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# Technical Report

**Organisation of the survey.** Socialiological survey of Roma took place in March-April 2015 and included 110 households with all their members. The total of 521 Roma were interviewed, of which 44 per cent were male and 56 percent female. Reliability of the data collected was assessed against the general population of Roma as established by the Population and Housing Census of 2011 (i.e. 2,115 persons).

The 521 Roma interviewed during the survey account for 25 percent of the general Roma population. Distribution of Roma respondents by age is a rather accurate representation of the age structure of the ethnic Roma group as captured by the 2011 Population Census (Fig.1). Only the youngest age group (ages 0 to 9) stands out; according to the survey of 2015 the number of the young Roma in this group is slightly higher. This diffrence may be accounted for by both the sampling methodology (families with young children were more easily available for the surveyors), and the natural changes in the population (i.e. increased birth rates).

**Figure 1.** Age Structure of Roma Population, % (data from 2011 and 2015)

**Sources:** Population and HousingCensus 2011 (Statistics Lithuania, 2013) and Roma Survey 2015.

Meanwhile, the gender distribution deviates from the gender structure of Roma population established by the 2011 Population Census. The present survey found fewer men than in 2011 (44% in 2015 and 47% in 2011).

There are differences in education data, too: the present survey has found a higher percentage of early leavers from primary school and illiterate persons (24% in 2015 and 10% in 2011), and a lower percentage of basic school and college graduates (32% in 2015 and 49% in 2011) (Fig. 2). These diffrences may have been determined by a number of factors: 1) the sampling methods used in the survey failed to reach more educated Roma people as a result of which their representation in the sample was not proportionate; 2) more educated Roma were not available for the survey because they migrated from Lithuania (Roma migration is above the national average); 3) part of the more educated Roma chose the strategy of assimilation and no longer identify themselves as Roma, thus making themselves unavailable for the survey.

**Figure 2.** Roma Education Indicators, % (data from 2011 and 2015)

*[Starting from the top: Higher Education. College and Special Secondary Education. Upper Secondary Education. Basic Education. Primary Education. Early Leavers from Primary School.]*

**Sources:** Population and HousingCensus 2011 (Statistics Lithuania, 2013) and Roma Survey 2015.

Before passing onto the comprehensive (not descriptive!) analysis of the survey results, the data should be weighted and inaccuracies of the sample related to the selection method should be evaluated.

**Geographical distribution**. Seeking to ensure adequate representation, the survey was conducted in fourteen residential locations of Roma (Table 1). The sampling was based on the data from the 2011 Population Census, and the selected geographical locations enabled to reach 80% of Roma population in Lithuania. To be selected for the survey, at least 2% of the total Roma population of Lithuania (i.e. at least 40 Roma) must reside in a particular geographical location; economic efficiency criteria were also taken into account (i.e. time required and possibility to reach Roma, etc.).

The number of individuals surveyed exceeded the minimum target number in most of the locations selected. There were, however, a few locations in Kaunas, city, in Šiauliai city and district were the minumum target was not reached for objective reasons.

During the survey in Kaunas it turned out that it was difficult to reach Roma through conventional contact points (schools and subdistrict offices, social workers, leaders of the Roma community); while direct mediation, where Roma were first contacted by people who already worked with them was possible in very few cases only. In some schools, where the Ministry of Education and Science reports Roma pupils, such pupils were not found during the survey. Moreover, in Kaunas Roma people are seldom assigned to the group of social risk families, and there are no non-governmental organisations of Roma in Kaunas. The survey in Kaunas lasted for 3 days; 8 households with the total of 32 members were surveyed (surveyors contacted 9 households, but one household refused to participate in the survey).

On the day of the survey in Šiauliai city and district majority of the Roma people could not be reached as they attended a funeral. The surveyors were able to interview only 3 households with 6 residents, most of them elderly people. A possibility of another visit was considered, but it was difficult to ensure the sufficient number of respondents nevertheless. The surveyors contacted city and district schools, subdistrict offices and social workers, but a considerable part of Roma households were not available at that time (they were absent). Taking into account the time, financial resources as well as difficulties to ensure adequate participation, the decision was made to discontinue the survey in Šiauliai city and district.

In other locations the survey was conducted without encountering any major difficulties. Direct interviews were usually conducted either by visiting respondents at home, or by inviting them to come to schools of their children. The mediation of schools, subdistricts, social workers and Roma NGOs was very important for establishing contacts with Roma people. There were a few houselholds that refused to participate in the survey (only 0-2 households in each geographical location).

**Table 1.** Sampling Locations of the Survey

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sampling locations** | **Households**  | **Respondents** |
|  | Kaunas city | 8 | 32 |
|  | Jonava district (Rukla, Jonava) | 8 | 38 |
|  | Kaunas district (Karmėlava, Vilkija) | 5 | 18 |
|  | Prienai district (Prienai) | 4 | 18 |
|  | Klaipėda city | 9 | 44 |
|  | Vilkaviškis district (Kybartai) | 12 | 49 |
|  | Marijampolė city | 8 | 29 |
|  | Panevėžys city | 6 | 24 |
|  | Panevėžys district (Ramygala parish) | 1 | 7 |
|  | Šiauliai city | 3 | 6 |
|  | Anykščiai district | 1 | 19 |
|  | Vilnius city (Kirtimai settlement 61%, other locations 38%)  | 29 | 168 |
|  | Šalčininkai district (Eišiškės) | 8 | 34 |
|  | Ukmergės district (Ukmergė, Pivonija parish) | 8 | 37 |
| **Total:** | **110** | **523[[1]](#footnote-1)** |

# Survey Results

**The aim of the survey** was to collect representative data about the situation of Roma according to indicators specified in Annex 3 of the *Action Plan for Integration of Roma into Lithuanian Society 2015-2020*[[2]](#footnote-2), and to compare the data against the national average based on the annual Income and Living Conditions Survey by the Statistics Lithuania. Thus, the survey filled the gaps in the information about Roma **housing conditions, financial situation, level of education, economic activity, living conditions and health status**. The present survey report contains data of the sociological representative survey of Lithuanian Roma and comparison of their situation with the national average. Information supplied by the respondents to answer specific questions is presented in the Annexes to this Report.

## Data on Households

1. **Housing**

**Size of housing.** The survey of Lithuanian Roma found that the average number of Roma residents per household is twice the national average: one Roma household consists of 4.8 members on average, while the national average is 2.3 members per household[[3]](#footnote-3).

**Type of housing.** Almost one third of Roma respondents (29%) indicated that they lived in single appartment houses, and this percentage is only slightly lower than the national average (37%). Compared with national indicators, significantly fewer Roma were residing in multi-appartment blocks of 10 appartments or more (Roma 28%; national average 48%); and more Roma than national average lived in small multi-appartment blocks of 3-10 appartments (Roma 28%; national average 8%).

**Type of ownership.** Compared with the overall national average, significantly fewer Roma are owners of the housing they live in (Roma 31%, national average 91%). Approximately one fifth (21%) of the respondents indicated that they do not pay rent for their accomodation (i.e. housing is illegal or owned by extended family members, etc.); the national average is 4%. A higher proportion of Roma than national average rent their appartments; 38% reside in social housing (national average 1%), 9% of households rente their apartments paying the market price (national average 0.7%). A very small proportion of Roma have taken out a mortgage to acquire housing (Roma 1%, national average 3%).

**Housing area and number of rooms.** The average area of Roma housing is smaller than the national average (48 and 63 m2 accordingly); the housing area per person is half the national average (12.6 and 26.2 m2 accordingly) and smaller than the minimum area per person fixed by the state (14 m2). The average number of rooms in Roma housing is 2.1 (national average 3.5), while the number of rooms per person is half the national average (0.6 and 1.5 accordingly).

**Amenities and quality of housing.** Living conditions are reflected by the presence of the amenities in the household. 56% of Roma households have no baths or showers (national average 15%), and 51% have no flush toilets (national average 16%).

The quality of Roma housing is also poorer: 68% of respondents indicated such problems as leaking roofs, damp walls (flooring, foundation), rotten windows or flooring (national average 19%). Roma housing is dark (not enough daylight) more frequently than overall national average (Roma 37%, national average 7.5%); Roma complain about the noise from the next-door neighbors, staircase or from the operations of transport, business or industry (Roma 31%, national average 13%). Also, Roma more often live in crime, violence and/or vandalism-ridden neighborhoods (Roma 34%, national average 5%).

Compared to the overall national average, a higher proportion of Roma households indicated that they can not afford adequate heating of their home (Roma 49%, national average 31%).

**Housing compensation.** 71% of Roma households indicated that they do not receive any housing compensations (i.e. for heating, hot and cold water). Compensations are paid to 29% of Roma households (national average 5%).

1. **Financial Situation of Roma Households**

**Material deprivation** refers to economic strains experienced by households and their inability to afford durable goods.

For the purpose of the analysis, economic strains are defined as follows: 1) a household can not afford to pay on time rent payments, utility bills, hire purchase installments or other loan payments; 2) a household can not afford one week’s annual holiday away from home; 3) a household can not afford adequate heating of their home; 4) a household can not afford to have a meal with meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent at least every second day; 5) a household can not face unexpected expenses (amount of expenses equals the monthly poverty threshold of the previous year). Durable goods are: 1) a telephone (including mobile phone); 2) a colour TV; 3) a washing machine; 4) a car.

Analysis of the data revealed that Roma households more often encounter economic difficulties to keep their accomodation. More than half of Roma households (58%) missed 2 or more payments of utility bills due to the lack of resources; one third (36%) missed 2 or more rent payments. Only one fourth of Roma households could afford a holiday away from home (national average 48%). A proportion of Roma households that can not afford to have a meal with meat or fish or vegetarian equivalent at least every second day is twice the national average (Roma 43%, national average 21%). An absolute majority of Roma households (92%) would not be able to face unxepected expenses (235 EUR).

As to durable goods in Roma households, majority of them have a telephone (94%) and a TV set (90%). These indicators are just a little lower than the national average. There are more pronounced differences, however, in the possession of other durable goods: a washing machine (Roma 60%, national average 92%); a computer (33 and 57%), and particularly a car (25 and 58%). More details are presented in Table 2 below.

**Table 2**. Material Deprivation Indicators

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Economic difficulties**  | **Roma Survey 2015 (%)** | **Income and Living Conditions Survey**  **2013 (%)** |
| Households that missed deadlines for mortgage or rent payments due to the lack of resources (answer “Yes, 2 or more times”) | 36 | 0.3 |
| Households that missed deadlines for utility bills due to teh lack of resources (answer “Yes, 2 or more times”) | 58 | 6 |
| Households that can’t afford to spend at least a weeks’ holiday away from home | 75 | 52 |
| Households that can’t afford adequate heating of their home  | 49 | 31 |
| Households that can’t afford to have a meal with meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent at least every second day | 43 | 21 |
| Households that couldn’t afford uNoxpected expenses | 92 | 59 |
| **Durable goods** |  |  |
| Telephone (including mobile phone) | 94 | 96 |
| Colour TV | 90 | 99 |
| Computer | 33 | 57 |
| Washing machine | 60 | 92 |
| Car  | 25 | 58 |

**Disposable income of households.** Equivalised disposable income of households is instrumental for the calculation of the at-risk-of-povery rate. The Roma Survey data found that the average disposable income of Roma households is significanlty lower than the overal national indicators (Table 3). The average monthly income per member of Roma household is 78 EUR (national average 326 EUR), and the average income per Roma household is 313 EUR (the median of 295 EUR), while the national average is at least twice as big.

It is important to note that the data collection method used by the survey was a direct interview without referring to the official registers, therefore the data so collected is deemed to be less accurate than that of the Income and Living Conditions Survey. However, the surveyors sought to calculate income of Roma households as accurately as possible by asking additional questions about alternative sources of income, social benefits, etc.

**Table 3.** Disposable Income of Households

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Monthly disposable income of households** (EUR) | **Roma Survey 2015 (EUR)** | **Income and Living Conditions Survey**  **2013 (EUR)** |
| Average | 313 | 854 |
| Median | 295 | 627 |
| Per person | 78 | 326 |
| **Monthly disposable income of households** (EUR)(intervals)  | **Roma Survey 2015 (%)** | **Income and Living Conditions Survey**  **2013 (%)** |
| Less than 200 | 25.5 | 6.9 |
| 200–300 | 33 | 13.7 |
| 301–400 | 17.9 | 10.1 |
| 401–600 | 13.2 | 21.6 |
| 601–900 | 6.6 | 20.3 |
| More than 900 | 3.8 | 27.4 |

**Debts.** Compared to the overallnational indicators, a somewhat larger proportion of Roma households have taken out loans, credits or acquired goods by hire-purchase. 65% of households have not taken out any loans (national average 92%). Those who have taken out loans claim that repayment of loans represents a heavy burden (28% of households) or a small burden (5% of households).

Although the survey did not include the question about forced collection of debts, respondents often mentioned that a proportion of their income is deducted to pay the outstanding debts for utility bills, fines (imposed for illegal construction, crimes or administrative infringements) and other debts. This is a particularly widespread problem at Kirtimai settlement in Vilnius, but on several occasions it was mentioned in other geographical locations, too.

**Subjective assessment of financial well-being by households.** Compared to the overall national indicators, a considerably larger proportion of Roma households assessed their financial situation as very grave (Roma 41%, national average 11%). The same proportion of Roma and general population indicated that they are in a difficult situation (26% each), but there are fewer Roma households claiming that they experience some hardship (Roma 28%, national average 50%) or no hardship at all (4% and 12% accordingly).

When asked about the minimal monthly income required for a household to make both ends meet, Roma indicated amounts that are slightly higher than the national average (797 and 656 EUR accordingly). One should note, however, that Roma households are larger. Thus, calculated as monthly income per household member, the amount indicated by Roma is by one third lower than the national average (Roma EUR 201, national average EUR 284).

## Data on Individuals

**Citizenship and migration.** According to the survey, 96% of the respondents are citizens of Lithuania, 2.5% are foreign nationals (mostly citizens of Ukraine, Russia and Belarus), and 1.9% are stateless persons.

About 20% of Roma respondents indicated that they resided abroad for a year or longer. This percentage is slightly higher than the national average identified by the 2011 Census, where 6.8% of Lithuanian population reported having resided abroad for one or more years.

**Education.** As alreadyindicated in the Technical Report, the sample contained a higher percentage of early leavers from primary schools and illiterate persons (24% compared to 10% in 2011), and a lower percentage of basic and college education graduates (32% compared to 49% in 2011) (Fig. 2). Before passing onto a more detailed analaysis of the survey data, the reasons behind the worsening of Roma education indicators from 2011 to 2015 need to be explored. This necessitates an expert consultation which will be carried out in the near future; then either the realiability of the survey data will be confirmed or the data will be revised against expert recommendations.

**Table 2.** Roma Education Indicators, % (data from 2011 and 2015)

*[Starting from the top: Higher Education. College and Special Secondary Education. Upper Secondary Education. Basic Education. Primary Education. Early Leavers from Primary School.]*

**Sources:** Population and HousingCensus 2011 (Statistics Lithuania, 2013) and Roma Survey 2015.

**Health.** Compared to the overall national average, a higher percentage of Roma described their health status as “poor or very poor” (Roma 29%, national average 23%); 50% indicated that they had a chronic disease or other long-term illness (national average 37%). Nearly a quarter of the respondents (23%) reported that at least once over the recent 12 months they did not receive health services when they were needed (national average 5%). Respondents indicated the following reasons for not seeing a doctor: 26% could not afford to pay for the service; 24% didn’t go to see a doctor due to the lack of time (child care, job); 26% had a fear of doctors, treatment, hospitals and medical tests.[[4]](#footnote-4) Even greater percentage of Roma (30%) reported that they did not receive any dental care services; 50% of them could not afford the service, and one third (32%) had a fear of doctors and treatment.[[5]](#footnote-5) Sligthly more than one tenth of adults (i.e. 15 and more years of age) (14%) indicated that they were not covered by the compulsory health insurance. Romani men are more likely not to be covered by the compulsory health insurance (20%) than women (9%). Out of the total Roma population including children under 15 years of age, 9% are not covered by the compulsory health insurance (this indicator matches the overall national average of 2011).

Analysis of the health data by gender revealed that women’s self-reported assessment of their health is lower than that of men: 31% of women and 26% of men described their health status as “poor or very poor”. Also, more women than men reported having long-term illnesses (53 and 46%); they sought medical advice less frequently, too. A quarter (25%) of women reported that over the recent 12 months they did not receive health care services when they were needed; 31% of them indicated they did not seek medical advice due to the time constraints (child care, job), and 26% reported having a fear of doctors and hospitals. Women more often than men did not receive dental care, too (32% and 26%). Most of them could not afford the treatment (57%), and 30% had a fear of doctors and treatment.

Health indicators of children from 0 to 15 years of age are better than those of adults. Only 8% of children were reported to be of poor or very poor health by their parents, 71% were reported to be in good and very good health. Chronic diseases and long term health conditions were reported in 21% of children (28% boys and 15% girls). Children are taken to see a physician more often, too: parents of only 6% of children said they did not receive any medical attention over the recent 12 months, and 9% did not receive dental care. Almost all children, with the exception of some individual cases, were reported to be covered by the compulsory health insurance and entitled for free medical treatment.

**Employment**. Compared to the 2011 Population Census, the Roma Survey data suggest a slightly higher percentage of economically active Roma. 11.6% of respondents indicated that they had hired labour jobs or were self-employed (6% in 2011). Despite the higher overall unemployment rate than in 2011 (38% and 34% accordingly), this rise indicates that more Roma are economically active, i.e. they participate in the labour market more intensively, but fail to stay there for longer periods of time.

Romani men are more active in the labour market than women: the percentage of employed men is slightly higher (15% and 9%), but more men also indicated that they were unemployed (48% and 32% accordingly). Women do not participate in the labour market because of their duties at home and child care: 23% of women reported being housewifes, 12% had children under 3 years of age (they did not work previously or had any jobs). It is important to note that a rather high percentage of Roma indicated they could not work because of their disability (Roma 10%, national average 5%); there were more men who reported unable to work because of their disability than women (12% and 9% accordingly).

Almost a quarter of respondents (23%) indicated that their economic activity had changed over the past year; 67% of them were employed as full or part time hired employees. This data confirms that a part of Roma are looking for ways to enter the labour market, but only a few succeed in finding and keeping a job. According to the field notes of the survey, Roma mentioned seasonal, temporary jobs (e.g., forest logging, time work), public works and jobs abroad to describe their working experience. A part of Roma emphasized that they could not take up unqualified and physically demanding jobs (which would correspond to their level of education), because of their poor health: 50% of respondents indicated having chronic diseases or other long-term illnesses.

**At-risk-of-poverty and material deprivation indicators**. The survey revealed that the at-risk-of-poverty rate among Roma is several times higher than that of the general population of Lithuania: at-risk-of-poverty rate[[6]](#footnote-6) among Roma population is 75% (national average in 2013 was 21%). The level of material deprivation[[7]](#footnote-7) among Roma is also exceptionally high: 86% of Roma face economic strains or can not acquire important durable goods due to the lack of financial resources (national average is at 16%).

More than two thirds (68%) of Roma of 15 or more years of age can not afford to replace their worn out clothes with brand new ones (national average 24%); half of respondents can not afford to have two pairs of adequate shoes (one pair for the warm season, another for the cold) (national average 2%). Most of Roma (68%) are not free to dispose of their income for personal needs. Only one fourth of female respondents (26%) and one third of male respondents (34%) reported that they could spend a little for their personal needs every week without consulting first with other family members; other respondents said they could not afford it.

**Children**. Analysis of the survey data revealed that Roma people’s approach to child care differs from that of the majority of Lithunian population. The differences are particularly pronounced in the group of pre-school children. Only one fourth of Roma children attend pre-school or pre-primary education programmes either at kindergartens or at schools (25%), and 74% do not. Meanwhile the distribution among general population is opposite: 75% attend kindergartens and only 25% do not. More often than other groups of Lithuanian population Roma ask other family members to help them with child care free of charge; majority of Roma children (67%) are sometimes child-minded by members of their family (other than parents), extended family members, friends or neighbors, usually for several hours a day or a week. However, the greatest burden of responsibility for child care in Roma families is placed on the parents, usually mothers. It must be noted that paid childminding services are not an option for an absolute majority of both Roma (99%) and general population (98%) of Lithuania.

As to enrollment of children in education, it must be noted that 14% of compulsory-education aged children (7-16 years old) were reported as not attending any general education school. Majority of Roma children were in primary schools (51% of enrolled children ages 7 - 18); the least number of children were in grades 11-12 of general eduction school or grades 3-4 of gymnasiums (3% of enrolled children ages 7 - 18). 46% of children were enrolled in basic education (i.e. grades 5-10), and majority of them were in grades 5-7.

**Survey Findings according to the Roma Integration Progress Assessment Criteria set in Annex 3 of the Action Plan for Integration of Roma into Lithuanian Society 2015-2020**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Roma Survey 2015**  |
| ***Education*** |  |
| *1.1.1. share of children enrolled in pre-school and pre-primary education programmes*  | 25%/ 1–6 year olds in kindergartens and pre-school education programmes |
| *1.2.1. illiteracy rate / rate of early leavers from primary edcuation programmes, age group 10-19*  | 35 % |
| *1.2.2. share of 10-19 year old persons with primary education*  | 56 % |
| *1.2.3. share of persons with basic education in the age group 10-19*  | 8 % |
| *1.2.4. share of 10-19 year old persons with secondary education*  | 1 % |
| *1.3.1. share of children involved in informal education programmes*  | 33 % / attend children day or occupation centres  |
| *1.4.1. share of 20 years old or older persons with primary education*  | 38 % |
| *1.4.2. chare of 20 years old or older persons with basic education*  | 22 % |
| *1.4.3. share of 20 years old or older persons with secondary and college education*  | 14 % |
| *1.4.4. a share of adult persons invovled in life-long-learning programmes*  | 8,5 %/ participated in labour exchange training courses, informal adult education programmes  |
| *1.4.5. share of 20–29 years old persons with secondary and college education*  | 13 % |
| ***Health*** |  |
| *2.1.1. share of persons covered by the compulsory health insurance*  | 91% |
| ***Employment*** |  |
| *3.1.1. rate of employment (%) – 15 year olds and older persons who have any kind of job for which they are remunerated either in cash or in kind (food or other goods) or earn profit (income)*  | 11.6 %/hired labour and self-employed  |
| *3.1.2. rate of unemployment (%) – 15 year olds and older persons who have no job but are activelly looking for oNo*  | 38% |
| *3.1.3. share of persons whose main source of income is social benefits*  | 29% |
| *3.1.4. at-risk-of-poverty rate*  | 75% |
| ***Situation of Women*** |  |
| *4.1.1. rate of female employment (%) – 15 years old and older women who have any kind of job for which they are remunerated either in cash or in kind (food or other goods) or earn profit (income)* | 9 %/hired labour and self-employed  |
| *4.1.2. share of 20 years old and older women with primary education* | 38 % |
| *4.1.3. share of 20 years old and older women with basic education*  | 21 % |
| *4.1.4. share of 20 years ol and older women with secondary and college education*  | 11 % |
| ***Housing*** |  |
| *5.1.1. share of persons confronted with the following housing problems: leaking roofs, damp walls (flooring, foundation), rotten windows or flooring*  | 72 % |
| *5.1.2. share of persons living in inadequately heated homes*  | 48 % |
| *5.1.3. share of persons who live in households confronted with economic strains (miss deadlines for payment of rent, utility bills, mortgage or other loan payments)*  | 83 % |
| *5.1.4. share of persons resideing in households without baths/showers*  | 43 % |

# ANNEXES

1. Data about Households Surveyed (in comparison with the data from the Income and Living Conditions Survey 2013)

|  |
| --- |
| **Information about Households** |
| **Housing Conditions** |
| **Housing size** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Average number of household memebers  | 4.8 | 2.3 |
| **Housing type** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Single appartment house | 29.4 | 37.2 |
| Appartment in a 2-appartment house | 7.4 | 7.1 |
| Appartment in a house of less than 10 appartments | 28.4 | 7.6 |
| Appartement in a house of 10 or more appartments | 28.4 | 47.9 |
| Other type of accomodation | 6.4 | 0.2 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **OwNorship type** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Owner of the housing, free of mortgage | 31.2 | 91.3 |
| Owner with an outstanding mortgage  | 0.9 | 3.1 |
| Lessee or sublessee paying a rent at the market price | 9.2 | 0.7 |
| Lessee paying a rent below the market price  | 37.6 | 0.9 |
| Lives in the accomodation and doesn’t pat any rent  | 21.1 | 4 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Years lived in the housing**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Average | 13.4 | 29.7 |
| Median | 7 | 28 |
| N | 108 | 5,142 |
| **Housing area** (m2) | **RS 2015** | **Census 2011** |
| Average area of housing  | 48.2 | 63.1 |
| Housing area per household member  | 126 | 26.2 |
| N | 108 | 3,043,429 |
| **Number of rooms**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Average number of rooms occupied | 2.1 | 3.5 |
| Average number of rooms per household member  | 0.6 | 1.5 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Access to a separate kitchen of at least 4 m2** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes, the kitchen is used by our household only  | 76.9 | no data |
| Yes, the kitchen is share with another household  | 4.6 | no data |
| No | 18.5 | no data |
| N | 108 | no data |
| **The kitchen is used also as a dining room or for other purposes that are not directly related to cooking of meals** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes  | 60.2 | no data |
| No | 39.8 | no data |
| N | 83 | no data |
| **Bath or shower** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes, bath/shower is used by our household only  | 38.5 | 83.6 |
| Yes, bath/shower is shared with another household  | 5.5 | 1.6 |
| No | 56 | 14.8 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Flush toilet** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes, toilet is used by our household only  | 41.3 | 82.5 |
| Yes, toilet is shared with another household  | 7.3 | 1.5 |
| No | 51.4 | 16 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Households that encounter the following problems: leaking roofs, damp walls (flooring, foundation), rotten windows or flooring**(%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 67.9 | 19 |
| No | 32.1 | 81 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Adequate heating**(%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 51.4 | 68.8 |
| No | 48.6 | 31.2 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Dark accomodation (not enough daylight)** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 36.7 | 7.5 |
| No | 63.3 | 92.5 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Households that suffer from noise caused by their next-door neighbors, staircase or outside (transport, business, industry)** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 31.2 | 13.4 |
| No | 68.8 | 86.6 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Air and environment pollution in the area** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 30.3 | 15.3 |
| No | 69.7 | 84.7 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Live in a crime, violence and vandalism-ridden area** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 33.9 | 5 |
| No | 66.1 | 95 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Financial situation** |
| **Housing compensation (%)** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 29.4 | 3 |
| No | 70.6 | 97 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Missed deadlines for mortgage or rent payments because of the lack of financial resources** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes, 1 time | 2.7 | 0.1 |
| Yes, 2 and more times  | 36.4 | 0.3 |
| No, always paid in time  | 7.3 | 4.1 |
| Did not have to pay  | 53.6 | 95.5 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **Missed deadlines for utility bills due of the lack of resources (%)** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes, 1 time | 5.5 | 3.6 |
| Yes, 2 and more times | 58.2 | 5.6 |
| No, always paid in time  | 23.6 | 90.6 |
| Did not have to pay | 12.7 | 0.2 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **Missed deadlines for payment of other loans, credits or interest** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes, 1 time | 6.3 | 0.2 |
| Yes, 2 and more times | 28.2 | 0.4 |
| No, always paid in time | 9.1 | 4.8 |
| Did not have to pay | 56.4 | 94.6 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **Ability to afford a week’s holiday away from home** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 25.5 | 48.2 |
| No | 74.5 | 51.8 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **Ability to afford a meal with meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent every second day** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 57.3 | 78.8 |
| No | 42.7 | 21.2 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **Ability to afford unexpected expenses[[8]](#footnote-8)** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 8.3 | 40.6 |
| No | 91.7 | 59.4 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Possession of a telephoNo (including mobile phone)** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 93.6 | 96.3 |
| No, can’t afford | 5.5 | 1.4 |
| No, other reason | 0.9 | 2.3 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **Possession of a colour TV** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 90 | 99.4 |
| No, can’t afford  | 9.1 | 0.4 |
| No, other reason | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Possession of a computer** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 32.7 | 56.7 |
| No, can’t afford | 60.8 | 9.5 |
| No, other reason | 6.5 | 33.8 |
| N | 107 | 5,142 |
| **Possession of a washing machine** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 59.6 | 92.1 |
| No, can’t afford | 38.6 | 3.6 |
| No, other reason | 1.8 | 4.3 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Possession of a car** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 24.7 | 57.5 |
| No, can’t afford | 67 | 14.7 |
| No, other reason | 8.3 | 27.8 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Household-related payments (utility bills, rent, mortgage, interest, insurance) are:** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| A heavy financial burden  | 48.6 | 38.6 |
| A small financial burden  | 29.9 | 52.6 |
| Not a burden  | 21.5 | 8.8 |
| N | 107 | 5,142 |
| **Repayment of mortgage or credit is: (%)** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| A heavy financial burden  | 28.2 | 2.8 |
|  A small financial burden  | 4.6 | 4 |
| Not a burden | 2.7 | 1 |
| No mortgage or credit  | 64.5 | 92.2 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **How a household is making ends meet:** (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| With great difficulty  | 40.9 | 11.3 |
| With difficulty | 26.4 | 26.1 |
| With some difficulty | 28.2 | 49.5 |
| Rather easily  | 3.6 | 11.5 |
| Easily | 0.9 | 1.6 |
| Very easily | 0 | 0 |
| N | 110 | 5,142 |
| **The minimum amount of monthly income required to make ends meet** (EUR) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Average | 797 | 656 |
| Median | 580 | 580 |
| Per person (average)  | 201 | 284 |
| N | 89 | 5,142 |
| **The minimum amount of monthly income required to make ends meet** (EUR) (intervals) (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Less than 450 | 27.6 | 34.5 |
| 451–800 | 44.9 | 34.6 |
| 801–1,000 | 12.8 | 15.6 |
| 1,001–1,500 | 4.6 | 13.8 |
| More than 1,500 | 10.1 | 1.5 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
| **Disposable monthly income of a household** (EUR) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Average | 313 | 854 |
| Median | 295 | 627 |
| Per person | 78 | 326 |
| N | 86 | 5,142 |
| **Disposable monthly income of a household** (EUR) (intervals) (%) | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Less than 200 | 25.5 | 6.9 |
| 200–300 | 33 | 13.7 |
| 301–400 | 17.9 | 10.1 |
| 401–600 | 13.2 | 21.6 |
| 601–900 | 6.6 | 20.3 |
| More than 900 | 3.8 | 27.4 |
| N | 109 | 5,142 |
|  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| **Households the monthly income of which is below the minimum average monthly income required to make ends meet** (EUR) | 74.5 | 56.8 |
| Households the monthly income of which is above the minimum average monthly income required to make ends meet (EUR)  | 25.5 | 43.2 |
| N | 86 | 5,142 |

1. Data about Individuals Surveyed (in comparison with the data from the Income and Living Conditions Survey 2013)

|  |
| --- |
| **Information about Persons**  |
| **Social Demographic Characteristics**  |
| **Gender** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Male | 44.15 | 46.07 |
| Female  | 55.85 | 53.93 |
| N | 521 | 11,756 |
| **Age** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| 0-9 | 26.3% | 5.6% |
| 10-19 | 29.0% | 10.2% |
| 20-29 | 12.7% | 8.9% |
| 30-39 | 10.9% | 8.1% |
| 40-49 | 7.7% | 14.0% |
| 50-59 | 8.4% | 19.3% |
| 60-69 | 3.5% | 15.0% |
| 70-79 | 1.0% | 13.1% |
| 80 and more | 0.6% | 5.7% |
| N | 521 | 11,756 |
| *Average* | 23.61 | 47.69 |
| **Citizenship** | **RS 2015** | **Census 2011** |
| Republic of Lithuania | 95.6% | 99.3% |
| Other state  | 2.5% | 0.7% |
| Stateless persons | 1.9% | 0.2% |
| ***Citizenship of another state***  | **RS 2015** | **Census 2011** |
| Russia  | 0.6% | 0.4% |
| Belarus | 0.6% | 0.3% |
| Latvia  | 0.2% |
| Ukraine  | 0.8% |
| Scotland | 0.2% |
| N | 521 | 3,043,429 |
| **Country of birth**  | **RS 2015** | **Census 2011** |
| Lithuania | 91.6% | 94.1% |
| Other country | 8.4% | 5.9% |
| ***Other country of birth***  | **RS 2015** | **Census 2011** |
| Russia  | 4.4% | 2.6% |
| Belarus | 1.2% | 1.6% |
| Ukraine  | 0.8% | 0.5% |
| Kaliningrad  | 0.2% |  |
| Kazakhstan | 0% | 0.2% |
| Latvia  | 1.0% | 0.7% |
| Poland | 0.2% |
| UK  | 0.6% |
| Other | 0% |
| N | 521 | 3,043,429 |
| **Resided abroad for one year or longer**  | **RS 2015** | **Census 2011** |
| Yes | 20.1% | 6.8% |
| No | 79.9% | 93.2% |
| N | 293 | 3,043,429 |
| ***Average length of stay in Lithuania (years)*** | 13.36 | no data |
| N | 56 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Education** |
| **Currently enrolled in a higher, vocational or general education programme**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 11.0% | 9.3% |
| Yes, but now on an academic/school leave  | 0.7% | no data |
| No | 88.3% | 90.7% |
| N | 281 | 10,444 |
| **Attended a higher, vocational or general education programme over the last 12 months**  | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes | 9.4% | N/I |
| No | 90.6% | N/I |
| N | 224 |  |
| **Current level of programme of those enrolled in education programmes**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Primary grades of general education school (1–4)  | 7.0% | 10.8% |
| Grades 5-10 of general education school or grades 1-2 of gymnasiums  | 55.8% |
| Grades 11-12 of general education school or grades 3-4 of gymnasiums  | 11.6% | 37.8% |
| Vocational school (entered before finishing the basic school)  | 2.3% | no data |
| Vocational school (entered after finishing the basic school)  | 2.3% | no data |
| Vocation school (entered after finishing the secondary school)  | 9.3% | 3.7% |
| College | 2.3% | 46.7% |
| University, academy, seminary (bachelor degree programme)  | 0% |
| University, academy, seminary (master degree or equivalent programme)  | 9.3% |
| University, academy, seminary (doctoral degree programme)  | 0.0% | .9% |
| N | 43 | 970 |
| **Education attainment**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Doctoral degree studies, postgraduate course at university (academy, institute, seminary)  | 0% | 0.3% |
| Master degree or equivalent studies (academy, institute, seminary)  | 0% | 24.8% |
| Bachelor degree studies at university (academy, institute, seminary)  | 0.7% |
| College | 0% |
| College-type school (until 2006)  | 0% |
| Special secondary school or technical school (until 1995) | 0% | 21.7% |
| Vocational training institution (entered after graduation of the secondary school)  | 3.1% |
| General education school, completed secondary education programme | 7.2% | 28.7% |
| Vocational training institution (entered after graduation of the basic school)  | 0.7% | 0.0% |
| Vocational training institution (entered without graduation from the basic school)  | 0% | 0.0% |
| General education school, completed basic education programme  | 20.2% | 15.1% |
| General education school, completed primary education programme | 43.8% | 8.3% |
| Primary school not completed  | 24.3% | 1.1% |
| N | 292 | 10,415 |
| **Took part in the labour market training, other vocational training, informal adult education programmes or courses in 2014**  | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes | 8.5% | no data |
| No | 91.5% | no data |
| N | 284 |  |
| **Economic Activity Level**  |
| **Current economic activity level**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Full time hired employee  | 5.8% | 37.5% |
| Part time hired employee  | 0.7% | 2.8% |
| Full time self-employed  | 1.0% | 3.8% |
| Part time self-employed  | 4.1% | .9% |
| Unemployed  | 38.3% | 6.6% |
| Pupil, student  | 11.2% | 8.0% |
| Old age pensioner  | 5.4% | 32.9% |
| Does not work because of disability  | 9.8% | 5.3% |
| Housewife, househusband  | 15.6% | 1.5% |
| Other type of economically inactive persons (parental leave for those having children aged 2-3 years, etc. )  | 8.1% | .5% |
| N | 295 | 10,444 |
| **Did your economic activity level change in 2014?** | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes | 22.6% | no data |
| No | 77.4% | no data |
| N | 292 |  |
| **How many months:[[9]](#footnote-9)** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| worked as a full time hired employee (average)  | 5.28 | 10.93 |
| worked as a full time hired employee (indicated) | 43.9% | 41.1% |
| N | 25 | 4,288 |
| worked as a part time hired employee (average) | 5.92 | 8.88 |
| worked as a part time hired employee (indicated) | 22.8% | 3.6% |
| N | 13 | 376 |
| worked as a self-employed or in family business, full time (average)  | 0 | 10.49 |
| worked as a self-employed or in family business, full time (indicated) | 0% | 4.2% |
| N | 0 | 440 |
| worked as a self-employed or in family business, part time (average)  | 5 | 9.5 |
|  (indicated) | 5.3% | 1.2% |
| N | 3 | 123 |
| was unemployed (average)  | 9 | 8.38 |
| was unemployed (indicated) | 39.3% | 10.0% |
| N | 23 | 1,044 |
| was attending school or studying (average) | 7.33 | 11.08 |
| was attending school or studying (indicated) | 11.1% | 9.4% |
| N | 6 | 981 |
| Was an old age pensioner (average) | 0 | 11.76 |
| Was an old age pensioner (indicated) | 0% | 33.0% |
| N | 0 | 3,444 |
| Was unemployed because of disability (average) | 0 | 10.85 |
| Was unemployed because of disability (indicated) | 0% | 5.8% |
| N | 0 | 610 |
| Was in compulsory military service (average) | 0 | 2 |
| Was in compulsory military service (indicated) | .0% | .0% |
| N | 0 | 1 |
| Was a houswife/househusband (average) | 9 | 9.19 |
| Was a housewife/househusband (indicated) | 1.8% | 2.0% |
| N | 1 | 204 |
| Was otherwise economically inactive (average) | 7.5 | 7.58 |
| Was otherwise economically inactive (indicated) | 17.5% | .9% |
| N | 10 | 97 |
| **Sources of income**  | **RS 2015** | **Census 2011[[10]](#footnote-10)** |
| Salary  | 12.9% | 35.9% |
| Income from individual or family business | 5.1% | 1.6% |
| Income from assets or investment  | .0% |
| Income from agricultural activity  | 1.4% | 1.2% |
| Pension  | 7.1% | 23.5% |
| Social benefit | 50.8% | 7.1% |
| Scholarship  | 1.4% | 0.6% |
| State dependent person | .3% | 1.0% |
| Family or otherwise dependent person  | 30.8% | 27.5% |
| Other sources of income  | 6.4% | 1.6% |
| N | 295 | 3043429 |
| **Living Conditions** |
| **Replaces at least a part of old clothes with brand new clothes**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 31.9% | no data |
| No, can’t afford | 67.5% | 24.0% |
| No, other reason | 0.7% | no data |
| N | 295 | no data |
| **Has two pairs of adequate shoes, one for the cold, another for the warm season**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 50.2% | no data |
| No, can’t afford | 48.5% | 2.0% |
| No, other reason | 1.4% | no data |
| N | 295 | no data |
| **Every week spends a small amount for his/her own needs without consulting with other family members** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 29.8% | no data |
| No, can’t afford | 68.1% | 25.0 % |
| No, other reason | 2.0% | no data |
| N | 295 | no data |
| **Has internet access for personal use at home**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 34.0% | no data |
| No, can’t afford | 56.1% | no data |
| No, other reason | 9.9% | no data |
| N | 294 | no data |
| **Health (adults)** |
| **General health status** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Very good | 3.4% | 5.8% |
| Good | 37.2% | 29.5% |
| Moderate | 30.7% | 42.2% |
| Poor | 18.6% | 18.4% |
| Very poor | 10.0% | 4.1% |
| N | 290 | 8195 |
| **Has a chronic disease or other long term health condition**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 50.0% | 37.2% |
| No | 50.0% | 62.8% |
| N | 288 | 10,242 |
| **Health-related restrictions on activity for 6 months or longer** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Very much restricted  | 31.7% | 9.9% |
| Somewhat restricted | 31.0% | 21.9% |
| No restrictions | 37.4% | 68.2% |
| N | 281 | 10263 |
| **Was there at least one case over the last 12 months when you did not receive medical attention or treatment (except dental care)?**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 23.2% | 5.1% |
| No | 76.8% | 94.9% |
| N | 289 | 10,264 |
| **What were the reasons for not receiving medical attention or treament (except dental care)?**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Could not afford (too expensive)  | 25.8% | 12.4% |
| Long waiting time (difficult to get an appointment or referral, etc.)  | 4.5% | 45.7% |
| Lack of time (job, child care, etc.)  | 24.2% | 4.7% |
| Too far to go, no tranposrt  | 1.5% | 6.4% |
| Fear of doctors, hospitals, tests, treatment  | 25.8% | 1.4% |
| Wanted to wait hoping that the problem would go away  | 12.1% | 29.1% |
| Did not know any good doctor or specialist  | 3.0% | .4% |
| Other reasons | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| N | 66 | 516 |
| **Was there at least one case over the last 12 months when you did not receive dental care services?**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 29.8% | 4.9% |
| No | 70.2% | 95.1% |
| N | 289 | 10,226 |
| **What were the reasons for not receiving dental care services?**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Could not afford (too expensive)  | 50.0% | 71.3% |
| Long waiting time (difficult to get an appointment or referral, etc.)  | 1.2% | 18.6% |
| Lack of time (job, child care, etc.)  | 8.3% | 1.0% |
| Too far to go, no tranposrt  |  | 1.8% |
| Fear of doctors, hospitals, tests, treatment  | 32.1% | 1.4% |
| Wanted to wait hoping that the problem would go away  | 3.6% | 4.7% |
| Did not know any good doctor or specialist  | 4.8% | 0% |
| Other reasons | 0% | 1.2% |
| N | 84 | 494 |
| **Are you covered by the compulsory health insurance?**  | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes, I am insured by the state  | 78.2% | no data |
| Yes, I am insured by the employer  | 3.8% | no data |
| No, I am not covered  | 13.8% | no data |
| I don’t know | 4.2% | no data |
| N | 289 |  |
| **Health (children)[[11]](#footnote-11)** |
| **General healt status** | **RS 2015** |  |
| Very good | 9.8% | no data |
| Good | 60.9% | no data |
| Moderate | 21.3% | no data |
| Poor | 4.0% | no data |
| Very poor | 4.0% | no data |
| N | 225 |  |
| **Has a chronic disease or other long term health condition** | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes | 21.3% | no data |
| No | 78.7% | no data |
| N | 225 |  |
| **Health-related restrictions on activity for 6 months or longer** | **RS 2015** |  |
| Very much restricted  | 13.5% | no data |
| Somewhat restricted | 30.6% | no data |
| No restrictions | 55.9% | no data |
| N | 222 |  |
| **Was there at least one case over the last 12 months when you did not receive medical attention or treatment (except dental care)?**  | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes | 6.3% | no data |
| No | 93.8% | no data |
| N | 224 |  |
| **What were the reasons for not receiving medical attention or treament (except dental care)?**  | **RS 2015** |  |
| Could not afford (too expensive)  | 7.7% | no data |
| Long waiting time (difficult to get an appointment or referral, etc.)  | 7.7% | no data |
| Too far to go, no tranposrt  | 7.7% | no data |
| Fear of doctors, hospitals, tests, treatment  | 7.7% | no data |
| Wanted to wait hoping that the problem would go away  | 23.1% | no data |
| Other reasons | 46.2% | no data |
| N | 13 |  |
| **Was there at least one case over the last 12 months when you did not receive dental care services?**  | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes | 8.9% | no data |
| No | 91.1% | no data |
| N | 224 |  |
| **What were the reasons for not receiving dental care services?** | **RS 2015** |  |
| Could not afford (too expensive)  | 10.0% | no data |
| Long waiting time (difficult to get an appointment or referral, etc.)  | 5.0% | no data |
| Too far to go, no tranposrt  | 5.0% | no data |
| Fear of doctors, hospitals, tests, treatment  | 45.0% | no data |
| Wanted to wait hoping that the problem would go away  | 10.0% | no data |
| Other reasons | 25.0% | no data |
| N | 20 |  |
| **Are you covered by the compulsory health insurance?** | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes, I am insured by the state  | 98.2% | no data |
| Yes, I am insured by the employer  | 0.4% | no data |
| No, I am not covered  | 1.3% | no data |
| N | 225 |  |
| **Child Care[[12]](#footnote-12)** |
| **1-6 year olds in kindergarten or nursery**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 25.3% | 74.4% |
| No | 74.7% | 25.6% |
| N | 79 | 308 |
| **7 year olds and above in general education schools**  | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 90.3% | 98.8% |
| No | 9.7% | 1.2% |
| N | 145 | 427 |
| **In what grade? (7 and more years of age)** | **RS 2015** |  |
| 1 | 14.1% | no data |
| 2 | 16.4% | no data |
| 3 | 14.1% | no data |
| 4 | 17.2% | no data |
| 5 | 8.6% | no data |
| 6 | 14.1% | no data |
| 7 | 8.6% | no data |
| 8 | 4.7% | no data |
| 9 | 2.3% | no data |
| N | 128 |  |
| **Can read and write (7 and more years of age)**  | **RS 2015** |  |
| Yes | 85.4% | no data |
| No | 14.6% | no data |
| N | 130 |  |
| **Attends after-classes activity group at school, a weekly kindergarten, etc.** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 10.8% | 3.6% |
| No | 89.2% | 96.4% |
| N | 212 | 665 |
| **Attends children’s day or occupation centres, etc.** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 33.2% | 3.5% |
| No | 66.8% | 96.5% |
| N | 205 | 877 |
| **Child is taken care of by a paid child minder** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 1.3% | 1.6% |
| No | 98.7% | 98.4% |
| N | 159 | 877 |
| **Child is taken care of by grandparents and other family members (other than parents), extended family members, friends or neighbours free of charge** | **RS 2015** | **ILCS 2013** |
| Yes | 67.0% | 25.0% |
| No | 33.0% | 75.0% |
| N | 197 | 877 |

1. Out of 523 respondents 2 were of other nationality than Roma, thus their personal data was not included into the analysis. The survey collected personal data on 521 Roma people. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Annex 3to *The Action Plan for Integration of Roma into Lithuanian Society 2015-2020*

<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/4a774b20a7c711e4a82d9548fb36f682> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Unless indicated otherwise, here and hereinafter comparisons against the overall Lithuanian average are made by referring to the resuls of Income and Living Conditions Survey 2013 (Statistics Lithuania, 2014). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The general population of Lithuania inadicates other reasons for not seeing a physician: 46% did not get medical attention because of the waiting time (difficult to get an appointment or a referral); 29% chose to wait hoping to get better on their own. Only 1% of Lithunian population reported a fear of doctors, 5% did not have time to see a doctor, and 12% could not afford the service. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Only 1% of the general population chose not to see a dentist. Inability to afford the service was indicated as the main reason by 71% of them, long waiting lists by 19%. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. At-risk-of-poverty rate is the share of people having an equivalised disposbale income that is below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold (Methodology for Calculation of Poverty Indicators, approved by Statistics Lithuania Director GeNoral’s Order No. DĮ-163 of 5 September 2011). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Material deprivation rate is the share of population that is confronted with a fixed number or more of material deprivation elements from a pre-defiNod list of material deprivation items. Accroding to the Eurostat methodology, a person is deemed to be materially deprived if he or she can not afford at least three of niNo items from the list. The list consists of 5 economic strains and 4 durable goods which a household can not afford due to the lack of financial resources. Economic strains: 1) a household can not afford to pay on time rent payments, utility bills, hire purchase installments or other loan payments; 2) a household can not afford oNo week’s annual holiday away from home; 3) a household can not afford adequate heating of their home; 4) a household can not afford to have a meal with meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent at least every second day; 5) a household can not afford uNoxpected expenses (amount of expenses equals the monthly poverty threshold of the previous year). Durable goods: 1) a telephoNo (including mobile phoNo); 2) a colour TV; 3) a washing machiNo; 4) a car. (Methodology for Calculation of Poverty Indicators, approved by Statistics Lithuania Director GeNoral’s Order No. DĮ-163 of 5 September 2011). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For the purposes of the RS 2015, the amount was EUR 235; in ILC Survey the amount was EUR 200. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Individuals who indicated the numbre of months: RS 2015 – 57; ILCS 2013 – 10444. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Includes all population from 0 years of age. The questions about sources of income used in ILCS 2013 are not identical to those of RS 2015; thus comparison with Census 2011 is more accurate. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. In ILCS 2013, questions about health were given to individuals of 16 years old or older. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. In ILCS 2013, indication of >0 hours/week per relevant type of care was qualified as “attendance”. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)