9,0	12,0	18,6	28,2	27,5	19,6	73	170
GER	95,7	88,8	92,5	13,9	15,9	13,7	18,3	27,6	17,0	97	112
UK	78,6	63,6	70,9	21,7	38,2	30,6	50,6	52,3	44,6	152	201
EU	91,9	81,0	86,8	16,4	21,2	19,5	28,9	35,8	24,8	113	154

1) AEI: average equivalised household income

2) The poverty risk index of a special sub-population is the poverty risk of that group divided by the overall poverty risk (multiplied by 100)

Source: ECHP 1998

Part B - Table 1: Monthly rent¹⁾ of the poor

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	1.010.130	97	95	98	100	60	111	54	100
NL	3.079.224	94	129	89	100	84	103	81	100
BEL	1.018.837	92	104	91	100	70	109	64	100
FR	9.209.258	95	76	100	100	49	115	43	100
IRE	268.290	51	49	61	100	60	132	45	100
IT	4.469.608	79	87	78	100	68	109	62	100
GRE	740.851	85	93	80	100	68	103	66	100
SP	1.362.741	61	62	59	100	62	106	59	100
POR	747.189	30	32	29	100	66	108	61	100
AU	1.234.720	83	90	79	100	67	105	64	100
SW	1.625.724	96	98	95	100	62	108	58	100
GER	19.473.273	123	140	118	100	70	105	66	100
UK	5.022.801	77	80	87	100	63	123	51	100
EU	49.262.646	100	100	100	100	61	110	56	100

1)The base of this table is the gross rent in pps, after subtraction of housing allowance

2) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

Part B - Table 2: Effects for the disposable income of the poor in rented accommodation

COUNTRY	monthly disposable income of the poor ¹⁾	monthly rent of the poor	monthly disp. income minus rent	EU = 100			ranks		
				a) monthly disposable income	b) monthly dispos. income minus rent	b) minus a)	a) monthly disposable income	b) monthly disp. income minus rent	a) minus b)
DEN	588	185	403	87	84	-3	9	10	-1
NL	759	252	507	112	105	-7	2	6	-4
BEL	765	203	562	113	116	4	1	2	-1
FR	697	148	548	103	114	11	7	4	3
IRE	698	96	601	103	125	22	5	1	4
IT	698	169	529	103	110	7	5	5	0
GRE	515	182	333	76	69	-7	12	13	-1
SP	587	120	466	87	97	10	10	7	3
POR	433	63	370	64	77	13	13	12	1
AU	725	176	549	107	114	7	3	3	0
SW	545	191	354	80	73	-7	11	11	0
GER	703	272	431	104	89	-15	4	9	-5
UK	614	155	459	91	95	4	8	8	0
EU	678	195	483	100	100	0	-	-	-

1) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

Part B - Table 3: Share of monthly rent of household income¹⁾ of the poor

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	all households	poor households	not poor households	EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
					all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	1.010.130	24,5	31,4	22,5	106	109	104	140	100
NL	3.079.224	23,7	33,2	21,7	103	115	100	153	100
BEL	1.018.837	21,8	26,5	20,5	95	92	95	130	100
FR	9.209.258	21,0	21,3	20,9	91	74	96	102	100
IRE	268.290	12,5	13,8	11,4	54	48	53	121	100
IT	4.469.608	19,7	24,3	18,4	86	84	85	132	100
GRE	740.851	22,1	35,3	20,8	96	123	96	170	100
SP	1.362.741	15,9	20,5	15,2	69	71	70	135	100
POR	747.189	9,3	14,5	8,1	40	51	38	179	100
AU	1.234.720	16,5	24,2	15,3	72	84	71	159	100
SW	1.625.724	29,6	35,0	28,4	128	122	131	123	100
GER	19.473.273	26,3	38,7	24,1	114	135	112	160	100
UK	5.022.801	21,1	25,3	18,5	92	88	85	137	100
EU	49.262.646	23,0	28,8	21,6	100	100	100	133	100

1) % of monthly rent of monthly household income (in pps); after subtraction of housing allowance

2) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

Part B - Table 4: Share of poor households with outstanding loan or mortgage for accomodation¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	% of all households	% of poor households ³⁾	% of not poor households	EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
					all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	1.335.281	83,6	39,6	87,8	205	163	202	45	100
NL	3.373.529	87,6	74,4	88,4	215	305	203	84	100
BEL	2.942.586	43,7	27,1	45,9	107	111	105	59	100
FR	12.634.036	45,1	25,3	47,9	111	104	110	53	100
IRE	915.855	44,5	16,9	49,3	109	69	113	34	100
IT	15.142.292	13,4	6,5	14,7	33	27	34	44	100
GRE	2.832.252	9,3	4,6	10,8	23	19	25	42	100
SP	10.337.931	24,2	19,1	25,3	59	78	58	75	100
POR	2.178.054	24,1	7,2	29,3	59	30	67	25	100
AU	1.605.069	39,0	24,6	41,2	96	101	95	60	100
SW									
GER	14.218.854	49,6	43,3	50,5	122	178	116	86	100
UK	16.676.135	59,0	36,2	63,3	145	148	145	57	100
EU	84.191.874	40,7	24,4	43,6	100	100	100	56	100

1) Share in % of all households/ poor households/ not poor households who are owners of dwellings

2) Only households of owners of dwellings

3) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 5: Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all poor owners with outstanding loan¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households ³⁾	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	1.116.525	112	66	113	100	49	102	48	100
NL	2.955.819	101	81	101	100	67	102	66	100
BEL	1.286.487	95	136	92	100	119	99	120	100
FR	5.699.557	111	92	111	100	69	102	68	100
IRE	407.898	76	47	77	100	51	103	50	100
IT	2.025.938	83	79	83	100	79	102	77	100
GRE	262.528	53	26	56	100	42	108	38	100
SP	2.505.948	82	81	83	100	82	103	79	100
POR	525.744	71	74	70	100	87	101	86	100
AU	626.762	55	71	53	100	107	99	108	100
SW									
GER	7.055.305	117	133	115	100	95	101	94	100
UK	9.834.511	96	95	96	100	83	102	82	100
EU	34.303.024	100	100	100	100	83	102	82	100

1) Amount in pps

2) only households of owners of dwellings with outstanding loan

3) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 6: Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all poor owners of dwellings¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	1.335.281	230	107	227	100	23	107	22	100
NL	3.373.529	217	248	205	100	57	102	55	100
BEL	2.942.586	102	151	97	100	74	104	71	100
FR	12.634.036	123	96	123	100	39	109	36	100
IRE	915.855	83	32	87	100	19	114	17	100
IT	15.142.293	27	21	28	100	38	112	34	100
GRE	2.832.252	12	5	14	100	21	126	16	100
SP	10.337.931	49	63	48	100	64	107	60	100
POR	2.178.053	42	22	47	100	26	122	21	100
AU	1.605.070	52	71	51	100	68	105	65	100
SW									
GER	14.218.854	142	236	134	100	83	102	81	100
UK	16.676.135	138	142	139	100	51	109	47	100
EU	84.191.876	100	100	100	100	50	109	46	100

1) Amount in pps

2) only households of owners of dwellings

Part B - Table 7: Share of poor households unable to pay scheduled rent or mortgage payment during the past 12 months¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	% of all households	% of poor households	% of not poor households	EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
					all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.345.412	<i>1,5</i>		<i>1,5</i>	<i>49</i>		<i>68</i>		
NL	6.452.752	1,3	<i>5,7</i>	<i>0,8</i>	43	80	36	713	100
BEL	3.961.424	4,3	<i>9,0</i>	3,5	140	127	159	257	100
FR	21.843.295	3,8	11,6	2,3	125	164	103	512	100
IRE	1.184.145	5,5	<i>11,8</i>	3,8	179	<i>166</i>	170	315	100
IT	19.611.900	2,3	<i>5,1</i>	1,8	77	72	80	290	100
GRE	3.573.103	7,7	<i>5,9</i>	8,2	251	83	372	72	100
SP	11.700.672	1,7	4,9	1,1	57	69	50	443	100
POR	2.925.243	<i>1,4</i>		<i>1,2</i>	46		55		100
AU	2.839.789	1,0			33				
SW	1.625.723	8,6	18,4	6,4	281	259	293	285	100
GER									
UK	21.698.936	3,3	6,6	2,4	108	93	110	272	100
EU	99.762.394	3,1	7,1	2,2	100	100	100	322	100

1) grey fields: results may not be published (below 20 observations in unweighted sample); figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

2) only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66% and households of owners of dwellings with outstanding loan

Part B - Table 8: Share of poor households for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	% of burdened households within ...			EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households ²⁾	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.345.411	6,5	<i>10,7</i>	5,8	34	40	33	185	100
NL	6.452.753	2,8	8,2	2,1	15	31	12	386	100
BEL	3.961.424	23,1	41,1	20,1	122	153	116	205	100
FR	21.843.295	18,0	27,6	16,0	95	103	92	172	100
IRE	1.184.145	15,4	30,2	11,4	81	112	65	266	100
IT	19.611.900	40,9	54,0	38,1	216	201	219	142	100
GRE	3.573.103	26,2	25,2	26,5	138	94	152	95	100
SP	11.700.672	28,7	41,5	26,1	152	155	150	159	100
POR	2.925.242	23,5	37,6	19,5	124	140	112	193	100
AU	2.839.789	10,8	22,7	9,0	57	84	52	251	100
SW									
GER	33.692.127	14,7	18,2	14,2	78	68	82	128	100
UK	21.698.936	6,2	9,4	5,3	33	35	31	177	100
EU	131.828.797	18,9	26,8	17,4	100	100	100	155	100

1) only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66% and households of owners of dwellings with outstanding loan

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 9: Index of dwelling quality of the poor

COUNTRY	number of households	dwelling quality index ¹⁾			EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.420.775	1,83	1,68	1,86	102	99	103	90	100
NL	6.651.732	1,96	1,86	1,97	109	110	109	94	100
BEL	4.156.875	1,85	1,71	1,87	103	101	103	92	100
FR	22.634.225	1,54	1,32	1,59	86	78	88	83	100
IRE	1.221.924	1,90	1,81	1,93	106	107	106	94	100
IT	21.458.829	1,85	1,73	1,88	103	103	103	92	100
GRE	3.833.123	1,87	1,71	1,91	104	101	105	89	100
SP	12.625.155	1,73	1,73	1,73	97	102	96	100	100
POR	3.286.934	1,60	1,33	1,68	89	79	93	79	100
AU	3.190.073	1,75	1,64	1,77	98	97	98	92	100
SW	4.503.894	1,87	1,72	1,89	104	102	104	91	100
GER	36.151.813	1,81	1,74	1,83	101	103	101	95	100
UK	23.939.353	1,91	1,88	1,93	107	111	106	97	100
EU	146.074.705	1,79	1,69	1,81	100	100	100	93	100

1) The dwelling quality index has three steps:

* it is 0 for dwellings without bath

* it is 1 for dwellings with bath and without terrace

* it is 2 for dwellings with bath and with terrace

(Other quality characteristics than 'bath' and 'terrace' are not available for all countries.)

Part B - Table 10: Occupancy density¹⁾ of the poor

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	all households	poor households	not poor households	EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
					all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.419.881	0,62	0,55	0,63	89	75	92	87	100
NL	6.651.732	0,52	0,61	0,50	75	83	74	122	100
BEL	4.136.113	0,63	0,70	0,61	90	95	90	114	100
FR	22.663.040	0,68	0,77	0,66	97	104	96	117	100
IRE	1.227.282	0,67	0,65	0,67	96	88	99	96	100
IT	21.435.688	0,84	0,96	0,81	121	131	119	118	100
GRE	3.833.124	0,94	0,96	0,94	136	130	137	102	100
SP	12.618.808	0,75	0,87	0,73	109	118	107	119	100
POR	3.286.934	0,86	0,80	0,87	124	109	128	92	100
AU	3.191.680	0,69	0,68	0,69	99	92	101	98	100
SW	4.499.056	0,64	0,68	0,64	93	93	93	107	100
GER	35.937.599	0,68	0,69	0,68	98	94	100	102	100
UK	23.704.162	0,58	0,57	0,58	84	77	85	97	100
EU	145.605.099	0,69	0,74	0,68	100	100	100	108	100

1) number of persons divided by number of rooms

Part B - Table 11: Share of poor households living in buildings in bad condition¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	in %			EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households ²⁾	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.418.345	13	<i>11</i>	13	69	<i>44</i>	78	<i>87</i>	100
NL	6.651.732	17	30	15	91	114	90	199	100
BEL	4.162.442	18	22	17	95	86	101	134	100
FR	23.728.449	24	33	21	128	129	128	157	100
IRE	1.230.988	11	23	8	62	89	48	288	100
IT	21.458.828	13	22	11	73	85	69	194	100
GRE	3.833.124	21	31	18	113	118	108	172	100
SP	12.625.155	21	30	19	116	117	117	157	100
POR	3.287.000	40	58	35	219	222	213	163	100
AU	3.191.805	10	18	8	54	70	50	216	100
SW									
GER									
UK	23.887.910	16	18	15	85	71	89	125	100
EU	106.475.778	18	26	17	100	100	100	157	100

1) The condition of the building is bad if

* it has leaky roof OR

* it has damp walls, floors, etc OR

* it has rot in window frames or floors

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 12: Share of poor households living in buildings with low quality of residential environment¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	in %			EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households ²⁾	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.418.375	14	12	14	50	42	52	87	100
NL	6.655.891	26	34	24	93	119	90	140	100
BEL	4.163.424	29	36	28	107	124	104	127	100
FR	23.728.449	28	32	27	102	112	99	118	100
IRE	1.232.857	14	21	12	52	73	46	168	100
IT	21.458.828	35	36	34	127	127	127	105	100
GRE	3.833.124	33	22	36	120	77	133	61	100
SP	12.625.154	30	28	30	108	99	110	96	100
POR	3.287.000	29	27	30	107	96	110	92	100
AU	3.198.258	22	24	21	79	83	78	112	100
SW									
GER									
UK	23.906.070	21	23	21	77	79	76	109	100
EU	106.507.430	27	29	27	100	100	100	105	100

1) The quality of residential environment is low if

* the accommodation has noise from outside (traffic, factories, etc) OR

* if there is any pollution, grime or other environmental problem caused by traffic or industry

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 13: Share of poor households living in buildings with low quality of social environment¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households	% -share of households with low quality within ...			EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households ²⁾	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.411.595	11	9	11	60	47	66	77	100
NL	6.654.377	18	28	17	100	129	97	164	100
BEL	4.161.891	19	22	18	103	101	105	118	100
FR	23.728.449	21	24	21	118	114	120	117	100
IRE	1.227.470	12	17	11	69	81	64	157	100
IT	21.458.828	19	23	18	104	106	104	125	100
GRE	3.833.124	11	7	12	62	33	72	57	100
SP	12.623.502	18	19	17	97	90	99	111	100
POR	3.287.000	22	14	25	123	66	143	57	100
AU	3.191.299	7	6	7	37	28	39	88	100
SW	4.240.033	12	17	11	65	79	63	155	100
GER									
UK	23.809.486	18	24	17	102	112	96	144	100
EU	110.627.054	18	21	17	100	100	100	123	100

1) The quality of social environment is low if there is crime or vandalism in the area

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 14: Index of the total quality of the housing situation of the poor

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	total quality index ¹⁾			EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.407.607	0,90	0,90	0,90	105	112	103	101	100
NL	6.650.219	0,87	0,80	0,88	102	99	102	90	100
BEL	4.119.722	0,84	0,79	0,85	99	97	98	92	100
FR	22.634.224	0,79	0,72	0,81	93	89	94	89	100
IRE	1.205.007	0,90	0,84	0,91	105	103	105	91	100
IT	21.435.688	0,82	0,75	0,83	95	93	96	90	100
GRE	3.833.124	0,81	0,80	0,81	94	99	93	99	100
SP	12.616.180	0,81	0,78	0,82	95	97	95	95	100
POR	3.286.934	0,74	0,70	0,75	87	87	87	93	100
AU	3.175.028	0,88	0,85	0,89	103	105	103	96	100
SW	4.235.853	0,93	0,88	0,94	108	109	108	94	100
GER	35.330.578	0,92	0,88	0,93	107	109	107	95	100
UK	23.576.896	0,88	0,85	0,88	102	105	102	96	100
EU	144.507.061	0,86	0,81	0,87	100	100	100	93	100

1) The total quality index is a summary of the results of tables 9 to 13:

- * The index of dwelling quality, with a range from "0" to "2" is divided by 2, to reach a range from "0" to "1"
- * The occupancy density is recoded: occupancy density from 1,26 thru highest is "0", occupancy density up to 1,25 is "1"
- * Building condition, residential environment, social environment: Index is "0" or "1"; "0" means low quality , "1" means high quality
- * All indicators are added and the sum is divided by 5
- * SW: only dwelling quality, occupancy density and quality of social environment available; so the sum is divided by 3
- * GER: only dwelling quality and occupancy density available; so the sum is divided by 2
- * the table shows the means of the total-quality- indicator of the households

Part B - Table 15: Share of poor households with low satisfaction with housing situation¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	in %			EU = 100			not poor households = 100	
		all households	poor households ²⁾	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	2.363.953	9	17	9	58	44	65	127	100
NL	6.476.050	9	18	7	55	73	54	241	100
BEL	3.851.440	11	17	10	69	69	72	170	100
FR	23.448.287	11	19	10	71	78	69	201	100
IRE	1.090.284	14	25	11	90	100	82	216	100
IT	19.725.659	28	47	23	174	192	169	200	100
GRE	3.805.436	33	57	26	205	231	186	221	100
SP	12.398.469	19	26	17	118	106	124	151	100
POR	3.267.853	27	38	24	172	153	176	154	100
AU	3.199.305	8	13	8	52	51	54	166	100
SW									
GER									
UK	22.382.628	9	11	8	56	44	61	128	100
EU	102.009.364	16	25	14	100	100	100	177	100

1) Housing satisfaction of the reference person of the household

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 16: Risk of homelessness

COUNTRY	number of households	number of poor households	number of homeless people ¹⁾	risk of			
				a) homelessness ²⁾		b) poverty ³⁾	
				in %	EU= 100	in %	EU= 100
DEN	2.423.208	385.741	4.000	0,17	13	15,92	85
NL	6.655.891	829.661	12.000	0,18	15	12,47	66
BEL	4.178.680	648.795	5.500	0,13	11	15,53	83
FR	23.728.449	4.429.830	346.000	1,46	118	18,67	99
IRE	1.237.362	274.095	3.700	0,30	24	22,15	118
IT	21.458.828	4.006.717	78.000	0,36	29	18,67	99
GRE	3.833.124	863.251	7.700	0,20	16	22,52	120
SP	12.626.130	2.239.610	11.000	0,09	7	17,74	95
POR	3.287.000	752.361	4.000	0,12	10	22,89	122
AU	3.199.700	508.349	8.400	0,26	21	15,89	85
SW	4.540.607	751.591	14.000	0,31	25	16,55	88
GER	36.867.000	6.022.980	876.450	2,38	193	16,34	87
UK	24.285.000	6.121.422	460.000	1,89	153	25,21	134
EU	148.320.979	27.834.403	1.830.750	1,23	100	18,77	100

correlation between a) and b)
0,21

1) source: Avramov, D. ED. (1999)

2) homeless people as a share of all households

3) poor households as a share of all households; source: Table A-1

Part B - Table 17: Over- and under-representation of the three income groups in the different housing sectors¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households	degree of over- or under-representation ²⁾ of the bottom 20% in ...				degree of over- or under-representation ²⁾ of the middle 60% in ...				degree of over- or under-representation ²⁾ of the top 20% in ...			
		cheapest segment of ³⁾		owner-occupied dwellings	single family housing	cheapest segment of ³⁾		owner-occupied dwellings	single family housing	cheapest segment of ³⁾		owner-occupied dwellings	single family housing
		social housing	private rental sector			social housing	private rental sector			social housing	private rental sector		
DEN	427.707	2,4	1,9	1,0	0,5	0,9	1,2	0,8	1,1			1,0	1,6
NL	1.166.612	2,3	2,3	0,5	0,4	0,8	1,1	0,9	0,9	0,2		1,8	1,4
BEL	748.952	3,4	2,4	0,8	0,8		0,9	0,7	1,1			1,4	1,1
FR	3.752.213	1,6	1,8	0,2	0,8	1,0	1,1	0,9	1,1			1,9	1,2
IRE	223.951	2,1	1,8	2,0	0,6	1,0			0,6	0,0			1,2
IT	3.516.955	2,5	1,9	0,9	0,7	0,7	1,0	0,9	1,1			1,1	1,1
GRE	678.148		0,8	0,5	1,6		1,3	1,0	1,1	0,0	1,2	1,4	0,5
SP	2.216.785		1,2	0,7	1,3		1,4	1,2	1,0			1,2	0,8
POR	533.713		1,2	0,3	1,3	1,2	1,3	1,2	1,1			2,2	0,7
AU	489.509	1,1	1,6	0,7	1,0	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0			1,3	0,9
SW	671.077												
GER	4.837.991	1,5	1,3	0,8	0,7	1,0	1,2	1,1	1,1		0,5	1,2	1,5
UK	3.433.965	1,9	1,6	0,5	0,6	1,0	1,0	1,1	1,1			1,5	1,3
EU	22.697.578	1,8	1,5	0,7	0,8	1,0	1,1	1,0	1,1	0,3	0,4	1,3	1,2

1) grey fields: results may not be published (below 20 observations in unweighted sample); figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

2) Values greater than 1 indicate overrepresentation, values smaller than 1 indicate under-representation of the respective income group in the individual sector. 1,0 indicates a share of 20% of the bottom/top 20% and a share of 60% of the middle 60% in the individual sector.

3) Cheapest 25%.

Part B - Table 18: Over- and under-representation of the three income groups in dwellings with low quality of social environment¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households	Shares (in %) of the ...			Shares (in %) of the ...		
		bottom 20%	middle 60%	top 20%	bottom 20%	middle 60%	top 20%
		in dwellings with low quality of social environment ²⁾			in dwellings without low quality of social environment		
DEN	482.155	18,1	68,9	<i>13,0</i>	20,2	58,8	21,0
NL	1.331.053	26,6	54,6	18,7	18,5	61,2	20,3
BEL	839.564	23,7	59,1	17,2	19,4	60,0	20,6
FR	4.744.227	22,2	60,1	17,7	19,4	60,0	20,6
IRE	243.316	26,1	59,5	<i>14,3</i>	18,9	60,3	20,8
IT	4.260.198	24,4	56,5	19,0	18,8	61,0	20,2
GRE	767.037	<i>12,1</i>	65,3	22,6	21,0	59,4	19,6
SP	2.526.180	20,8	59,8	19,3	19,8	60,0	20,2
POR	657.198	13,1	62,3	24,6	22,0	59,3	18,7
AU	638.060	17,3	60,3	22,4	20,2	60,0	19,8
SW	791.456	25,4	59,3	15,3	17,8	61,0	21,3
GER							
UK	4.728.578	25,5	60,6	14,0	18,6	59,8	21,6
EU	22.009.022	23,0	59,4	17,6	19,2	60,2	20,6

1) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

2) The quality of social environment is low if there is crime or vandalism in the area

Part B - Table 19: Connection between job mobility and housing mobility

COUNTRY	number of households	% of households with house moving ¹⁾	% of job-related house moving of ...		EU=100			housing consequences of start of current job		
			... all households ²⁾	households with house moving ¹⁾	% of households with house moving ¹⁾	% of job-related house moving of all households	households with house moving ¹⁾	number of households with start of job ¹⁾ of reference person	% of households without job-related house moving ²⁾
DEN	2.413.768	41,8	5,2	12,3	149	143	96	730.824	93,0	
NL	6.655.891	34,9	4,7	13,5	124	130	105	1.629.663	94,9	
BEL	4.117.758	27,5	1,9	6,8	98	52	53	600.827	95,8	
FR	23.309.619	34,9	5,9	16,8	124	162	131	4.135.480	88,5	
IRE	1.218.229	19,4	2,3	11,8	69	64	92	260.869	96,7	
IT	21.280.809	17,7	1,8	10,2	63	50	79	2.139.695	96,2	
GRE	3.827.002	19,8	2,3	11,6	70	63	90	688.798	97,8	
SP	12.580.575	20,4	2,3	11,5	73	65	89	2.921.975	95,9	
POR	3.285.394	17,2	1,2	6,8	61	33	53	532.225	98,6	
AU	3.189.397	18,0	1,7	9,6	64	48	74	567.211	97,2	
SW										
GER	33.777.321	29,8	3,2	10,7	106	88	83	7.782.024	94,9	
UK	23.824.315	33,9	5,0	14,7	121	138	115	8.359.696	95,2	
EU	139.480.078	28,1	3,6	12,8	100	100	100	31.235.582	94,6	

1) since 1993

2) Job related house-moving: Year of move to actual address is the year of start of current job or the following year.

3) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 20: Housing consequences of reduced income

COUNTRY	households with deteriorated income situation ¹⁾		households with deteriorated income situation and without payment problems		average of both percentages
	number of households	% of households without payment problems	number of households	% of households who have not moved last year	
DEN	414.739	97	403.319	88	92
NL	1.047.938	95	998.472	91	93
BEL	652.807	90	590.433	98	94
FR	6.187.846	94	5.791.423	92	93
IRE	216.130	91	197.718	96	94
IT	5.972.581	95	5.692.569	96	96
GRE	1.056.360	86	903.291	97	92
SP	2.434.498	96	2.336.111	93	95
POR	692.278	99	682.720	95	97
AU	666.276	98	656.066	95	97
SW	1.274.669	92	1.177.176	100	96
GER					
UK	1.992.728	95	1.893.836	95	95
EU	22.608.850	94	21.323.134	95	94

1) income situation compared to last year

Part B - Table 21: Monthly rent¹⁾ of single parents²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			not single parents = 100	
		all households	single parents ⁴⁾	not single parents	all households	single parents	not single parents	single parents	not single parents
DEN	1.010.130	97	107	96	100	97	100	97	100
NL	3.079.224	94	101	94	100	94	100	94	100
BEL	1.018.837	92	98	93	100	94	102	92	100
FR	9.209.258	95	88	96	100	81	101	81	100
IRE	268.290	51	39	53	100	67	105	64	100
IT	4.469.608	79	93	78	100	103	100	103	100
GRE	740.851	85		83	100		99		
SP	1.362.741	61		60	100		99		
POR	747.189	30	49	29	100	143	99	145	100
AU	1.234.720	83	94	82	100	99	100	99	100
SW	1.625.724	96	103	97	100	94	101	93	100
GER	19.473.273	123	122	123	100	87	100	86	100
UK	5.022.801	77	72	78	100	82	101	81	100
EU	49.262.646	100	100	100	100	87	100	87	100

1) The base of this table is the gross rent in pps, after subtraction of housing allowance

2) single parents with 1+ dependent child

3) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields (GRE, SP): below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 22: Share of monthly rent of household income¹⁾ of single parents²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	all households	single parents ⁴⁾	not single parents	EU = 100			not single parents = 100	
					all households	single parents	not single parents	single parents	not single parents
DEN	1.010.130	24,5	22,8	24,5	106	85	107	93	100
NL	3.079.224	23,7	24,0	23,9	103	89	104	101	100
BEL	1.018.837	21,8	19,8	22,1	95	74	96	90	100
FR	9.209.258	21,0	21,7	20,9	91	81	91	104	100
IRE	268.290	12,5	<i>15,1</i>	12,1	54	56	53	125	100
IT	4.469.608	19,7	<i>25,0</i>	19,6	86	93	86	128	100
GRE	740.851	22,1		22,0	96		96		100
SP	1.362.741	15,9		15,8	69		69		100
POR	747.189	9,3	<i>21,2</i>	8,9	40	79	39	237	100
AU	1.234.720	16,5	21,3	16,3	72	79	71	131	100
SW	1.625.724	29,6	29,1	29,6	128	108	129	98	100
GER	19.473.273	26,3	34,6	26,0	114	129	113	133	100
UK	5.022.801	21,1	20,4	21,2	92	76	93	96	100
EU	49.262.646	23,0	26,9	22,9	100	100	100	117	100

1) % of monthly rent of monthly household income (in pps); after subtraction of housing allowance

2) single parents with 1+ dependent child

3) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields (GRE, SP): below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 23: Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all single parents¹⁾ who are owners of dwellings²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			not single parents = 100	
		all households	single parents ⁴⁾	not single parents	all households	single parents	not single parents	single parents	not single parents
DEN	1.335.281	230	<i>151</i>	231	100	<i>86</i>	100	<i>86</i>	100
NL	3.373.529	217	<i>151</i>	219	100	<i>91</i>	100	<i>91</i>	100
BEL	2.942.586	102	<i>79</i>	103	100	<i>102</i>	100	<i>102</i>	100
FR	12.634.036	123	<i>106</i>	123	100	<i>113</i>	100	<i>114</i>	100
IRE	915.855	83	<i>70</i>	83	100	<i>111</i>	100	<i>111</i>	100
IT	15.142.293	27	<i>32</i>	27	100	<i>153</i>	99	<i>155</i>	100
GRE	2.832.252	12	<i>8</i>	12	100	<i>88</i>	100	<i>88</i>	100
SP	10.337.931	49	<i>52</i>	49	100	<i>139</i>	100	<i>140</i>	100
POR	2.178.053	42	<i>31</i>	42	100	<i>96</i>	100	<i>96</i>	100
AU	1.605.070	52	<i>45</i>	53	100	<i>112</i>	100	<i>113</i>	100
SW									
GER	14.218.854	142	<i>197</i>	142	100	<i>182</i>	99	<i>184</i>	100
UK	16.676.135	138	<i>141</i>	138	100	<i>133</i>	99	<i>135</i>	100
EU	84.191.876	100	<i>100</i>	100	100	<i>131</i>	99	<i>132</i>	100

1) single parents with 1+ dependent child

2) Amount in pps

3) only households of owners of dwellings

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 24: Share of single parents¹⁾ for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	% of all households	% of single parents ³⁾	% of not single parents	EU = 100			not single parents = 100	
					all households	single parents	not single parents	single parents	not single parents
DEN	2.345.411	6,5	22,3	6,2	34	75	33	361	100
NL	6.452.753	2,8		2,7	15		15		100
BEL	3.961.424	23,1	45,4	22,3	122	153	120	203	100
FR	21.843.295	18,0	30,8	17,6	95	104	94	175	100
IRE	1.184.145	15,4	38,3	14,5	81	129	78	264	100
IT	19.611.900	40,9	69,3	40,3	216	234	216	172	100
GRE	3.573.103	26,2		26,0	138		139		100
SP	11.700.672	28,7	38,9	28,6	152	131	153	136	100
POR	2.925.242	23,5	27,3	23,4	124	92	125	117	100
AU	2.839.789	10,8	30,9	10,2	57	104	55	303	100
SW									
GER	33.692.127	14,7	22,2	14,5	78	75	78	153	100
UK	21.698.936	6,2	17,7	5,7	33	60	31	310	100
EU	131.828.797	18,9	29,6	18,7	100	100	100	159	100

1) single parents with 1+ dependent child

2) only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66% and households of owners of dwellings

3) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields (NL, GRE): below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 25: Index of dwelling quality of single parents¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	dwelling quality index ²⁾			EU = 100			not single parents = 100	
		all households	single parents	not single parents	all households	single parents	not single parents	single parents	not single parents
DEN	2.420.775	1,83	1,86	1,83	102	104	102	102	100
NL	6.651.732	1,96	1,99	1,95	109	111	109	102	100
BEL	4.156.875	1,85	1,85	1,84	103	103	103	100	100
FR	22.634.225	1,54	1,42	1,54	86	79	86	92	100
IRE	1.221.924	1,90	1,78	1,91	106	99	106	93	100
IT	21.458.829	1,85	1,87	1,85	103	104	103	101	100
GRE	3.833.123	1,87	1,80	1,87	104	100	104	96	100
SP	12.625.155	1,73	1,63	1,73	97	91	97	94	100
POR	3.286.934	1,60	1,51	1,60	89	84	89	94	100
AU	3.190.073	1,75	1,77	1,75	98	99	98	101	100
SW	4.503.894	1,87	1,91	1,86	104	107	104	103	100
GER	36.151.813	1,81	1,84	1,81	101	102	101	101	100
UK	23.939.353	1,91	1,90	1,92	107	106	107	99	100
EU	146.074.705	1,79	1,79	1,79	100	100	100	100	100

1) single parents with 1+ dependent child

2) The dwelling quality index has three steps:

* it is 0 for dwellings without bath

* it is 1 for dwellings with bath and without terrace

* it is 2 for dwellings with bath and with terrace

(Other quality characteristics than 'bath' and 'terrace' are not available for all countries.)

Part B - Table 26: Occupancy density¹⁾ of single parents²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	all households	single parents	not single parents	EU = 100			not single parents = 100	
					all households	single parents	not single parents	single parents	not single parents
DEN	2.419.881	0,62	0,72	0,62	89	98	89	117	100
NL	6.651.732	0,52	0,56	0,51	75	76	74	109	100
BEL	4.136.113	0,63	0,61	0,62	90	83	90	98	100
FR	22.663.040	0,68	0,70	0,67	97	95	98	104	100
IRE	1.227.282	0,67	0,74	0,66	96	100	96	111	100
IT	21.435.688	0,84	0,76	0,84	121	103	122	90	100
GRE	3.833.124	0,94	0,98	0,94	136	133	136	104	100
SP	12.618.808	0,75	0,66	0,75	109	90	109	88	100
POR	3.286.934	0,86	0,84	0,85	124	114	123	98	100
AU	3.191.680	0,69	0,75	0,68	99	102	99	110	100
SW	4.499.056	0,64	0,80	0,63	93	109	92	126	100
GER	35.937.599	0,68	0,82	0,68	98	112	98	122	100
UK	23.704.162	0,58	0,68	0,57	84	92	83	118	100
EU	145.605.099	0,69	0,73	0,69	100	100	100	106	100

1) number of persons divided by number of rooms

2) single parents with 1+ dependent child

Part B - Table 27: Index of the total quality of the housing situation of the single parents¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	total quality index ¹⁾			EU = 100			not single parents = 100	
		all households	single parents	not single parents	all households	single parents	not single parents	single parents	not single parents
DEN	2.407.607	0,90	0,89	0,90	105	106	105	99	100
NL	6.650.219	0,87	0,83	0,88	102	98	102	94	100
BEL	4.119.722	0,84	0,80	0,85	99	94	99	94	100
FR	22.634.224	0,79	0,76	0,80	93	90	93	95	100
IRE	1.205.007	0,90	0,83	0,90	105	98	105	92	100
IT	21.435.688	0,82	0,82	0,82	95	98	95	101	100
GRE	3.833.124	0,81	0,79	0,81	94	94	94	98	100
SP	12.616.180	0,81	0,79	0,81	95	94	95	97	100
POR	3.286.934	0,74	0,72	0,74	87	85	87	96	100
AU	3.175.028	0,88	0,88	0,88	103	104	103	99	100
SW	4.235.853	0,93	0,89	0,93	108	106	109	96	100
GER	35.330.578	0,92	0,94	0,92	107	111	107	102	100
UK	23.576.896	0,88	0,83	0,88	102	98	103	94	100
EU	144.507.061	0,86	0,84	0,86	100	100	100	98	100

1) single parents with 1+ dependent child

2) The total quality index is a summary of the results of tables 9 to 13:

- * The index of dwelling quality, with a range from "0" to "2" is divided by 2, to reach a range from "0" to "1"
- * The occupancy density is recoded: occupancy density from 1,26 thru highest is "0", occupancy density up to 1,25 is "1"
- * Building condition, residential environment, social environment: Index is "0" or "1"; "0" means low quality , "1" means high quality
- * All indicators are added and the sum is divided by 5
- * SW: only dwelling quality, occupancy density and quality of social environment available; so the sum is divided by 3
- * GER: only dwelling quality and occupancy density available; so the sum is divided by 2
- * the table shows the means of the total-quality- indicator of the households

Part B - Table 28: Share¹⁾ of young adults who have not established an own household²⁾

COUNTRY	16 - 20 years old			21 - 25 years old			26 - 30 years old			31 - 35 years old			average percentage of all groups
	number of people ³⁾	in education or training	others	number of people ³⁾	in education or training ⁴⁾	others	number of people ³⁾	in education or training	others	number of people ³⁾	in education or training	others	
DEN	261.609	94	90	300.341		39	413.567			393.199			37
NL	613.167	95	91	1.018.267	47	33	1.319.021		6	1.249.471			45
BEL	500.561	100	92	569.365	97	69	706.546		27	905.003		6	65
FR	2.301.464	92	91	3.850.475	77	64	4.378.836		28	4.468.469		10	60
IRE	275.353	100	97	303.509	97	80	255.100		52	303.601		20	74
IT	3.130.991	99	99	4.147.392	95	93	4.367.072	92	61	4.767.886		29	79
GRE	578.227	98	99	709.998	73	83	764.399		59	777.509		24	73
SP	2.903.887	100	94	3.307.790	98	90	3.186.994	84	62	3.310.662		36	80
POR	660.439	99	98	870.073	98	85	741.426	86	66	823.281		31	80
AU	458.298	99	97	512.500	75	64	656.506	45	36	750.453		23	66
SW													
GER	3.649.831	98	91	4.018.393	85	64	6.049.515	43	26	6.363.495		14	63
UK	2.795.787	84	87	3.434.496		51	3.693.360		18	4.214.929		6	41
EU	18.647.839	93	90	23.591.039	82	68	27.149.602	61	36	28.955.528	34	17	64

1) in %

2) young adults, living in the household of the parents

3) number of all young adults in the corresponding category of age

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 29: Monthly rent¹⁾ of young couples with children²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			not young couples w. ch. = 100	
		all households	young couples w.ch. ⁴⁾	not young couples w.ch.	all households	young couples w.ch.	not young couples w.ch.	young couples w.ch.	not young couples w.ch.
DEN	1.010.130	97	115	96	100	132	99	134	100
NL	3.079.224	94	94	95	100	111	99	111	100
BEL	1.018.837	92	90	91	100	109	98	112	100
FR	9.209.258	95	102	94	100	120	98	122	100
IRE	268.290	51	49	50	100	<i>108</i>	98	<i>110</i>	100
IT	4.469.608	79	79	76	100	111	95	117	100
GRE	740.851	85	78	85	100	102	100	103	100
SP	1.362.741	61	58	61	100	105	99	106	100
POR	747.189	30	46	28	100	171	92	186	100
AU	1.234.720	83	84	82	100	113	98	115	100
SW	1.625.724	96	109	96	100	126	98	127	100
GER	19.473.273	123	125	123	100	113	99	114	100
UK	5.022.801	77	74	77	100	106	98	108	100
EU	49.262.646	100	100	100	100	111	99	112	100

1) The base of this table is the gross rent in pps, after subtraction of housing allowance

2) couple with 1+ child (all aged less than 16), reference person aged less than 36

3) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 30: Share of monthly rent of household income¹⁾ of young couples with children²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	all households	young couples with children ⁴⁾	not young couples with children	EU = 100			not young couples = 100	
					all households	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.
DEN	1.010.130	24,5	19,5	24,8	106	95	106	79	100
NL	3.079.224	23,7	23,0	23,9	103	111	103	96	100
BEL	1.018.837	21,8	15,6	22,5	95	76	97	69	100
FR	9.209.258	21,0	18,7	21,2	91	91	91	88	100
IRE	268.290	12,5	<i>11,8</i>	12,5	54	57	54	95	100
IT	4.469.608	19,7	20,7	19,4	86	100	83	107	100
GRE	740.851	22,1	21,9	22,2	96	106	95	99	100
SP	1.362.741	15,9	17,7	15,8	69	86	68	112	100
POR	747.189	9,3	15,4	8,6	40	75	37	179	100
AU	1.234.720	16,5	15,2	16,7	72	74	72	91	100
SW	1.625.724	29,6	23,8	29,9	128	115	129	79	100
GER	19.473.273	26,3	25,0	26,4	114	121	113	95	100
UK	5.022.801	21,1	16,2	21,6	92	78	93	75	100
EU	49.262.646	23,0	20,7	23,3	100	100	100	89	100

1) % of monthly rent of monthly household income (in pps); after subtraction of housing allowance

2) couple with 1+ child (all aged less than 16), reference person aged less than 36

3) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; no figures: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 31: Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all young couples with children²⁾ who are owners of dwellings

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			not young couples = 100	
		all households	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.	all households	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.
DEN	1.335.281	230	181	233	100	158	94	168	100
NL	3.373.529	217	132	229	100	122	98	125	100
BEL	2.942.586	102	129	91	100	253	82	307	100
FR	12.634.036	123	147	123	100	240	93	258	100
IRE	915.855	83	99	78	100	240	88	273	100
IT	15.142.293	27	24	27	100	177	93	190	100
GRE	2.832.252	12	12	12	100	209	93	225	100
SP	10.337.931	49	62	47	100	253	90	282	100
POR	2.178.053	42	67	36	100	319	79	406	100
AU	1.605.070	52	79	48	100	303	84	360	100
SW									
GER	14.218.854	142	129	142	100	183	92	198	100
UK	16.676.135	138	117	142	100	170	95	179	100
EU	84.191.876	100	100	100	100	201	93	216	100

1) Amount in pps

2) couple with 1+ child (all aged less than 16), reference person aged less than 36

Part B - Table 32: Share of young couples with children¹⁾ for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	% of all households	% of young couples w. ch. ³⁾	% of not young couples w. ch.	EU = 100			not young couples w. ch. = 100	
					all households	young couples w. ch.	not young couples w. ch.	young couples w. ch.	not young couples w. ch.
DEN	2.345.411	6,5			34				
NL	6.452.753	2,8			15				
BEL	3.961.424	23,1	21,2	23,4	122	98	125	91	100
FR	21.843.295	18,0	16,4	18,1	95	75	97	91	100
IRE	1.184.145	15,4	<i>13,9</i>	15,5	81	64	83	90	100
IT	19.611.900	40,9	42,2	41,1	216	194	220	103	100
GRE	3.573.103	26,2	29,8	25,9	138	137	139	115	100
SP	11.700.672	28,7	36,9	28,1	152	170	150	131	100
POR	2.925.242	23,5	31,6	22,7	124	145	121	139	100
AU	2.839.789	10,8	15,1	10,4	57	69	55	146	100
SW									
GER	33.692.127	14,7	20,4	14,3	78	94	77	142	100
UK	21.698.936	6,2	12,1	5,9	33	56	31	206	100
EU	131.828.797	18,9	21,8	18,7	100	100	100	116	100

1) couple with 1+ child (all aged less than 16), reference person aged less than 36

2) only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of 66% and households of owners of dwellings

3) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields (DEN, NL): below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 33: Index of dwelling quality of young couples with children¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	dwelling quality index ²⁾			EU = 100			not young couples = 100	
		all households	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.	all households	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.	young couples with children	not young couples w. ch.
DEN	2.420.775	1,83	1,93	1,83	102	106	102	105	100
NL	6.651.732	1,96	1,98	1,95	109	109	109	101	100
BEL	4.156.875	1,85	1,96	1,83	103	108	103	107	100
FR	22.634.225	1,54	1,58	1,54	86	87	86	103	100
IRE	1.221.924	1,90	1,95	1,90	106	108	106	103	100
IT	21.458.829	1,85	1,83	1,85	103	101	104	99	100
GRE	3.833.123	1,87	1,94	1,86	104	107	104	104	100
SP	12.625.155	1,73	1,78	1,73	97	98	97	103	100
POR	3.286.934	1,60	1,73	1,58	89	95	89	110	100
AU	3.190.073	1,75	1,75	1,75	98	97	98	100	100
SW	4.503.894	1,87	1,97	1,86	104	109	104	106	100
GER	36.151.813	1,81	1,83	1,81	101	101	101	101	100
UK	23.939.353	1,91	1,95	1,91	107	108	107	102	100
EU	146.074.705	1,79	1,81	1,79	100	100	100	102	100

1) couple with 1+ child (all aged less than 16), reference person aged less than 36

2) The dwelling quality index has three steps:

* it is 0 for dwellings without bath

* it is 1 for dwellings with bath and without terrace

* it is 2 for dwellings with bath and with terrace

(Other quality characteristics than 'bath' and 'terrace' are not available for all countries.)

Part B - Table 34: Occupancy density¹⁾ of young couples with children²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	all households	young couples	not young couples	EU = 100			not young couples = 100	
					all households	young couples	not young couples	young couples	not young couples
DEN	2.419.881	0,62	0,90	0,59	89	90	89	152	100
NL	6.651.732	0,52	0,72	0,50	75	73	75	145	100
BEL	4.136.113	0,63	0,89	0,60	90	90	89	150	100
FR	22.663.040	0,68	0,97	0,65	97	98	97	150	100
IRE	1.227.282	0,67	0,86	0,65	96	86	97	132	100
IT	21.435.688	0,84	1,12	0,81	121	113	121	138	100
GRE	3.833.124	0,94	1,20	0,92	136	121	138	131	100
SP	12.618.808	0,75	0,92	0,74	109	93	111	124	100
POR	3.286.934	0,86	1,07	0,83	124	108	125	128	100
AU	3.191.680	0,69	1,02	0,65	99	103	97	158	100
SW	4.499.056	0,64	0,98	0,62	93	98	93	157	100
GER	35.937.599	0,68	1,05	0,66	98	106	98	161	100
UK	23.704.162	0,58	0,91	0,55	84	92	83	166	100
EU	145.605.099	0,69	0,99	0,67	100	100	100	149	100

1) number of persons divided by number of rooms

2) couple with 1+ child (all aged less than 16), reference person aged less than 36

Part B - Table 35: Index of the total quality of the housing situation of the young couples with children¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	total quality index ¹⁾			EU = 100			not young couples = 100	
		all households	young couples	not young couples	all households	young couples	not young couples	young couples	not young couples
DEN	2.407.607	0,90	0,91	0,90	105	111	104	101	100
NL	6.650.219	0,87	0,89	0,87	102	108	102	102	100
BEL	4.119.722	0,84	0,87	0,84	99	106	98	104	100
FR	22.634.224	0,79	0,76	0,80	93	93	93	95	100
IRE	1.205.007	0,90	0,94	0,89	105	114	104	105	100
IT	21.435.688	0,82	0,78	0,82	95	94	96	94	100
GRE	3.833.124	0,81	0,78	0,81	94	95	94	96	100
SP	12.616.180	0,81	0,82	0,81	95	100	95	101	100
POR	3.286.934	0,74	0,79	0,74	87	96	86	107	100
AU	3.175.028	0,88	0,86	0,89	103	105	103	97	100
SW	4.235.853	0,93	0,91	0,93	108	110	108	97	100
GER	35.330.578	0,92	0,84	0,92	107	102	108	91	100
UK	23.576.896	0,88	0,84	0,88	102	103	102	96	100
EU	144.507.061	0,86	0,82	0,86	100	100	100	96	100

1) couple with 1+ child (all aged less than 16), reference person aged less than 36

2) The total quality index is a summary of the results of tables 9 to 13:

* The index of dwelling quality, with a range from "0" to "2" is divided by 2, to reach a range from "0" to "1"

* The occupancy density is recoded: occupancy density from 1,26 thru highest is "0", occupancy density up to 1,25 is "1"

* Building condition, residential environment, social environment: Index is "0" or "1"; "0" means low quality , "1" means high quality

* All indicators are added and the sum is divided by 5

* SW: only dwelling quality, occupancy density and quality of social environment available; so the sum is divided by 3

* GER: only dwelling quality and occupancy density available; so the sum is divided by 2

* the table shows the means of the total-quality- indicator of the households

Part B - Table 36: Monthly rent¹⁾ of senior citizen households²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			"old" senior citizens = 100	
		all households	"young" senior citizens ⁴⁾	"old" senior citizens	all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	1.010.130	97	98	75	100	87	61	142	100
NL	3.079.224	94	112	115	100	101	96	106	100
BEL	1.018.837	92	94	107	100	88	92	95	100
FR	9.209.258	95	95	95	100	86	79	109	100
IRE	268.290	51	28		100	47			
IT	4.469.608	79	76	77	100	83	77	108	100
GRE	740.851	85	91		100	93			
SP	1.362.741	61	42	43	100	60	56	107	100
POR	747.189	30	16	20	100	45	53	84	100
AU	1.234.720	83	74	71	100	77	68	114	100
SW	1.625.724	96	104	100	100	93	82	113	100
GER	19.473.273	123	132	130	100	92	84	110	100
UK	5.022.801	77	67	62	100	74	63	117	100
EU	49.262.646	100	100	100	100	86	79	109	100

1) The base of this table is the gross rent in pps, after subtraction of housing allowance

2) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

3) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields (IRE, GRE): below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 37: Share of monthly rent of household income¹⁾ of senior citizen households²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	all households	"young" senior citizens ⁴⁾	"old" senior citizens	EU = 100			all households = 100	
					all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	1.010.130	24,5	24,3	23,9	106	104	94	99	98
NL	3.079.224	23,7	24,3	26,9	103	104	105	102	113
BEL	1.018.837	21,8	22,7	26,9	95	97	105	104	123
FR	9.209.258	21,0	21,8	23,9	91	94	94	104	114
IRE	268.290	12,5	9,8	10,0	54	42	39	79	80
IT	4.469.608	19,7	21,1	20,5	86	91	80	107	104
GRE	740.851	22,1	29,8	26,6	96	128	104	135	120
SP	1.362.741	15,9	11,7	12,9	69	50	50	74	81
POR	747.189	9,3	5,7	9,4	40	24	37	61	101
AU	1.234.720	16,5	14,5	16,7	72	63	65	88	101
SW	1.625.724	29,6	31,3	31,5	128	135	124	106	107
GER	19.473.273	26,3	27,0	28,8	114	116	113	103	110
UK	5.022.801	21,1	20,7	24,9	92	89	98	98	118
EU	49.262.646	23,0	23,2	25,5	100	100	100	101	111

1) % of monthly rent of monthly household income (in pps); after subtraction of housing allowance

2) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

3) Only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66%

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 38: Average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for all senior citizen households¹⁾ who are owners of dwellings²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ³⁾	EU = 100			all households = 100			"old" senior citizens = 100	
		all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	1.335.281	230	480	491	100	39	15	266	100
NL	3.373.529	217	376	474	100	32	15	216	100
BEL	2.942.586	102	18	0	100	3	0	0	100
FR	12.634.036	123	192	92	100	29	5	572	100
IRE	915.855	83	50	38	100	11	3	356	100
IT	15.142.293	27	24	45	100	16	11	144	100
GRE	2.832.252	12	8	9	100	13	5	238	100
SP	10.337.931	49	21	39	100	8	6	144	100
POR	2.178.053	42	22	40	100	10	7	151	100
AU	1.605.070	52	65	75	100	23	10	238	100
SW									
GER	14.218.854	142	161	184	100	21	9	239	100
UK	16.676.135	138	81	132	100	11	7	167	100
EU	84.191.876	100	100	100	100	19	7	273	100

1) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

2) Amount in pps

3) only households of owners of dwellings

Part B - Table 39: Share of senior citizen households¹⁾ for which housing costs are a heavy financial burden

COUNTRY	number of households ²⁾	% of all households	% of "young" senior citizens ³⁾	% of "old" senior citizens	EU = 100			all households = 100	
					all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	2.345.411	6,5	4,3		34	25			
NL	6.452.753	2,8	3,2		15	19			
BEL	3.961.424	23,1	18,6	18,8	122	107	109	80	81
FR	21.843.295	18,0	16,3	15,8	95	94	92	91	88
IRE	1.184.145	15,4	14,7	9,7	81	85	56	95	63
IT	19.611.900	40,9	41,6	44,3	216	240	258	102	108
GRE	3.573.103	26,2	24,7	21,9	138		127	95	84
SP	11.700.672	28,7	28,4	27,7	152	164	161	99	97
POR	2.925.242	23,5	22,9	27,6	124	132	161	98	118
AU	2.839.789	10,8	7,3	9,9	57	42	58	67	92
SW									
GER	33.692.127	14,7	7,7	9,6	78	44	56	52	65
UK	21.698.936	6,2			33				
EU	131.828.797	18,9	17,3	17,2	100	100	100	91	91

1) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

2) only households in rented accommodation with a maximum share of monthly rent of monthly household income of 66% and households of owners of dwellings

3) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields (DEN, NL, UK): below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part B - Table 40: Index of dwelling quality of senior citizen households¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households	dwelling quality index ²⁾			EU = 100			all households = 100	
		all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	2.420.775	1,83	1,92	1,81	102	107	106	105	99
NL	6.651.732	1,96	1,97	1,95	109	110	114	101	100
BEL	4.156.875	1,85	1,85	1,71	103	103	100	100	92
FR	22.634.225	1,54	1,54	1,42	86	86	83	100	92
IRE	1.221.924	1,90	1,88	1,78	106	105	104	99	94
IT	21.458.829	1,85	1,81	1,72	103	101	101	98	93
GRE	3.833.123	1,87	1,82	1,67	104	101	98	98	90
SP	12.625.155	1,73	1,68	1,60	97	94	94	97	93
POR	3.286.934	1,60	1,47	1,27	89	82	74	92	79
AU	3.190.073	1,75	1,77	1,62	98	99	95	101	93
SW	4.503.894	1,87	1,93	1,88	104	107	110	103	101
GER	36.151.813	1,81	1,88	1,77	101	104	104	104	98
UK	23.939.353	1,91	1,93	1,87	107	107	110	101	98
EU	146.074.705	1,79	1,80	1,71	100	100	100	100	95

1) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

2) The dwelling quality index has three steps:

* it is 0 for dwellings without bath

* it is 1 for dwellings with bath and without terrace

* it is 2 for dwellings with bath and with terrace

(Other quality characteristics than 'bath' and 'terrace' are not available for all countries.)

Part B - Table 41: Occupancy density¹⁾ of senior citizen households²⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	EU = 100			all households = 100	
					all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	2.419.881	0,62	0,46	0,45	89	86	92	75	73
NL	6.651.732	0,52	0,39	0,38	75	72	79	75	74
BEL	4.136.113	0,63	0,50	0,44	90	93	90	80	70
FR	22.663.040	0,68	0,51	0,48	97	95	99	75	72
IRE	1.227.282	0,67	0,51	0,43	96	96	89	77	65
IT	21.435.688	0,84	0,65	0,58	121	121	119	77	69
GRE	3.833.124	0,94	0,73	0,68	136	136	139	78	72
SP	12.618.808	0,75	0,48	0,42	109	89	87	63	56
POR	3.286.934	0,86	0,65	0,55	124	121	112	76	64
AU	3.191.680	0,69	0,53	0,49	99	99	100	78	71
SW	4.499.056	0,64	0,49	0,49	93	91	100	75	75
GER	35.937.599	0,68	0,55	0,51	98	102	104	81	75
UK	23.704.162	0,58	0,45	0,41	84	84	84	78	71
EU	145.605.099	0,69	0,54	0,49	100	100	100	77	70

1) number of persons divided by number of rooms

2) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

Part B - Table 42: Index of the total quality of the housing situation of the senior citizen households¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	total quality index ¹⁾			EU = 100			all households = 100	
		all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	2.407.607	0,90	0,92	0,95	105	106	109	103	105
NL	6.650.219	0,87	0,90	0,91	102	103	104	102	104
BEL	4.119.722	0,84	0,85	0,85	99	98	98	101	101
FR	22.634.224	0,79	0,79	0,83	93	91	95	100	104
IRE	1.205.007	0,90	0,90	0,90	105	103	103	101	100
IT	21.435.688	0,82	0,83	0,81	95	95	93	102	100
GRE	3.833.124	0,81	0,84	0,82	94	96	94	104	101
SP	12.616.180	0,81	0,83	0,82	95	95	94	102	101
POR	3.286.934	0,74	0,73	0,72	87	83	82	98	97
AU	3.175.028	0,88	0,89	0,88	103	103	101	101	100
SW	4.235.853	0,93	0,96	0,95	108	110	109	103	103
GER	35.330.578	0,92	0,96	0,94	107	110	108	105	102
UK	23.576.896	0,88	0,88	0,89	102	102	102	101	101
EU	144.507.061	0,86	0,87	0,87	100	100	100	102	102

1) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

2) The total quality index is a summary of the results of tables 9 to 13:

- * The index of dwelling quality, with a range from "0" to "2" is divided by 2, to reach a range from "0" to "1"
- * The occupancy density is recoded: occupancy density from 1,26 thru highest is "0", occupancy density up to 1,25 is "1"
- * Building condition, residential environment, social environment: Index is "0" or "1"; "0" means low quality, "1" means high quality
- * All indicators are added and the sum is divided by 5
- * SW: only dwelling quality, occupancy density and quality of social environment available; so the sum is divided by 3
- * GER: only dwelling quality and occupancy density available; so the sum is divided by 2
- * the table shows the means of the total-quality- indicator of the households

Part B - Table 43: Age-dependent underoccupancy

COUNTRY	number of all households	% of senior citizen households in underoccupied dwellings ¹⁾	number of senior citizen households	% of senior citizen households in underoccupied dwellings ¹⁾
DEN	2.423.208	14,4	585.137	59,4
NL	6.655.891	18,0	1.412.044	85,1
BEL	4.178.680	18,4	1.156.695	66,4
FR	23.728.449	16,4	6.001.285	64,9
IRE	1.237.362	16,8	252.683	82,0
IT	21.458.828	14,5	6.005.141	51,8
GRE	3.833.124	7,5	1.047.635	27,5
SP	12.626.130	18,6	2.868.973	81,7
POR	3.287.000	13,5	732.325	60,8
AU	3.199.700	14,0	723.748	61,7
SW	4.540.607	12,1	1.053.590	52,2
GER	36.867.000	12,8	9.485.837	49,6
UK	24.285.000	20,6	7.122.053	70,2
EU	148.320.979	15,7	38.447.146	60,6

1) a dwelling is underoccupied, if there is one person in the household and the number of rooms without kitchen is greater than 2 or if there are two persons in the household and the number of rooms without kitchen is greater than 3

Part B - Table 44: Social isolation of senior citizen households

COUNTRY	number of households	%share of social isolation ¹⁾			EU=100			all households = 100		
		all households	"young" ²⁾ senior citizens	"old" ²⁾ senior citizens	all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens	all households	"young" senior citizens	"old" senior citizens
DEN	2.371.225	22,8	23,0	23,7	89	92	77	100	101	104
NL	6.471.625	16,9	16,8	18,4	66	67	60	100	99	109
BEL	3.943.744	30,4	28,4	23,1	119	114	75	100	93	76
FR	23.601.178	38,9	46,8	58,3	152	187	189	100	120	150
IRE	1.218.921	5,8	4,9	8,9	23	20	29	100	84	154
IT	19.734.173	22,0	22,5	29,7	86	90	96	100	102	135
GRE	3.805.436	10,4	13,4	12,9	41	54	42	100	128	124
SP	12.438.311	8,4	7,4	8,7	33	30	28	100	88	104
POR	3.267.853	30,4	29,9	34,7	119	119	113	100	98	114
AU	3.198.105	29,9	34,2	44,4	117	137	144	100	114	148
SW	4.540.607	13,1	16,9	17,6	51	68	57	100	129	135
GER	36.632.828	35,5	29,4	36,9	139	118	120	100	83	104
UK	22.709.600	14,6	11,8	15,9	57	47	52	100	81	109
EU	143.933.606	25,5	25,0	30,8	100	100	100	100	98	121

1) social isolation: meets friends or relatives less often than once a week

2) "young" senior citizen households: reference person between 65 and 74; "old" senior citizen households: reference person aged 75 or more

Part C - Table 1: Level of housing costs

COUNTRY	number of households	monthly housing costs, gross; before subtraction of housing allowance (in pps)										
		rent							amount to pay for out-standing loan or mortgage ³⁾		mean ⁴⁾ of all dwellings	adjusted mean ⁵⁾ of all dwellings
		social housing ¹⁾			private rental sector			whole rental sector	owner occupied dwellings	single family housing		
		cheapest ²⁾ segment	other segments	together	cheapest ²⁾ segment	other segments	together					
DEN	2.287.818	243	452	398	190	375	327	369	316	460	404	500
NL	6.214.113	199	359	319	140	294	256	311	381	424	365	452
BEL	3.888.393	<i>103</i>	248	212	169	385	330	295	158	199	220	346
FR	21.141.355	211	364	324	163	450	379	355	242	231	284	383
IRE	1.165.433	49	117	99	<i>133</i>	396	330	177	<i>178</i>	157	162	294
IT	18.987.766	55	211	172	122	346	289	253	58	44	98	230
GRE	3.531.534				137	321	273	271	33	15	75	209
SP	11.648.194		215	163	32	257	201	197	108	73	105	256
POR	2.810.302	4	46	35	15	145	113	96	182	43	85	210
AU	2.773.486	141	310	267	123	332	280	273	101	101	178	272
SW	1.625.723	-	-	-	-	-	-	357	-	-	-	-
GER	29.065.551	217	383	341	249	484	425	410	209	303	341	424
UK	20.708.452	171	310	274	170	490	408	311	284	260	274	404
EU	125.848.120	184	339	300	188	429	369	341	135	217	242	353

1) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

2) The cheapest 25% of all dwellings with 1 or 2 rooms / 3 or 4 rooms / 5 or more than 5 rooms

3) This amount doesn't include costs of energy, water, garbage removal, saving for repairs and maintenance.

That's why owners without any loan to repay have no housing costs in these two columns.

4) This mean underestimates the real mean of monthly housing costs because costs of owners for energy, water, ... are not included.

5) When calculating this 'adjusted mean' there was imputed a monthly amount of 170 Euro (in pps) to each owner for costs of energy, water, ...

Part C - Table 2: Cost differences¹⁾ between the individual sectors with rental dwellings

COUNTRY	number of households	social housing ²⁾ :	privat rental sector:	average of	cheapest segments:	other segments:	average of	whole rental sector:	average of
		other segments minus cheapest segment	other segments minus cheapest segment	other segments minus cheapest segment	privat rental sector minus social housing	privat rental sector minus social housing	privat rental sector minus social housing	other segments minus cheapest segment	both kinds ³⁾ of differences
DEN	1.004.704	208	185	197	-53	-77	-65	199	131
NL	3.050.825	160	154	157	-59	-65	-62	159	110
BEL	1.006.072	<i>145</i>	216	180	66	137	101	194	141
FR	8.844.418	153	287	220	-48	86	19	227	120
IRE	262.652	68	263	166	84	279	182	136	174
IT	4.325.104	156	224	190	67	135	101	203	146
GRE	740.851				29	49	39	184	106
SP	1.355.533		225	206	4	43	23	221	115
POR	747.189	<i>42</i>	130	86	11	99	55	112	71
AU	1.231.134	168	208	188	-18	22	2	187	95
SW	1.625.723	-	-	-	-	-	-	156	-
GER	14.891.188	166	234	200	32	101	66	222	133
UK	4.858.333	140	320	230	0	180	90	190	160
EU	43.943.726	155	240	198	4	89	47	206	122

1) Differences between the average housing costs (in pps) before reduction of housing allowance

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

3) Average of:

* average of other segments minus cheapest segment

* average of privat rental sector minus social housing

NL and DEN: average of the absolute amounts of both kinds of differences

Part C - Table 3: Rent level in relation to level of monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage

COUNTRY	a) monthly rent, gross; after subtraction of housing allowance (in pps)			b) average monthly amount to pay for outstanding loan or mortgage for accomodation (in pps); owner-households with outstanding loan			Differences (b minus a)		
	all households	poor households	not poor households	all households	poor households ¹⁾	not poor households	all households	poor households	not poor households
DEN	307	185	342	523	257	535	216	72	193
NL	299	252	309	472	315	480	173	64	170
BEL	291	203	317	444	527	438	153	324	121
FR	302	148	347	518	358	530	215	210	182
IRE	162	96	214	354	182	364	192	86	150
IT	250	169	273	389	306	396	139	137	123
GRE	268	182	277	246	102	266	-23	-80	-11
SP	193	120	205	384	314	396	191	194	191
POR	95	63	103	331	287	335	236	224	232
AU	262	176	276	255	274	254	-7	99	-22
SW	306	191	332	-	-	-	-	-	-
GER	390	272	410	545	516	548	155	244	139
UK	245	155	303	447	371	455	202	216	153
EU	318	195	348	467	389	475	150	194	127

1) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part C - Table 4: Rent level in relation to level of household income of vulnerable households

COUNTRY	% of the rent ¹⁾ (in the respective segment) of the average household income of all ...											
	... poor households			... single parents			... young couples with children			... senior citizen households		
	cheapest segment ²⁾	other segments	all segments	cheapest segment	other segments	all segments	cheapest segment	other segments	all segments	cheapest segment	other segments	all segments
	of all rental dwellings ³⁾			of all rental dwellings			of all rental dwellings			of all rental dwellings		
DEN	29,8	50,9	41,7		27,1	25,6		18,0	16,8	19,8	31,0	28,3
NL	21,7	40,3	33,5	11,7	23,3	19,7		16,5	15,9	13,0	23,9	20,9
BEL	17,5	31,7	24,8		20,4	18,5		14,6	11,7	7,5	17,8	14,9
FR	21,1	38,9	32,5	14,7	30,1	27,2	8,8	20,2	18,5	12,1	27,1	21,2
IRE	9,1	20,8	17,3		23,9	19,3		8,5	8,4			6,3
IT	14,2	36,1	26,7		23,0	20,9	7,8	20,1	17,0	7,7	25,4	18,9
GRE	30,4	53,8	41,1					19,5	17,4		35,5	30,6
SP	5,4	33,2	22,6					17,1	15,6	3,5	21,1	12,7
POR	3,3	21,7	14,7			13,4		11,3	9,9	1,5	7,7	5,2
AU	15,4	37,4	28,2		25,7	22,9		15,3	13,6	10,3	22,6	16,3
SW	37,1	62,7	54,9		36,1	34,8	15,3	24,9	22,9	22,5	32,6	30,4
GER	28,1	46,7	39,4	22,7	41,7	37,6	14,2	24,8	22,5	15,8	27,0	23,9
UK	23,1	46,5	39,3		29,9	27,0		14,9	13,5	13,6	26,1	21,9
EU	23,5	44,5	36,7	15,9	31,6	28,6	10,3	20,6	18,6	13,2	27,4	22,8

1) % of average monthly rent (before subtraction of housing allowance) of average monthly household income (in pps);

2) The cheapest 25% of all dwellings with 1 or 2 rooms / 3 or 4 rooms / 5 or more than 5 rooms

3) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part C - Table 5: Size and structure of the stock of affordable rented dwellings¹⁾

COUNTRY	number of rented dwellings	affordable rented dwellings in % of all		social	private rented	together	afford. Rented dwellings with			average monthly rent ²⁾ of affordable dwellings	
		rented dwellings	dwellings	housing	dwellings		1 or 2 rooms	3 or more rooms	together	EU = 100	in % of average rent of all dwellings
				in % of affordable rented dwellings			in % of affordable rented dwellings				
DEN	478.843	46	20	54	46	100	46	54	100	114	70
NL	2.353.394	74	35	86	14	100	9	91	100	120	88
BEL	640.430	61	15	40	60	100	27	73	100	94	72
FR	4.087.835	43	17	54	46	100	17	83	100	113	73
IRE	224.070	81	18	79	21	100	14	86	100	51	65
IT	1.953.007	42	9	50	50	100	21	79	100	55	49
GRE	71.707	9	2		92	100		87	100	40	33
SP	793.152	57	6	13	87	100		95	100	39	44
POR	596.627	78	18	27	73	100	19	81	100	21	48
AU	834.704	66	26	55	45	100	32	68	100	91	75
SW	178.696	10	4	-	-		43	57		98	63
GER	4.799.544	23	13	26	74	100	23	77	100	119	68
UK	3.256.785	60	13	83	17	100	18	82	100	105	74
EU	20.268.794	39	14	55	45	100	19	81	100	100	67

1) A rented dwelling is affordable if:

it has 1 room and its rent is lower than 33% of the income of a poor household with 1 person (before reduction of housing allowance)
the same with dwellings with 2, 3, 4 and 5 or more rooms and poor households with 2, 3, 4 and 5 or more persons

2) rent in pps, gross, before subtraction of housing allowance

Part C - Table 6: Number of affordable rented dwellings in relation to the number of vulnerable households

COUNTRY	number of affordable rented dwellings	affordable ¹⁾ rented dwellings in % of poor households	affordable ¹⁾ rented dwellings with 1 or 2 rooms ²⁾ in % of young adults ³⁾	affordable ¹⁾ rented dwellings with 3 or 4 rooms ²⁾ in % of young couples with children
DEN	478.843	124	16	144
NL	2.353.394	284	5	256
BEL	640.430	99	6	102
FR	4.087.835	92	5	138
IRE	224.070	82	3	110
IT	1.953.007	49	2	111
GRE	71.707	8		19
SP	793.152	35		59
POR	596.627	79	4	116
AU	834.704	164	11	159
SW	178.696	24	3	23
GER	4.799.544	80	5	144
UK	3.256.785	53	4	137
EU	20.268.794	73	4	125

1) A rented dwelling is affordable if:

- it has 1 room and its rent is lower than 33% of the income of a poor household with 1 person (before reduction of housing allowance)
- the same with dwellings with 2, 3, 4 and 5 or more rooms and poor households with 2, 3, 4 and 5 or more persons

2) number of rooms without kitchen

3) population between 16 and 35

Part C - Table 7: Share of households with housing allowance

COUNTRY	number of households	% of households with housing allowance ⁴⁾							
		social housing		private rental sector		whole rental sector		owner-occupied dwellings	single family housing
		cheapest ²⁾ segment	other segments	cheapest ²⁾ segment	other segments	cheapest ²⁾ segment	other segments		
DEN	491.267	47	57		33	36	47		3
NL	353.715	10	12	0		9	11		1
BEL	48.751			0					
FR	4.654.757	56	52	36	37	45	43	5	7
IRE	18.286	0	0					0	
IT	113.474							1	
GRE	23.207	0							
SP	83.549	0							
POR	3.202	0	0	0	0	0			
AU	190.286		12				8	7	6
SW	1.112.999	-	-	-	-	24	40	24	19
GER	1.392.440		8	7	6	9	6	-	-
UK	1.739.160	35	41		21	31	35	0	1
EU	10.225.093	28	29	12	12	18	19	2	3

Table 8: Relevance of housing allowance for all households in rented dwellings

COUNTRY	number of households	Share of households with allowance ⁴⁾	Average allowance ³⁾ of		Average housing costs ^{1) 3)}		Difference (b minus a)	Allowance ¹⁾ as a share of	
			households with allowance	all households	a) before reduction of allowance	b) after		rent before subtraction of allowance ¹⁾	household income of all households ¹⁾
DEN	1.047.060	43,5	141	61	373	312	-61	16,5	4,3
NL	3.185.788	10,6	105	11	310	299	-11	3,6	0,7
BEL	1.052.290			5	300	295	-5	1,5	0,3
FR	9.558.468	43,8	116	51	354	304	-51	14,3	3,1
IRE	276.050			15	182	167	-15	8,1	1,0
IT	4.698.298			1	256	255	-1	0,3	0,0
GRE	782.644			2	274	272	-2	0,8	0,1
SP	1.401.555			4	203	200	-4	1,7	0,2
POR	763.151			0	100	100	0	0,3	0,0
AU	1.269.041	7,6	141	11	277	266	-11	3,9	0,6
SW	1.764.045	35,7	136	49	359	310	-49	13,6	4,2
GER	20.518.614	8,2	71	6	398	392	-6	1,5	0,3
UK	5.469.602	31,7	188	60	325	265	-60	18,4	4,3
EU	51.786.606	17,9	124	22	344	322	-22	6,4	1,4

1) of all households in rented dwellings (with or without allowance)

2) The cheapest 25% of all dwellings with 1 or 2 rooms / 3 or 4 rooms / 5 or more than 5 rooms

3) in pps

4) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part C - Table 9: Effects of housing allowance for the rent burden of the poor

COUNTRY	before subtraction of housing allowance:			after subtraction of housing allowance:			Difference of the %-share (in points)
	share of the rent of the household income of poor households in rented dwellings		position (lowest share = 1)	share of the rent of the household income of poor households in rented dwellings		position (lowest share = 1)	
	in %	EU = 100		in %	EU = 100		
DEN	41,7	114	12	31,4	109	9	-10,2
NL	33,5	91	8	33,2	115	10	-0,3
BEL	24,8	67	4	26,5	92	8	1,8
FR	32,5	89	7	21,3	74	4	-11,3
IRE	17,3	47	2	13,8	48	1	-3,5
IT	26,7	73	5	24,3	84	6	-2,4
GRE	41,1	112	11	35,3	123	12	-5,8
SP	22,6	61	3	20,5	71	3	-2,0
POR	14,7	40	1	14,5	51	2	-0,2
AU	28,2	77	6	24,2	84	5	-4,0
SW	54,9	150	13	35,0	122	11	-19,9
GER	39,4	107	10	38,7	135	13	-0,6
UK	39,3	107	9	25,3	88	7	-14,0
EU	36,7	100		28,8	100		-7,9

Part C - Table 10: Effects of the housing allowance for the poverty rate

COUNTRY	number of households	average disposable income ¹⁾	poverty threshold (60% of the median)	number	rate (in%)	average disposable income ¹⁾	poverty threshold (60% of the median)	number	rate (in%)	Difference between the two poverty rates (in points)
		without allowance		of poor households ²⁾		with allowance		of poor households ²⁾		
DEN	2.423.208	13.442	8.065	385.741	15,9	13.680	8.208	303.379	12,5	-3,4
NL	6.655.891	13.673	8.204	829.661	12,5	13.677	8.206	797.233	12,0	-0,5
BEL	4.178.680	13.896	8.338	648.795	15,5	13.898	8.339	637.010	15,2	-0,3
FR	23.728.449	12.700	7.620	4.429.830	18,7	12.794	7.677	3.964.623	16,7	-2,0
IRE	1.237.362	10.518	6.311	274.095	22,2	10.551	6.330	269.765	21,8	-0,3
IT	21.458.828	9.756	5.854	4.006.717	18,7	9.756	5.854	4.005.959	18,7	0,0
GRE	3.833.124	7.569	4.541	863.251	22,5	7.575	4.545	860.793	22,5	-0,1
SP	12.626.130	8.197	4.918	2.239.610	17,7	8.205	4.923	2.232.836	17,7	-0,1
POR	3.287.000	6.850	4.110	752.361	22,9	6.850	4.110	752.361	22,9	0,0
AU	3.199.700	13.636	8.182	508.349	15,9	13.678	8.207	483.222	15,1	-0,8
SW	4.540.607	10.962	6.577	751.591	16,6	11.102	6.661	521.957	11,5	-5,1
GER	36.867.000	13.573	8.144	6.022.980	16,3	13.576	8.146	5.832.011	15,8	-0,5
UK	24.285.000	13.228	7.937	6.121.422	25,2	13.307	7.984	5.688.572	23,4	-1,8
EU	148.320.979	11.982	7.189	27.834.403	18,8	12.052	7.231	26.349.721	17,8	-1,0

1) in pps

2) In this paper the rate of poor households is the proportion of poor **households** of the total number of **households** (and not the proportion of poor people)

Part C - Table 11: Shares of the most important housing sectors

COUNTRY	number of households	% of the given housing sectors among all households							
		social housing ¹⁾		private rental sector		whole rental sector ²⁾		owner-occupied dwellings	single family housing
		cheapest ³⁾ segment	other segments	cheapest ³⁾ segment	other segments	cheapest ³⁾ segment	other segments		
DEN	2.287.818	7	19	5	13	11	33	11	45
NL	6.214.113	11	32	2	5	12	37	7	44
BEL	3.888.393	2	6	5	14	7	19	8	66
FR	21.141.355	5	14	6	17	11	31	11	47
IRE	1.165.434	4	11	2	6	6	17	7	76
IT	18.987.766	2	5	4	12	6	17	48	29
GRE	3.531.534			5	15	6	15	35	44
SP	11.648.194	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	3	8	3	9	52	36
POR	2.810.302	2	4	5	16	7	20	20	53
AU	2.773.486	6	18	5	16	11	33	15	41
SW	4.218.286	-	-	-	-	9	29	16	46
GER	29.065.552	2	7	11	32	13	38	18	31
UK	20.708.452	4	13	2	5	6	17	7	70
EU	128.440.685	4	10	5	15	9	26	22	44

1) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

2) Sum of whole rental sector, owner occupied sector and single family housing = 100%

3) The cheapest 25% of all dwellings with 1 or 2 rooms / 3 or 4 rooms / 5 or more than 5 rooms

Part C - Table 12: Relation of housing costs between tenancy agreements with longer and shorter terms until now

COUNTRY	number of households	monthly rent ¹⁾ in dwellings with 1 to 3 rooms		Relation between b) and a) (a=100)	monthly rent ¹⁾ in dwellings with more than 3 rooms		Relation between b) and a) (a=100)	geometric mean of both relations
		moved to this address			moved to this address			
		a) before 1992 ²⁾	b) since 1992	a) before 1992	b) since 1992			
DEN	1.017.273	326	330	101	395	601	152	124
NL	3.075.479	288	280	97	322	334	104	100
BEL	999.062	252	307	122	259	383	148	134
FR	8.965.129	288	353	122	349	452	130	126
IRE	267.094	119	259	218	123	252	205	211
IT	4.497.969	211	309	147	286	322	113	129
GRE	765.723	232	286	123	263	427	162	141
SP	1.396.162	127	321	253	141	289	206	228
POR	730.460	61	203	333	77	231	299	316
AU	1.206.585	226	289	128	324	420	130	129
SW	1.764.045	338	332	98	500	509	102	100
GER	19.321.446	332	389	117	471	626	133	125
UK	4.993.651	262	331	126	295	420	142	134
EU	49.000.079	287	354	123	335	466	139	131

1) monthly rent, gross, before subtraction of housing allowance (in pps)

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample

Part C - Table 13: Average length of occupancy in rented dwellings

COUNTRY	number of households ¹⁾	Average length of occupancy (in years)			
		households ¹⁾ with			all households ¹⁾
		1 person ²⁾	2 persons	3 or more persons	
DEN	410.284	2,7	3,8	3,4	3,1
NL	1.105.203	3,8	3,8	6,3	4,4
BEL	457.775	3,7	2,9	4,9	3,9
FR	4.318.071	2,9	2,5	3,8	3,1
IRE	135.200	3,8	2,1	6,4	4,8
IT	1.128.216	5,8	5,3	5,9	5,7
GRE	322.068	5,1	4,1	5,8	5,2
SP	654.220	1,8	4,9	8,6	6,3
POR	218.302		5,0	8,6	7,7
AU	560.834	6,3	6,5	6,8	6,6
SW	889.296	2,5	2,2	2,7	2,5
GER	7.425.333	3,8	3,1	4,8	3,8
UK	1.748.783	1,6	2,4	4,6	2,9
EU	19.373.586	3,4	3,2	5,0	3,9

1) Only households with reference persons less than 41 years old

2) Figures printed in italics: 20 to 49 observations in unweighted sample; grey fields: below 20 observations in unweighted sample

Part C - Table 14: Volume and structure of housing subsidies

Indicators for volume and structure	Netherlands	France	Spain	Austria	Sweden	United Kingdom
GDP in mio Euro ⁸⁾	444 649	1 355 100	494 140	182 486	239 449	1 330 000
number of households	6 941 000	24 482 000	12 026 000	3 163 100	4 118 000	24 742 000
volume of housing subsidies per poor household (in Euro) ⁹⁾	8 029 ¹⁾	4 667	1 881	6 014	4 665 ²⁾	3 021
volume of housing subsidies per household (in Euro)	895 ¹⁾	871	350	966	850 ²⁾	747
volume of housing subsidies as a share of GDP	1,4% ¹⁾	1,6%	0,9%	1,7%	1,5% ²⁾	1,4% ³⁾
share of subsidies for urban renewal (of all subsidies)		6% ⁶⁾		22%		
share of indirect subsidies (of all subsidies)	48%	21%	63%	12%	34%	12% ⁴⁾
share of direct supply sided subsidies (of all subsidies)	26%	19%	21%	81%	14%	2%
direct supply sided subsidies per household (in Euro)	221	168	73	782	117	106
direct supply sided subsidies as a share of GDP	0,4%	0,3%	0,2%	1,4%	0,2%	0,2%
share of direct subsidies for the owner sector (of all subsidies)		18%	16%	62%	4%	5%
share of direct demand sided subsidies (of all subsidies)	26%	60%	16%	5% ⁵⁾	52%	86%
share of direct demand sided subsidies (of all <i>direct</i> subsidies)	50%	76%	44%	6%	79%	98%
share of direct demand sided subsidies for the private rental sector (of all subsidies)		24%	0%	1%		22%
share of means for emergency measures (of all subsidies)				1,7% ⁷⁾		

1) source: Donner, C. (2000), p. 424; completed by calculations of SRZ

2) source: Donner, C. (2000), p. 468; completed by calculations of SRZ

3) The overall level of subsidy (in % of GDP) has fallen considerably since the early 1990 when it was over 3% - one of the highest in the EU.

4) The costs of the right to buy and of capital gains tax exemptions are not included; Mortgage interest relief which is the most important element of indirect subsidies was abolished in April 2000. So actually indirect subsidies have a smaller share.

5) without emergency measures

6) share of housing benefits for dwelling improvement; without renewal funding by other ministries

7) help for homeless people, different housing help for asylum seekers and refugees; without housing subsidies which are part of the social security

8) Year of the figure for the GDP: Spain and Austria: 1997, France 1999, United Kingdom: 2001, Netherlands and Sweden: 2002

9) Year(s) of the figures for housing subsidies: France: 1999, Spain: Average 1995-1998, Austria: Average 1995-2000, United Kingdom: Average 1996-2001; Netherlands, Sweden: 2000

Source: Supplementary research of the SOCOHO partner institutes in their countries

Part C - Table 15: Rent regulation for private and social rented accommodation

Kind of rent regulation for new lettings

Housing sector	% of dwellings with ...	Netherlands	France	Spain	Austria	Sweden	United Kingdom
Social Housing	object-related cost rent	0	100 ¹²⁾	0	53 ¹⁾	0	
	local reference rent	0	0	0	0	0	6)
	dwelling value rent	100	0	0	0	100	7)
	other rent limitation	0	0	100 ³⁾	47	0	
	free rent	0	0	0	0	0	0
private rented sector	object-related cost rent	0	0	0	0	0	0
	local reference rent	0	0	0	45 ¹³⁾	0	0
	dwelling value rent	100	0	0	33	100	0
	other rent limitation	0	3 ¹⁰⁾	0	0	0	0
	free rent	0	97 ¹¹⁾	100 ⁴⁾	22	0	100 ⁵⁾

Average rent level in Euro per m2

Social Housing		4,1 ⁸⁾	1,5	4,8 / 5,4 ²⁾		
Private rented Sector		5,2 / 6,3 ⁹⁾	4,7	5,9 / 6,2 ²⁾		

- 1) with an upper limit for possible costs
- 2) depending of kind of regulation
- 3) for private developers of projects in the Protected Housing Sector upper limit is 4% of the "theoretical price of sale" (actual: 779,71 euros per m2)
- 4) absolute freedom to establish rents and also in their updating if contract lasts for a longer period than five years;
 - until 5 years: updating according to Price index
- 5) All new lettings are free. Regulated rent applies only to tenancies existing pre 1989. In 2000 only 5% of all privately rented dwellings have a 'fair rent'.
- 6) Housing act of 1989 requires that local authorities in determining their rent relativities should have regard to relativities in other rented sectors. In 1999 29% of authorities were comparing their rents with those in the private rented sector and 36% with those in the housing association sector.
- 7) 54% of local authorities use a 'point system' based on rent pooling
- 8) Enquête Nationale Logement 1996-1997, INSEE. Only empty rental dwellings are considered.
- 9) limited / free rent
- 10) rent law of 1948
- 11) No limits for initial rent but several regulations to limit its growth
- 12) Initial rent is linked to the construction costs with an upper limit per square meter according to equipment and localisation of the dwelling. During the tenant contract possible increase of rent is regulated by yearly variation of construction costs. When tenant changes, rent can be freely increased under the regulated upper limit.
- 13) The regulation is not strong. There is nearly no difference to a completely free rent.

Source: Supplementary research of the SOCOHO partner institutes in their countries

Part C - Table 16: Income-dependence of monthly housing costs in rental sector

Housing sector	Kind of income dependence	Netherlands	France	Spain	Austria	Sweden	United Kingdom
Social Housing	Housing allowance						
	% of dwellings with possible cost reduction	100	100	100	100	100	100
	% of dwellings with actual cost reduction	?	49	?	6	?	74
	average housing allowance in % of the rent	?	56	88 (?)	42	?	90 ³⁾
	Income related rent supplements						
	% of dwellings with possible cost increase	0	90	0	0	0	0
	% of dwellings with actual cost increase	0	5	0	0	0	0
	average cost increase in % of the rent	-	18	-	-	-	-
	Income dependent rent						
	% of dwellings with possible income depend.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dwellings with actual income dependence	0	0	0	0	0	0
private rented dwellings	Housing allowance						
	% of dwellings with possible cost reduction	1)	100	2)	80	100	100
	% of dwellings with actual cost reduction		36	?	2	?	36
	average housing benefit in % of the rent		43	?	38	?	67 ³⁾
	Income related rent supplements						
	% of dwellings with possible cost increase	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dwellings with actual cost increase	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Income dependent rent						
	% of dwellings with possible income depend.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dwellings with actual income dependence	0	0	0	0	0	0
	together	Housing allowance					
% of dwellings with possible cost reduction			100	?	90	100	100
% of dwellings with actual cost reduction		32	42	?	4	16	60
average allowance/benefit in % of the rent			49	?	40	?	82 ³⁾
Income related rent supplements							
% of dwellings with possible cost increase		0	42	0	0	0	0
% of dwellings with actual cost increase		0	2	0	0	0	0
Income dependent rent							
% of dwellings with possible income depend.		0	0	0	0	0	0
% of dwellings with actual income dependence		0	0	0	0	0	0

1) Rent subsidy is available for private rented dwellings, but not for rooms and not for expensive dwellings

2) Only in some Autonomous Communities.

3) As a share of 'eligible rent' (and not as a share of total rent)

Source: Supplementary research of the SOCOHO partner institutes in their countries

Part C - Table 17: Initial payments in rental sector

Housing sector	Kind of initial payment	Netherlands	France	Spain	Austria	Sweden	United Kingdom	
Social Housing	Advance rent							
	reimbursement when leaving the dwelling	-	-	-	partly	-	-	
	Average level in dwellings with it (in Euro)	-	-	-	7000	-	-	
	Share of yearly new lettings with it (in%)	0	0	0	70	0	0	
	Deposit:							
	reimbursement when leaving the dwelling	yes	yes	-	-	-	-	
	Average level in dwellings with it (in Euro)	1 month rent	max. 2 months rent	-	-	-	-	
	Share of yearly new lettings with it (in%)	?	high share	0	0	0	0	
	Key Money							
	reimbursement when leaving the dwell.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Average level in dwellings with it (in Euro)	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Share of yearly new lettings with it (in%)	0	0	-	0	0	0	
	private rented dwellings ¹⁾	Advance rent						
		reimbursement when leaving the dwelling	-	yes	-	-	-	?
Average level in dwellings with it (in Euro)		-	several months	-	-	-	1 month rent	
Share of yearly new lettings with it (in%)		0	low share	0	0	0	100	
Deposit:								
reimbursement when leaving the dwelling		yes	yes	?	yes	-	?	
Average level in dwellings with it (in Euro)		1 month rent	max. 2 months rent	1-2 months rent	3 months rent	-	1 month rent	
Share of yearly new lettings with it (in%)		?	high share	99	80	0	100	
Key Money								
reimbursement when leaving the dwell.		-	-	-	sometimes	-	?	
Average level in dwellings with it (in Euro)		-	-	-	5000	-	1 additional month	
Share of yearly new lettings with it (in%)		0	0	-	10	0	?	

1) without payment for the agent (if property is let through an agent)

Source: Supplementary research of the SOCOHO partner institutes in their countries

Part C - Table 18: Frequency of fixed term tenancies

Housing sector	unlimited/limited tenancies	Netherlands	France	Spain	Austria	Sweden	United Kingdom
Social Housing	unlimited (in%)	100 ⁸⁾	100	near 100 ³⁾	100	100	100 ⁵⁾
	limited (in%)	0	0	near 0	0	0 ²⁾	0
	total (in %)	100	100	100	100	100	100
private rented dwellings	unlimited (in%)	100	7	0	88	100	5
	limited (in%)	0	93 ⁷⁾	100 ⁴⁾	12 ¹⁾	0 ²⁾	95 ⁶⁾
	total (in %)	100	100	100	100	100	100
together	unlimited (in%)	100	50	1	94	100	68
	limited (in%)	0	50 ⁷⁾	99	6 ¹⁾	0 ²⁾	32
	total (in %)	100	100	0	0	100	100

- 1) among annual new lettings the share of limited tenancies in private rental sector is much higher than 12%. It is 35%.
The respective share within all annual new lettings (in private rental sector and social housing) is higher too:
24% instead of 6%.
- 2) Limited agreements are only possible if a dwelling is sub-let or if it is a room or appartement exclusively for students.
In 1999 0,6% of all households stayed in sub-let dwellings.
- 3) Some of the developers control each year the income level of tenants and, according to that, they renew or not the contract. However, and given that the poorest demand segment is located in this sector, it is quite difficult for the tenants to change their poor condition. So they usually enjoy an indefinite contract.
- 4) Completely freedom of tenancy with the compulsory prorogue for the landlord till five years
- 5) Except tenants on introductory tenancies and tenants housed under the homeless legislation
- 6) Since 1997 all new tenancy agreements are assured shortholds with a fixed term tenancy of a maximum of 6 months.
- 7) among annual new lettings the share of limited tenancies in private rental sector is higher than 93%. It is 97%.
The respective share within all annual new lettings (in private rental sector and social housing) is higher too:
61% instead of 50%.
- 8) Unless the dwelling will be demolished or renovated, then the tenant will be offered a temporary contract.
The same holds for sub-letted dwellings

Source: Supplementary research of the SOCOHO partner institutes in their countries

Part C - Table 19: Statutory protection from eviction in private rental sector

Housing sector	Level of protection	Netherlands	France	Spain	Austria	Sweden	United Kingdom
Social Housing	highest	100	100 ¹⁾	100	100	100	100 ²⁾
	mean	0	0	0	0	0	0
	lowest	0	0	0	0	0	0

private rented dwellings	highest	100	100 ¹⁾	0	71	100	6
	mean	0	0	100	9	0	10
	lowest	0	0	0	20	0	56
	other	0	0	0	0	0	28 ³⁾

together	highest	100	100	1	86	100	59
	mean	0	0	99	4	0	4
	lowest	0	0	0	10	0	24
	other	0	0	0	0	0	13 ³⁾

1) quite the same legislation applies to the private and the social sectors.

2) Social Housing: Only local authorities;

Most tenants of Housing Associations have only a mean level of protection;

3) other tenancy agreements: dwellings which are not accessible to the public, dwellings with a resident landlord, dwellings with no security

Source: Supplementary research of the SOCOHO partner institutes in their countries

Part C - Table 20: Conditions for housing improvement

	Netherlands	France	Spain	Austria	Sweden	United Kingdom
Maintenance regulation in the private rental sector:						
Must part of income from rent be saved for maintenance work?	no	no	Landlord has to pay all necessary repairs without possibility of an increase in rent	yes	no	no
Kind of regulation		Two different lists of compulsory maintenance items exist for the landlord and the tenant		a legally-stipulated large proportion of rent must be saved. Tenants can check it.		?
Can tenants force through necessary maintenance work?	? major can request it and set a time limit	Yes, if the dwelling is not "decent"	?	yes: They can enforce it at arbitration boards in court	yes: with help from rent tribunals	yes: in principle they can do so. But it seldom occurs

rent regulation in case of improvement in private rental sector:

is there an upper limit for rent increases due to improvement?	yes: the maximum rent of the quality level reached by improvement	Free rent sector: no ¹⁾ Social housing: yes ²⁾	yes: with a maximum of 20% of the rent	yes: as a result of court decisions	yes	actually no. But it existed under the 'fair rent' system.
is there legal control of rent increases due to housing improvement?	yes: all rent increases can be checked by anyone because of the existence of the quality point system	Free rent sector: no ¹⁾ Social housing: yes ²⁾	?	yes: if money saved for improvement is not sufficient landlord must apply for rent increases in court or at an arbitration board.	yes: by the rent tribunals	no
Are rent increases due to improvement alleviated by allowances?	yes: as long as the rent is not above a maximum	Yes		yes: by loans which reduce costs and by allowances for low-income households	yes	yes. Housing benefit incorporates an element for housing improvement

Protection from eviction due to improvement in the private rental sector

Is the intention to improve housing a ground for eviction?	No. But in social rental sector it is possible	If the building is to be demolished or to undergo major works threatening habitability: yes	no	Only in two cases: 1. if tenant refuses to have a WC built into his dwelling 2. if a permission of demolition exists		yes, in some cases. But landlord has to follow the correct procedures when attempting to evict a tenant.
In cases of eviction: must a dwelling of the same quality be offered?	yes	No. But a dwelling corresponding to household's need and financial ability must be offered		yes. Two dwellings with same quality and price must be offered.		no

1) But the rent increase proposed by the landlord after improvement may be challenged by the tenant on the basis of neighbourhood references.

2) Including private dwellings under "renewal lease": yes. A decree fixes an upper limit rent according to the dwellings categories.

3) Type of housing improvement subsidies: see the individual reports with the results of supplementary research

Source: Supplementary research of the SOCOHO partner institutes in their countries

Discussion on the Concept of Social Cohesion

Thesis

Ronald van Kempen

Social Cohesion	89
------------------------------	----

Antithesis

Peter Moser

On the restrictive use of the notion of “Social Cohesion”	90
1. Ronald van Kempen's concept and the academic arena	91
2. Ronald van Kempen's concept and the political arena	93
3. Conclusion.....	95
Bibliography.....	96

Synthesis

Karl Czasny

The Concept of Social Cohesion and the SOCOHO project	97
1. Social cohesion in the context of European integration	97
2. The systematic role of the concept of social cohesion.....	100
3. The various levels of social cohesion	104
4. Social cohesion in the context of the SOCOHO project.....	108
Bibliography.....	110

Ronald van Kempen

Social Cohesion

This contribution to the discussion on social cohesion was intended to be published on the following 5 pages. However, the author, Ronald van Kempen, withdrew the permission for publication of his text after the whole report was prepared for print already. The editor, Karl Czasny, does regret this very much but has to respect the withdrawal. Thus, unfortunately one part of the controversy is missing here. Readers interested in the missing part are kindly requested to contact Ronald van Kempen himself: Utrecht University Urban Research Centre Utrecht; e-mail: R.vanKempen@geog.uu.nl

Peter Moser

On the restrictive use of the notion of “Social Cohesion”

Ronald van Kempen sees social cohesion only in terms of events or occurrences that can be sensually experienced by people: in this context socialisation effects, social contacts, and social cohesion become almost synonyms. Lived experience – we are talking about experienced social events - is possible only at the micro level of families, partnerships, clanships, street communities, neighbourhoods at the maximum. Ronald van Kempen does not allow any extension of his social cohesion concept into realms that are beyond these interhuman social contacts. With this selfimposed restriction he confines social cohesion also in a spatial manner: If at all, social cohesion can appear, can be found, can be missed, can be strengthened, can be demolished only in spatially limited areas, such as neighbourhoods or even smaller urban quarters. Thus, questions about social cohesion are confined to the existence or absence of a pub in the street, of the corner shop, of the quality of public space where the residents can meet. On this level, any measures taken to increase the opportunity of people meeting each other and enjoying their being together and communicating with each other, all such measures are qualified as means fostering or even generating social cohesion.

There is nothing really wrong with pointing out these aspects of social cohesion. No doubt, defining the notion that way will help urban politicians, geographers, planners, activists of the civil society, grass roots groups etc struggling for the improvement of every day live in their street, quarter or neighbourhood. However, it has to be criticised that restricting social cohesion to this level is arbitrary. The exclusive validity of the notion at this level is a sheer assertion and has nothing to do with scientific clarifications and a better common understandig. It is certainly for the good to focus on sensually (and hopefully measureable) perceptible practical experience of every day life (be it more or less socially cohesive); but I think we must not stick solely to such a focus and deny societal realities, levels of political or other social activities beyond this kind of a “small is beautiful”-view.

Still, ifwe would do it, it is rather obscuring the social-cohesion-debate’s state of the arts than reveiling the academic and political positions at european level. Let me give just a few examples to illustrate how this is done in Ronald van Kempen’s paper.

1. Ronald van Kempen's concept and the academic arena

FIRST EXAMPLE: Throughout the current debate on social cohesion almost everybody is citing **Kearns & Forrest**; so does Ronald van Kempen in his paper. He does quote them more or less correct – if you define “correct” by “literally without mistake”. However, sticking to such a poor definition of correctness, it would still be “correct” if you were leaving out sentences which follow the quoted one and place it within a certain frame, or if you were not mentioning the limited context to which the cited authors explicitly refer.

Ronald van Kempen is citing Kearns & Forrest to “prove” that social cohesion can only be found in e.g. neighbourhoods. He does not quote Kearns & Forrest when these authors write – in the same paper - : *“For the purposes of this paper¹ the point to note is that it is the neighbourhood which is likely to be the site for many of these mundane routines ...”*² This is something different than asserting that social cohesion exists and can only be observed in neighbourhoods. The original statement of Kearns & Forrest does not allow the conclusion Ronald van Kempen is drawing; instead, the authors refer to the subject they are bound to talk about: social cohesion at the neighbourhood level, which is also the title of their paper. And to make this even clearer they carry on later: *“Of course strong cohesive neighbourhoods, micro-cohesion, could be in conflict with one another and contribute to a divided and fragmented city. (...) could be in conflict with any sense of common national purpose or macro-cohesion. Whether society faces a crisis of social cohesion depends upon what spatial scale one is examining.”*³

We don't find the authors' notions of micro- and macro-cohesion anywhere in Ronald van Kempen's paper. Instead, he attempts to introduce his very own concept of social cohesion by quoting the colleagues and leaving out their own terminology of micro- and macro-cohesion.

SECOND EXAMPLE: The German sociologist **Tönnies** is also quoted “correctly” by Ronald van Kempen, when he writes *“... GESELLSCHAFT (a society in which impersonal and superficial contacts dominate, as do social isolation and an absence of norms)”*; however, following Steven Vertovec, University of Warwick, the quoted paragraph is read slightly differently: *“... notions of GEMEINSCHAFT (social solidarity based on commonality of sentiment, experiences, sense of place and purpose person to person*

¹ underline by Peter Moser

² Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001), p. 2127

³ Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001), p. 2128; underline by Peter Moser

relationships) and GESELLSCHAFT (characterised by impersonal and superficial relationships, isolated lives, normlessness and heterogeneous identifications): in both social formations a kind of social cohesion is maintained (sic!), but by qualitatively different means (in the case of the former ((GEMEINSCHAFT)), consensus is promoted by informal institutions, especially family and peer group; in the latter ((GESELLSCHAFT)), social solidarity is governed by formal authority).⁴

Ronald van Kempen refers to Tönnies, but only for the purpose to “prove” that on the GESELLSCHAFT-level one cannot talk about social cohesion; the “proof” works if you deprive the reader of the other half of Tönnies’ statement.

THIRD EXAMPLE: **Jan Vranken**, from the Antwerp University, also being quoted by Ronald van Kempen, could tell us more about social cohesion than Ronald van Kempen tries to convey by citing his Belgian colleague. It is true that Vranken, when discussing the spatial dimension, being one of the five dimensions of social cohesion, says that *“on the neighbourhood level, social cohesion is likely to exist, although it may vary among neighbourhoods.”⁵* and, admittedly, he (Vranken) finds it *“difficult to trace or document social cohesion on the city level”*. However, *“... social cohesion has several dimensions, and the feeling of belonging is but one of them. What with the other dimensions: structural solidarity, social networks? Structural solidarity is organised in many ways, through the paying of taxes, labour distribution. The existence of social networks could also be considered to be a form of structural solidarity in that they assist people, so as to find a job.”* and (Vranken writes) further on *“High social cohesion at the city level is more directly obtained in a context of low cohesion at the lower levels (area, neighbourhood). (...) cohesion at a higher level remains possible if an extra condition is fulfilled, namely that of structured non-conflicting relations between these constituent parts of the urban system. If this is not the case, ‘one place’s cohesion might be society’s deconstruction (Kearns & Forrest 2000: 1001)”⁶* And finally Vranken makes it quite clear: *“We consider cohesion to be important on the national level and on the neighbourhood level, but less important on the city level”*.

Not one of these sentences is quoted by Ronald van Kempen, but he refers to Vranken - “correctly” (?) – when it comes to say something about social cohesion and memberships of voluntary associations and clubs. Again Ronald van Kempen does not mention

⁴ Vertovec, S. (1997); underline by Peter Moser

⁵ Vranken; J. (2002), p.6

⁶ Vranken; J. (2002), p.8; underline by Peter Moser

that Vranken explicitly discusses social cohesion at its different levels, i.e. neighbourhood, city, and nation. And Vranken does so even in the context of the UGIS-project⁷, which – unlike the SOCOHO-project – tackles explicitly the impact of urban development programmes on urban quarters and neighbourhoods! It would stand to reason if the notion of social cohesion would be restricted to the limited spatial dimension in the UGIS-project, but the UGIS coordinator (Vranken) does not do this!

2. Ronald van Kempen's concept and the political arena

Refusing to think social cohesion in terms beyond this micro level is equal to refusing the existence of human activities and politics which cannot be smelled nor physically seen nor heard nor touched. Most of political activities are of that kind. They are part of social reality. These activities also aim at certain goals, sometimes more, sometimes less explicitly. Thus, for instance, employment-, health- or housing-politics, having in mind equal access for all citizens to the appropriate facilities and institutions, these political activities may well be targetted on improving social cohesion (within society as a whole), regardless whether the individuals (citizens) know each other and whether they live in the same district or even town. Of course, the appropriate political means are not granted to achieve what they are aiming for. But this can be true for the opening of a corner shop or the redesigning of a green in the neighbouring housing block too: They might improve communication between the local residents, but they might just as well not do so. Both activities claim – correctly – social cohesion as their goal.

Reducing social cohesion to something that exists only on the micro level, and redefining the cohesion's macro level as "*some kind of precondition*"⁸ is not only to be repelled on the academic and scientific level. It also falls way behind the political debate during the recent past. You may look up whatever document of the European Committee for Social Cohesion (CDCS) at what historical step ever, you won't find any remark that recommends such a restrictive use of the notion of social cohesion as Ronald van Kempen suggests. Instead, when references to social cohesion are made in these papers it is the national if not even the trans-national political arena which is being addressed. A few statements picked from the social cohesion debate on the international political level may illustrate this:

⁷ UGIS „Urban development programmes, urban governance, social inclusion & sustainability“, see: www.ufsia.ac.be/ugis/concepts.htm

⁸ Ronald van Kempen, internal paper 2004

Regional Policy - Inforegio: *“The origins of economic and social cohesion go back to the Treaty of Rome (sic!) where a reference is made in the preamble to reducing disparities in development between regions. (...) The Maastricht Treaty finally incorporated the policy establishing the European Community. It is an expression of solidarity between the Member States and the regions of the European Union. This means balanced and sustainable development, reducing structural disparities between regions and countries and promoting equal opportunities for all individuals. In practical terms it is achieved by means of a variety of financing operations (...)”*⁹ NB: The notion of social cohesion is being used here at an even higher than the national, at a supranational level.

The European Committee for Social Cohesion (CDCS) adopted its *Strategy for Social Cohesion* on 12 May 2000: *“... it does not define social cohesion as such but seeks to identify some of the factors in social cohesion such as (...) measures to combat poverty and social exclusion, particularly in areas such as housing, health, education and training, employment and income distribution and social services. (...) also seek, more positively, to strengthen those forces that help to create social solidarity and a sense of belonging. Some of these forces are clearly within the legitimate ambit of government policy, others come with the private sphere, where governments must tread more cautiously”*.¹⁰ And CDCS too is distinguishing the various levels of social cohesion policies: *“Social security systems are one of the most powerful institutional expressions of social solidarity. Any social cohesion strategy must therefore have as a main aim the strengthening of the social security systems, ...”*¹¹

We all know that social security systems are definitely not negotiated at the neighbourhood level! They are elements of structural solidarity, a term which is frequently used as synonym for social cohesion at the macro level – in both the sociological and the political debate.

The CDCS, however, does not stick to the macro level only, it calls the *“family a fundamental factor of social cohesion in the private domain”* and *“... (the family) is another institution facing strong challenges and undergoing far-reaching changes; policies for families will also, therefore, take their place naturally in a strategy for social cohesion. Particular attention has to be given to (...) more vulnerable members (...) namely chil-*

⁹ European Commission, Directorate General, Regional Policy; http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/glossary/glos3_en.htm

¹⁰ Council of Europe (2000), summary and pt. 13; underline by Peter Moser

¹¹ Council of Europe (2000), pt. 14; underline by Peter Moser

dren and the elderly, ...".¹² At the same time CDCS leaves no doubt about the macro level of social cohesion where governments (urban, regional, federal etc) are acting: "Social cohesion, therefore, combines the political determination of governments to bring in social development policies, and make a success of them, with their citizens' aspirations towards greater solidarity".¹³ Nobody ever talks about "preconditions" if social cohesion policies are carried out by governments!

The **Council of Europe's Strategy for Social Cohesion** has summarized all the debates and discussions on social cohesion during the years before at its conference at the University of Hong Kong, November 2003. The report presents three types of definitions and finally explains that the CoE will "*adopt a functional definition rather than a descriptive one, highlighting for aspects of individual and collective well-being that are fostered by social cohesion: equity, individual and collective dignity, autonomy and participation. Social cohesion is the capacity of a society to ensure the welfare of all its members, minimizing disparities and avoiding polarization. A cohesive society is a mutually supportive community of free individuals pursuing these common goals by democratic means.*"¹⁴ You won't find any statement or remark in this recently published document that would suggest to take an urban spatial dimension as a determinant of the social cohesion notion.

3. Conclusion

There is, to put it quite frankly, more social reality than what can be experienced on the face to face level of a village, a street, or a neighbourhood. It makes no sense, it actually denies societal reality, if one confines social cohesion to the (spatial) level of making personal contacts. It does not see, for instance, solidarity activities carried out by people for other people whom they don't know and whose cultural attitudes they don't share at all, but they do so simply for the sake of a peaceful and respective coexistence within one society; in other words: to make this society more cohesive. There are plenty examples just for the opposite kind of activity: Xenophobia does not need knowing the stranger whom you dislike and whom you don't want to claim the same citizens' rights or equal access to schools and hospitals and homes. Xenophobia motivated politics are certainly based upon internally rather cohesive groups, but they result in a less cohesive, but more polarised society. In both examples it is not necessary that the ac-

¹² Council of Europe (2000), pt. 15; underline by Peter Moser

¹³ Council of Europe (2000) pt. 17; underline by Peter Moser

¹⁴ Battaini-Dragoni, G., Dominioni, S. (2003)

tors and the political objects know each other, nor do they have to share other values amongst themselves. Still, these politics are aimed at social cohesion or its opposite respectively.

Bibliography

BATTAINI-DRAGONI, G., DOMINIONI, S. (2003), The CoE's Strategy for Social Cohesion; Conference on Social Cohesion, 28-29 November 2003, Hong Kong

COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2000): Strategy for Social Cohesion;
http://www.coe.int/T/E/social_cohesion/social_policies/03.Strategy_for_Social_Cohesion

FORREST, R., KEARNS, A. (2001): Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood; in: Urban Studies, Vol. 38, No. 12, p. 2125-2143

VERTOVOC, S. (1997): Social Cohesion and Tolerance, University of Warwick,
www.international.metropolis.net/research-policy

VRANKEN; J. (2002 presumably): Urban Social Futures – No Social Cohesion without Social Exclusion?, Antwerp University, Dptm. of Sociology and Social Policy

Karl Czasny

The Concept of Social Cohesion and the SOCOHO project

This paper aims to answer two questions.

1. What is the meaning of 'social cohesion'? (sections 1 to 3)
2. What are the relations between 'social cohesion' and the other theoretical concepts of our project? (section 4)

1. Social cohesion in the context of European integration

Cohesion is one of the central aims of European integration policy. This is why the European Commission must deliver a Cohesion Report every three years which analyses progress in the realisation of economic and social cohesion in the European Union.¹ This Cohesion Report is one of the most important foundations of the common cohesion policy.

The concept of cohesion which is fundamental to the above-mentioned activities is essentially based upon five assumptions:

- (1) Cohesion is the result of the successful social integration of individuals and (socially and regionally defined) groups.
- (2) The most important mechanism of social integration is the market.
- (3) Approximate equality of opportunity for all groups and individuals in a common market is a precondition that the market brings about this integration and therefore creates cohesion.
- (4) Equality of opportunity does not however mean only a formal equality of conditions of access to the market but also implies at least an approximate equality of socio-economic potential for action for the actors.
- (5) The subsidy measures of cohesion policy for particular countries, regions and groups aim to reduce the largest deficits in this socio-economic potential for action. Equality of opportunity should thereby be increased in the common market in order to improve capacity for integration and finally achieve greater cohesion.²

¹ See European Commission (2001)

² This concept lying at the foundation of cohesion policy of an even development of socio-economic action potential also largely influences the conceptual framework of social science working at European level. Compare, for example, the definition of the concept of 'social exclusion' in the project 'Social Exclusion in European Neighbourhoods': social exclusion is seen here as a consequence of economic processes which lead to certain groups being 'left behind', which 'threatens social harmony'. See Cars, G., Vestergaard, H. (2000), Final Report

The key problem of this concept lies in the over-optimistic evaluation of the market's capacity to achieve this integration because, due to the mechanism of competition, the market necessarily divides society into winners and losers and thereby creates serious imbalances in the socio-economic potential for action of the actors. Its capacity for integration is therefore accompanied by the systematic exclusion of particular groups and individuals so that the ideal of equality of potential for action finally reveals itself as an illusion.

Since 1995, the European Union has attempted to make allowances for this fact by supplementing its cohesion policy with three-year Social Action Programmes. These are oriented towards the aim of an 'inclusive society'³ and, through compensatory measures, attempt to combat the tendencies towards exclusion created by the market.

When, against this background, sociological analyses work with concepts of 'cohesion', they have two possibilities: they can either take on board the view of the relationship between cohesion and the market as propagated on the political level or call into question the all too optimistic supposition that the market creates cohesion.

Concepts which primarily or even exclusively (like Ronald van Kempen) understand cohesion as 'social cohesion' in the narrower sense, tend towards acceptance of the above-mentioned suppositions of integration policy. These approaches see cohesion 'in large parts' as 'a geographically localised phenomenon that includes membership of voluntary associations and clubs, ... kinship, friendships, neighbourliness' and 'absence of deviant behaviour.'⁴ The role of the market and competition in this social integration is thereby pushed so far into the background that systematic analysis of the integration potential which actually exists in these two institutions cannot be undertaken.

If, in its conceptual tools, sociology does not presuppose market mechanisms to be the best possible model for overcoming the central problems of social welfare, and therefore largely excludes them from investigation, it must fall back upon a different concept of cohesion. This concept must enable the integration effects of the market to be compared with those of public and cooperative organisational models. Only in this way can the question be answered by what means the most comprehensive integration (and thereby the greatest cohesion) can be achieved.

³ See European Commission (1999)

⁴ De Decker, P., Vranken, J. (2002) p. 25 f.

Such a concept of cohesion is wider than that of the first-mentioned approach and distinguishes clearly between two levels of social integration and of the cohesion which is thereby created:

- (1) a macro level of integration and cohesion based on a particular mix of state, municipal as well as market and cooperative regulating mechanisms which form the basic conditions for the solution of the social problems of the production and distribution of goods and services.
- (2) a micro level of integration and cohesion on which the individual is integrated in a network of personal interaction within the framework of neighbourhood, friendship, family, membership, educational and work relationships.

The basic conditions existing on the macro level of social integration for the production and distribution of goods and services differ not only in relation to the respective shares of state, municipal, market and cooperative regulatory mechanisms. They are also open to varying degrees to cooperation with and the participation of social networks on the micro level. This is already the case because the various institutional component parts at macro level (market, state, local councils and cooperatives⁵ each have varying degrees of potential for such an opening.

In addition to participation relationships, there are also close structural relations between the two levels of integration and cohesion. These can only be mentioned briefly here with a few examples:

- Fragmentation at macro level, which is expressed in varying degrees of opportunity of access for particular groups to the goods, services and action potential⁶ provided by the state, the market and cooperatives, causes corresponding fragmentation at the level of social networks.
- This happens because individuals and groups excluded from opportunities for action determined at macro level form especially tightly knotted social networks which have compensatory effects.⁷
- In many cases, extreme fragmentation at the macro level of integration overtakes the integrative power of social networks and thereby endangers social cohesion at

⁵ Production and consumption cooperatives, cooperative businesses and other non-profit organisations

⁶ Residence permits, work permits, jobs, qualifications etc.

⁷ This compensation can be the completely autonomous self-organisation of groups affected by exclusion or a relief process consciously initiated by institutions at macro level in the spirit of so-called 'communitarianism'.

micro level (social disintegration e.g. in the form of racial conflicts, crime and unruliness, including street disorder and rowdyism⁸).

- On the other hand, if there is very little fragmentation and exclusion at the macro level of integration, there is a tendency for the importance of social networks for individual behaviour to be reduced.⁹

2. The systematic role of the concept of social cohesion

The problem of the cohesion of independent individuals within a community addressed in the term 'social cohesion' is not new. Under changing conceptual frameworks social theory has been concerned with it since its beginnings. The misunderstandings and lack of clarity surrounding the concepts attached to it are as old as the question itself.

The article of Forrest and Kearns in the 'Urban Studies', to which van Kempen and Moser are referring, is just one of many current examples of this lack of clarity.¹⁰ This article first introduces social cohesion as a phenomenon of micro-level interactions.¹¹ However, it then goes on to classify various dimensions of social cohesion which (correctly!) are in no way limited to micro level and which also include macro-level aspects such as 'harmonious economic and social development, or equal access to services and welfare benefits'.¹² - There is obviously not only a lack of clarity among the circle of partners in the SOCOHO project to which levels of social action the concept of social cohesion should be attached and how these levels are connected. This conceptual confusion can only be remedied by going back to the theoretical foundations of the problem of social cohesion. Let us take a look back.

As Max Weber already knew, social action is always based on the fact that individual action is oriented towards the other participants in an interactive context.¹³ However, since complex societies are made up of a multitude of interactions working in combination, this basic law of social action is modified within them. Each activity here does not only refer to the immediate cooperation partner but is always simultaneously oriented towards all members of society as a whole. Therefore, in complex societies all activity

⁸ See De Decker, P., Vranken, J. (2002) p. 24 f.

⁹ „The more the state promises to absorb the risk of individual behaviour via welfare arrangements, the more individuals (voters) can pursue their specific goals.“ Friedrichs, J., Vranken, J. (2000), p.28

¹⁰ Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001)

¹¹ Forrest and Kearns relate the concept of social cohesion in the initial stage to the local phenomenon of social networks in the area of neighbourhoods: 'The problems of poor people in poor neighbourhoods in cities are at the heart of current concerns about societal cohesion. ... Social cohesion is about getting by and getting on at the ... level of everyday life.' Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001) p. 2126 f.

¹² Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001). p. 2129

¹³ See Weber, M. (1956), p. 1

takes place simultaneously on two levels of meaning. I would like to describe them as the macro and micro levels of action orientation.

The principle of a reciprocal orientation of actions towards the conduct and the expectations of the cooperation partners applies to **both** levels of action orientation. Since this reciprocal relationship can also be more or less close in both cases, it is useful to characterise the relationships of the actors to each other through a certain degree of cohesion both on micro as well as on macro level.

That degree of cohesion thereby measures the closeness of the reciprocal relationship of the actors and is therefore a unit of measurement which characterises the respective community as a whole. As with many other average quantities, this is also very difficult to interpret. This most particularly applies to social cohesion at macro level. A particular mean degree of cohesion of a complex society can result from completely different models of cohesion. A very high average of cohesion can for example contain the total or partial exclusion of minority groups or individuals – it can even be based upon this exclusion (scapegoat principle, elite society principle etc.).

Therefore the **type** of cohesion, which can be viewed from widely differing perspectives, is at least as interesting as its **degree**. Three of these possible distinguishing features are mentioned below as examples. They distinguish between the type of cohesion according to:

- whether it is purely materially motivated or people oriented,
- whether it gives the individual actors greater or lesser scope for freedom,
- whether it includes all interaction partners in the same way, or contains fragmentations¹⁴ or exclusions.

The respective type of cohesion is always only an expression of how the reciprocity of the orientation underlying all social action shows itself. Observing somewhat more closely the basic principles of this reciprocity, one sees that they are always based upon a common aim shared by all participants in a respective interaction context. On the one hand, particular tasks for individual cooperation partners are derived from this common aim and on the other, it is determined how and to what extent each of them participates in the results of their joint action. The reciprocity of orientation of the cooperation partners is therefore based on three aspects of association which constitute the cohesion of the respective group:

¹⁴ Fragmentation occurs when groups are formed in which internal cohesion is higher than that between the groups.

- (1) recognition of a common aim
- (2) recognition of the distribution of functions defined in order to achieve the common aim (distribution of the necessary burdens and work)
- (3) recognition of the distribution of the returns resulting from achievement of the common aim (participation in the success of joint action)

We find definitions of these aspects of association on both levels of orientation. Let us now examine them at macro level. Whereas in traditional communities definitions which bound every individual appeared in the guise of personal claims to power mostly based on religion, in modern societies they are based on the working mechanism of the market. This has now become the central point of integration in that it creates a reciprocal orientation connection between all members of society as producers of commodities.

In the model of a market which works perfectly, which has unfortunately hardly ever been realised, the three dimensions of association which constitute the reciprocity of action and the type of social cohesion have the following form:

- Recognition of an aim common to all participants in the market exists within the explicit belief that the sum of commodities exchanged on the market satisfies the sum of all demands within society.
- Individual action is fitted into collective efforts towards reaching the common aim because individual producers of commodities, despite their own interests being in the foreground, must take into account the requirements of other (anonymous) market participants if they want to find exchange partners. In the act of exchange the productive activity of other market participants is recognised as useful action.
- The mechanism of competition finally guarantees that in the long term the prices of the commodities exchanged find a level appropriate to the level of the content of socially useful work embodied in them. For producers of commodities this means a promise of participation in the consumption of commodities produced for the market corresponding to their own contribution.

The special feature of the integration achievement of the market registered with admiration by social theorists of all political shades thereby has three aspects:

- (1) The cohesion created by the market does without a common personal point of reference for all individuals (e.g. a leader or God).¹⁵
- (2) Cohesion is possible despite the fact that individual members of society are primarily oriented towards their own interests.
- (3) Due to the mechanism of competition, which is decisively involved in the total function of the market, even the struggle between individuals is turned into an instrument of their integration.

In a fictive ideal model of simple commodity production this is the given form of the constitution of social cohesion on the macro level of action orientation. Under capitalism it goes through a double modification that can be characterised as a transition to a class-based society. On the one hand the moment of conflict between the individual producers of commodities which is already inherent in the competition mechanism of the market deepens here into a systematic conflict (class conflict) between groups of commodity producers (classes) characterised by their different position with respect to the means of production. On the other hand, within these now opposing classes, new forms of social cohesion appear, among which the cohesion pattern of 'solidarity' should be emphasised.

Just like the previously described association of all commodity producers, solidarity is a component of the macro level of action orientation. This expresses itself in its impersonal character related to an anonymous mass of commodity producers and market participants, which distinguishes it from forms of reciprocity existing on levels of personal interactions such as friendship or willingness to help. However, in contrast to the cohesion of all ordinary commodity producers, solidarity applies only to a part of all producers and is also formed through a conflict between groups defined by their opposing interests.

A systematic analysis of the forms of social cohesion within the framework of a capitalist society would require a more detailed examination of its development. This analysis would for example have to show how the creation of a post-Ford type of accumulation leads to the dissolution of inclusive bonds of solidarity within the working class¹⁶ and to

¹⁵ In his work 'Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego', Sigmund Freud described the reciprocal identification of individuals through a common love for a leader or idol as a fundamental social-psychological mechanism of the constitution of large communities. The rise of fascist movements as a result of the great economic crisis of the twentieth century is impressive proof that patterns of the personal integration of masses thought to have been surpassed can re-appear at any time in place of the impersonal power of the market to create cohesion if this suffers a complete longer-term breakdown.

¹⁶ This is one form of what is described as 'the crisis of social cohesion'. See, for example, Forrest and Kearns who mention 'institutional changes which undermine forces of solidarity and cohesion.' Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001), p. 2128

the individualisation of workers in combination with the constitution of completely new models of social cohesion.

Furthermore, it would be necessary to describe how, on the basis of the fundamental relationship between labour and capital and in addition to the mechanism of the market, other means of social integration can assert themselves and develop by compensating for certain market deficits. These are monopolies and oligopolies, municipal and cooperative institutions as well as state organisations of national or supra-national character. These partially neutralise the unbridled working of the mechanism of competition and, each with a different weighting, have the integration functions of joint planning and solidarity in the distribution of burdens and returns as a principle of their action.

Just as the market itself represents a characteristic form of social cohesion related to specific patterns of exclusion,¹⁷ the principles according to which these supplementary organisations work embody widely varying types of cohesion which are also accompanied by typical patterns of exclusion. However, since in any given national economy each sector, such as the health system or the housing system, is characterised by a certain dovetailing of the market with the above-mentioned institutions, a characteristic profile of social cohesion and exclusion can be found embedded in all these social fields of action on the macro level of action orientation.

I can of course not even begin a systematic analysis of all the various forms of social cohesion and exclusion here and would only like to add a few comments on the relationship between the macro and micro levels of orientation of social action. These should also define more precisely my understanding of social cohesion.

3. The various levels of social cohesion

It should firstly be mentioned that the distinction between only two levels of action orientation merely describes a gross simplification of the actual relationships. In reality, between the lowest level of personal interactions and the highest level of activity in the context of the whole of society there are numerous intermediate levels with an increasingly wide horizon of meaning.

The transition from the respective macro level to the next micro level of action orientation below it, at the same time means a progression towards ever smaller **spatial**

¹⁷ See the relevant parts of section 1.

scales of social action and social cohesion.¹⁸ In this sense, analysis can proceed downwards from the level of the single European market to the respective national economy and from there to the level of the individual city – and then go further downwards to observation of the individual quarters and neighbourhoods.

Each of these levels must be described as a cluster of structures which express themselves in particular formal or informal arrangements and in the institutionalised personal orientation patterns associated with them¹⁹, as well as in certain organisational, housing and technical conditions. On the one hand those structures represent the result of action which takes place in the context of personal social relationships. On the other hand, for practice on the respectively lower levels, the results of the relevant action have the status of presupposed **basic conditions** which must be **adopted** in the course of personal interactions.²⁰

The laws which regulate the conditions for subsidies of housing can serve as an example of such basic conditions. They are brought into being in the course of personal interactions between lawyers, parliamentarians, representatives of interest groups and housing experts and are a precondition for the activities of subsidy authorities, housing authorities and providers, construction companies and finance institutions. The actions of each of these institutions then result in particular housing and economic structures in the housing stock which households acting on the lowest level of social action must come to terms with in their housing behaviour. Social action takes place on each of these levels and the results of this action represent not only 'objective meaning' but also always a certain content of social cohesion.

It should now be described what the above-mentioned 'adoption of basic conditions' means for the actors. To this end I would firstly like to take up the central function of common aim orientation for social action mentioned in the previous section, and view

¹⁸ The importance of the respective spatial scale for the analysis of social cohesion is also seen in the previously mentioned article by Forrest and Kearns: 'Whether society is said to face a crisis of social cohesion depends upon what spatial scale one is examining ...'. Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001), p. 2128

¹⁹ Personal patterns of orientation which are connected to regulating mechanisms installed at macro level point to what Marx described as 'character masks'. Whereas Marx was thinking of figures such as the 'capitalist' or the 'worker', we should focus on typical actors in the housing system such as the 'tenant' and the 'landlord'. In my view, the term of the character mask better indicates the real status of an orientation model than the sociological concept of the role. This primarily relates to the level of personal interactions, whereas the concept of the character mask places each model of orientation in the very hard economic pressures of the market.

²⁰ This adoption does not only relate to coping with normative, housing, organisational and technical factors but also (and especially) to the way in which individuals deal with the previously mentioned orientation models in the course of personal interaction relationships. For example, 'the tenant', who as such has particular interests defined at macro level which he attempts to promote through personal contact with other tenants and 'the landlord', who for his part is driven by his own interests.

this from now on as a cooperative form of satisfying requirements and solving problems.

When the cooperation of individuals is brought about via the market, collective action for satisfying requirements is split into two independent processes – the production of goods and their consumption. For individuals, participation in the process of production becomes a precondition for participation in the process of consumption. In the capitalist form of society, entry into this two-tier problem-solving mechanism is mediated via the market, namely the labour market. For the individual, participation and success on the labour market mean entry into the most important mechanism of problem-solving under these conditions. Conversely, exclusion from the labour market or failure in it mean a denial of access to the central collective problem-solving mechanism.

Both in the fields of production and consumption, the starting point of individual action is always the existing basic conditions. In both fields, social action is thereby organised according to the scheme of micro and macro levels of action orientation. The basic conditions of the respective macro level provide the structures for individual solutions to problems of production and consumption. Adoption of the basic conditions therefore means nothing other than the transformation of the collectively available supply of problem-solving strategies into individual problem-solving action.

Existing basic conditions, which in themselves each represent a certain content of social cohesion, can to a greater or lesser extent facilitate or hinder the development of such action. In extreme cases certain groups are **excluded** from existing problem-solving mechanisms resulting from the basic conditions; whereby exclusion from the labour market is the most important for the above-mentioned reasons. This is even more the case since access to the range of state and cooperative problem-solving mechanisms is often indirectly linked to access to the labour market.

For those excluded, the above-mentioned ‘adoption of basic conditions for action’ means ‘coping with exclusion’. This can be done in two ways:

- by turning to available and accessible alternative solutions in other areas at macro level (e.g. a household which is excluded from the unregulated housing market due to price levels turning to social housing)
- through the development of adaptation strategies on the micro level of interactions (e.g. several households in a social network living together in a single dwelling if there is no alternative solution at macro level).

The latter example of an adaptation strategy refers to the compensatory role of social networks at micro level mentioned in the first section and underlines that social cohesion which develops at micro level has in a certain sense a complementary function to the social cohesion embodied in the macro level as a result of the basic conditions.

After explaining what 'adoption of the basic conditions' means for the actors, it must be shown what consequences this has for the basic conditions themselves.

As the actors at the respective lower micro levels adopt the basic conditions existing at macro level, these conditions are **reproduced** - since coming to terms with (in most cases) means acceptance of existing circumstances. Such acceptance also exists if this coming to terms with the conditions consists of repairing the deficits in everyday life caused by them.²¹ Even criminal behaviour is a form of this acceptance since it takes place in the consciousness of stepping outside the limits which exist for other members of society. It is only in the mass negation of those existing limits and conditions that their reproduction is refused and **social change** initiated.

Another, less spontaneous form of social change takes place when interaction structures at the upper levels, upon which the basic conditions for action at lower levels are based, open up for actors involved at lower levels. They then have the opportunity to take part in changing the relevant basic conditions through **participation**. Participation is thereby the mechanism through which macro structures open themselves for social change, i.e. for adaptation to changed problematic situations and requirements of actors on the lowest action level.²²

Here we come to an aspect of the concept of social cohesion which has not yet been mentioned. So far it has only been shown that certain patterns of cohesion can be observed both at micro and macro levels of social action. At this point it should be added that something like social cohesion also expresses itself in the respective relationships of the various levels of orientation to each other. The more open the structures and interaction structures on the upper levels are for participation and change from below, the stronger this is.

²¹ For Turner the personal interactions of everyday life represent 'ongoing repair work to normalise social relations'. Turner, B. (1991); cited in Forrest, R., Kearns, A. (2001) p. 2127

²² The model described of various levels of action orientation has no clear relation to an upper-lower metaphor. On the one hand the macro levels are 'below' the micro level since they contain obligatory orientation models for a larger circle of actors. On the other hand they are 'above' the micro level since it is only possible to implement models of orientation by means of the relevant control mechanisms (power, money), which is why macro-level institutions, in the sense of the usual application of the upper-lower metaphor, are above those on micro level.

If we describe aspects of cohesion on the same levels of orientation as **horizontal** cohesion, then here we are dealing with the **vertical** dimension of social cohesion. A high level of vertical cohesion in a social system equates with great openness to social change arising from the problems and requirements of actors at the lowest level.

4. Social cohesion in the context of the SOCOHO project

The SOCOHO project is based upon the following assumptions:

- (1) There is a general crisis of social cohesion caused by the social and economic system. This means that current processes of economic and social transformation in Europe call into question traditional forms of reproduction of social cohesion. Focal points of this crisis are the following phenomena:
 - Poverty and social inequality
 - Problems of integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities
 - Problems in the context of transformation of the socio-demographic structure (instability of the economic base of the individual households, ageing society)
- (2) The housing systems fulfil extremely important functions in the continual reproduction of social cohesion, because they
 - alleviate or aggravate the increasing risks of poverty faced by households
 - alleviate or aggravate the dangers in many urban areas arising from increasing social and ethnic diversity
 - alleviate or aggravate dealing with the growing instability of the individual household and with the increasing proportion of senior citizen households.

Against this background, we can try to define more precisely the relations between

- a) social cohesion and the three focal points of its crisis
- b) social cohesion and the housing system
- c) the housing system and the three focal points of the crisis of social cohesion

I see the following relations:

a) Social cohesion and the three focal points of its crisis

From the remarks made in the previous sections it ensues that phenomena such as poverty, inequality and spatial segregation are consequences of a particular pattern of social cohesion which is anchored on the macro level of society. This also applies to the transformation in the socio-demographic structure since the crisis of the traditional family, the emancipation of women, the low birth rate and the consequent ageing in

society result from very particular structures of the social organisation of work, which for their part embody a particular pattern of social cohesion.

In their interactions, individuals develop characteristic forms of reaction to the existing structural conditions of poverty, inequality, segregation etc. However, these reactions on the level of interactions themselves then also embody social cohesion. Here it is a question of micro-cohesion, which has very particular relationships (partly compensatory) to the pattern of cohesion established on macro level.

b) Social cohesion and the housing system

As a component of the macro level, the housing system embodies important aspects of the social cohesion anchored at this level. For example, a housing stock characterised by a high proportion of rental accommodation of approximately the same quality represents a completely different type of cohesion compared to a housing stock with a high proportion of owner-occupied dwellings with considerable differences in quality.

Analogue to this, a different objective content of cohesion can also be established for subsidy systems and the basic legal conditions for housing. A high total volume of subsidies and a high percentage of direct subsidies point to a completely different pattern of cohesion compared to a low volume of subsidies with a rather low percentage of direct subsidies.

c) The housing system and focal points of the crisis of social cohesion

The three focal points of the crisis of social cohesion are (as mentioned under point a) expressions of particular deficits in cohesion at macro level. The housing system can increase or compensate for these deficits in cohesion which are grounded in other components of social structure through its structural content of social cohesion. For example, housing structures which result in low housing costs for low-income households work directly against other tendencies in the social system towards economic exclusion.

Furthermore, the housing system can indirectly alleviate the crisis of social cohesion by enabling individuals to cope more easily with the effects of the crisis. Housing structures which favour the formation of compensatory social cohesion at the lowest level of interaction (neighbourhoods and other social networks) are an example of this. Another example is housing structures which improve opportunities for housing mobility and thereby increase the social and economic flexibility of households.

Bibliography

- CARS, G., VESTERGAARD, H. (2000): Social Exclusion in European Neighbourhoods – Processes, Experiences and Responses; Final Report of project ERB-SOE2-CT97-3057
- DE DECKER, P., VRANKEN, J. (2002): Social Cohesion as Order and Legitimacy; in: Social Inclusion, Urban Governance and Sustainability; Towards a Conceptual Framework for the UGIS Research Project. Antwerpen: Acco
- DUFFY, K. (1998): The Human Dignity and Social Exclusion Project; Opportunity and risk: trends of social exclusion in Europe; Steering Committee on Social Policy (CDPS), Council of Europe, Strasbourg
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2001): Unity, solidarity, diversity for Europe, its people and its territory; Second report on economic and social cohesion
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (1999): Social Action Programme 1998 - 2000
- FORREST, R., KEARNS, A. (2001): Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood; in: Urban Studies, Vol. 38, No. 12, p. 2125-2143
- FREUD, S. (1967): Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse, Fischer Bücherei, Frankfurt am Main
- FRIEDRICHS, J., VRANKEN, J. (2000): European Urban Governance in Fragmented Societies; in: Governing European cities. Social fragmentation, social exclusion and urban governance; Eds: Andersen, H., T., Kempen, R., Ashgate, Aldershot
- TURNER, B. (1991): Prolegomena to a general theory of social order. University of Essex (mimeograph)
- VRANKEN, J. (2001): Urban Governance, Social Inclusion and Sustainability; Research Unit on Poverty, Social Exclusion and the City, Department of Sociology and Social Policy, Antwerpen University (Co-ordinating Institute); a research programme financed by the European Commission, DG RTD, Bruxelles
- WEBER, M. (1956): Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft; Grundriß der verstehenden Soziologie, 1. Halbband, Tübingen

List of Project Deliverables

The SOCOHO project has brought forth three kinds of deliverables:

- scientific reports (R)
- Workshops involving peoples external to the project (W)
- Conferences (C)

The dissemination level of the deliverables is

- confidential (CO),
- restricted to a group specified by the consortium (RE), or
- public (PU).

The reports are delivered in

- draft version (DR) or
- final version (FI).

At the time of the present report's deadline, all agreed deliverables were completed with the exception of the final conference.

Deliverables list

Del. No.	Deliverable title	Kind	Diss. level	Natur
D01	First design of the detailed concept	R	CO	DR
D02-D07	First surveys about situation in the individual states	R	CO	DR
D08	Comprehensive methodical framework and detailed structure of the national reports	R	CO	DR
D09-D14	National workshops; theme: "Optimising the relations between Changing socio-economic structures and housing system in ..."	W	RE	
D15-D20	National final reports; theme: "The importance of Housing Systems in Safeguarding Social Cohesion in ..."	R	PU	FI
D21	Comparative overall report; theme: "The importance of Housing Systems in Safeguarding Social Cohesion in Europe"	R	PU	FI
D22-D27	National Conferences; theme: "Optimising the relations between Changing socio-economic structures and housing system in ..."	C	PU	
D28	Conference at European level; theme: "Optimising the relations between Changing socio-economic structures and housing system in Europe"	C	PU	