EVALUATION OF NON-RESPONSE IN SURVEY ON HOUSEHOLDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT 2008

1.- Introduction

The Social Survey, as it was initially conceived, is an annual modular survey aimed at individuals or households, comprised of fixed and variable modules, whose objective is to be able to collect, in an agile manner, information regarding different social interest subjects without having to go through the complicated gestation process necessary to conduct ad-hoc surveys. Once the instrument has been built, it will only be necessary to discuss, each year, the subjects to include in the survey modules.

It was agreed that the objectives of Social Survey 2008 would be to research the habits, consumption trends and attitudes of households regarding the environment, as well as to study household equipment and the use that households make of the same, relating to the different aspects of the environment, for the purpose of being able to formulate environmental policies related to households.

The primary sampling unit is the census section, and the second stage unit is the dwelling, including in the sample all those households resident in the family dwellings selected. The last sampling unit considers one person aged 16 years old and over who is a member of each household.

The **incidences** that occur in the **incumbent dwellings** are subject to **replacement**, for the purpose of trying to obtain an effective sample size as similar as possible to the theoretical sample size.

The errors affecting the surveys are divided into two large groups: sampling errors and non-sampling errors. The former can be estimated using statistical procedures, whilst the latter are hard to measure, among other reasons due to the variety of possible causes.

This document analyses **non-sampling errors**, which appear in the different stages of the statistical process. They may occur before the information is gathered (deficient framework, insufficient definitions or questionnaires, etc.), during the information collection (incorrect fieldwork, incorrect statements or non-response of the informants) and, lastly, in operations subsequent to the fieldwork (errors when encoding variables, recording questionnaires, tabulating figures, etc.).

Among the possible causes of non-sampling errors, one of the most notable is the **non-response rate of the respondent units**, which can be caused by a refusal to answer the questionnaire, absence, inability to answer of all the persons inhabiting the respondent unit or cases in which the dwelling was inaccessible at the time of the interview.

In order to analyse non-response in the sample, an **evaluation questionnaire** is used, to be able to obtain information regarding the basic features of the units that do not participate in the survey.

This questionnaire consists of three sections. The first section is for noting down the identification data of the dwelling. The second section is for indicating

whether the dwelling has been replaced or not, noting down the order number of the replacement dwelling if it has. Lastly, the third section serves for noting down a series of basic data on the reference person of the dwelling: sex, age, nationality, highest level of studies attained and relation with economic activity.

This questionnaire is only completed for **surveyable incumbent** dwellings (in other words, dwellings that are not empty, used for other purposes, unlocatable or inaccessible) that, due to some incidence, have not taken part in the survey.

There is a listing of reserve dwellings to replace those incumbent dwellings that present some incidence. If the incumbent dwelling cannot be replaced after using all of the reserve dwellings, the former shall remain without being replaced, causing a loss in the sample.

2.- Analysis of the data

Table 1 presents the distributions, by Autonomous Community, of the theoretical sample, expressed as a number of dwellings, and of the effective total sample (number of households surveyed) and incumbent households. The effective sample is expressed as a number of households, given that for each dwelling selected, all of the households resident therein are studied.

It can be observed that, on a national level, the *total effective sample*, which includes the replacements of the incidences, represents 96.4% of the theoretical sample. This indicates that, as a result of the different incidences, and despite the replacements, somewhat less than 4% of the theoretical sample has been lost.

Dropping to the level of Autonomous Community, we observe that all of the Communities present *total effective sample* percentages greater than 82%. The Autonomous Community with the highest percentage of total effective sample is Galicia, standing at 99.5%, whereas at the other end of the spectrum, that is, with the lowest percentage of total effective sample, we find Canarias, slightly exceeding 82%. The figure obtained for País Vasco, greater than 100%, is misleading, as in some sections, more than the eight incumbent dwellings were surveyed, due to the fact that, after managing to survey eight dwellings, having carried out the corresponding replacements, the incumbent dwellings that had had incidences and had been replaced, were recovered.

TABLE 1. Distribution of the theoretical and effective samples, by Autonomous Community

Autonomous Communities	Theoretical sample		Effective sample			
			Total		Incumbent households	
	Dwellings	%	Households	%	Households	%
Total	27,678	100.00	26,689	96.43	16,174	58.44
Andalucía	6,000	100.00	5,684	94.73	3,391	56.52
Aragón	552	100.00	507	91.85	345	62.50
Asturias (Principado de)	512	100.00	490	95.70	286	55.86
Balears (Illes)	504	100.00	437	86.71	241	47.82
Canarias	688	100.00	567	82.41	322	46.80
Cantabria	416	100.00	383	92.07	215	51.68
Castilla y León	1,504	100.00	1,439	95.68	922	61.30
Castilla-La Mancha	672	100.00	643	95.68	410	61.01
Cataluña	3,504	100.00	3,424	97.72	2,100	59.93
Comunitat Valenciana	2,416	100.00	2,032	84.11	1,201	49.71
Extremadura	512	100.00	489	95.51	305	59.57
Galicia	1,110	100.00	1,104	99.46	732	65.95
Madrid (Comunidad de)	1,456	100.00	1,325	91.00	826	56.73
Murcia (Región de)	1,128	100.00	1,118	99.11	748	66.31
Navarra (Comunidad Foral de)	848	100.00	793	93.51	506	59.67
País Vasco	4,848	100.00	5,324	109.82	3,056	63.04
Rioja (La)	672	100.00	622	92.56	385	57.29
Ceuta and Melilla	336	100.00	308	91.67	183	54.46

Regarding the *effective sample of incumbent households*, we observe that the percentages are significantly lower than those of the total effective sample, indicating that it was necessary to make many replacements of incumbent dwellings. On a national level, the percentage reaches a value of 58.4%, whereas by Community, Murcia has the highest percentage of effective sample of incumbents (somewhat more than 66%), and Canarias has the lowest (nearly 47%).

Tables 2 and 2bis present the distribution of incidences in the incumbent dwellings of the sample, by Autonomous Community.

Table 2 allows for evaluating the defects of the framework through the unsurveyable dwellings, while **table 2bis** presents the distribution, by Autonomous Community, of the surveyable dwellings (including those surveyed plus those with non-response).

TABLE 2. Distribution of the incumbent dwellings of the sample, by Autonomous Community

Autonomous Communities	Incumbent dwellings							
	Total		Surveyable		Unsurveyable		Inaccessible	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	27,678	100.00	24,591	88.85	2,965	10.71	122	0.44
Andalucía	6,000	100.00	5,078	84.63	892	14.87	30	0.50
Aragón	552	100.00	479	86.78	73	13.22	0	0.00
Asturias (Princ. de)	512	100.00	452	88.28	60	11.72	0	0.00
Balears (Illes)	504	100.00	399	79.17	101	20.04	4	0.79
Canarias	688	100.00	555	80.67	131	19.04	2	0.29
Cantabria	416	100.00	366	87.98	48	11.54	2	0.48
Castilla y León	1,504	100.00	1,298	86.30	198	13.16	8	0.53
Castilla-La Mancha	672	100.00	582	86.61	82	12.20	8	1.19
Cataluña	3,504	100.00	3,183	90.84	304	8.68	17	0.49
Comunitat Valenciana	2,416	100.00	2,130	88.16	272	11.26	14	0.58
Extremadura	512	100.00	414	80.86	89	17.38	9	1.76
Galicia	1,110	100.00	954	85.95	155	13.96	1	0.09
Madrid (Comunidad de)	1,456	100.00	1,396	95.88	51	3.50	9	0.62
Murcia (Región de)	1,128	100.00	959	85.02	165	14.63	4	0.35
Navarra (Cdad. Foral de)	848	100.00	763	89.98	85	10.02	0	0.00
País Vasco	4,848	100.00	4,693	96.80	146	3.01	9	0.18
Rioja (La)	672	100.00	618	91.96	53	7.89	1	0.15
Ceuta and Melilla	336	100.00	272	80.95	60	17.86	4	1.19

If in **table 2** we focus on the unsurveyable dwellings, which include the empty dwellings, the unlocatable dwellings and those intended for other purposes, we can see that their percentage on a national level stands at 10.7%. Dropping to the level of Autonomous Community, worth noting are the low percentages of unsurveyable dwellings in País Vasco and Madrid, that is, 3% and 3.5%, respectively; the highest percentage has been obtained in Illes Balears, with 20%.

Table 2bis shows the distribution of the surveyable incumbent dwellings. As all of the percentages in this table are calculated with regard to the total number of surveyable dwellings, that is, subtracting the unsurveyable and inaccessible dwellings, the percentage of surveyed dwellings can be considered the **response rate** in the survey, which at a national level reaches a value of 65.4%, while by Community, it varies between the 56.4% recorded in Comunitat Valenciana and the 78% obtained in Murcia.

Absences are the incidences with the greatest weight in non-response, as at a national level, they represent 18% of the surveyable dwellings. By Community, Comunitat Valencia presents the highest percentage of absences, with 28%, while at the opposite extreme, Ceuta and Melilla have recorded the lowest percentage (4.8%).

TABLE 2bis. Distribution of the surveyable incumbent dwellings of the sample, by Autonomous Community

Autonomous Communities	Surveyable incumbent dwellings											
	Total		Surveyed		Non-response							
					Total		Refusals		Absences		Inability to answer	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	24,591	100.00	16,084	65.41	8,507	34.59	3,827	15.56	4,431	18.02	249	1.01
Andalucía	5,078	100.00	3,391	66.78	1,687	33.22	730	14.38	861	16.96	96	1.89
Aragón	479	100.00	344	71.82	135	28.18	67	13.99	64	13.36	4	0.84
Asturias (Princ. de)	452	100.00	286	63.27	166	36.73	91	20.13	71	15.71	4	0.88
Balears (Illes)	399	100.00	241	60.40	158	39.60	57	14.29	88	22.06	13	3.26
Canarias	555	100.00	322	58.02	233	41.98	182	32.79	37	6.67	14	2.52
Cantabria	366	100.00	215	58.74	151	41.26	59	16.12	92	25.14	0	0.00
Castilla y León	1,298	100.00	921	70.96	377	29.04	200	15.41	170	13.10	7	0.54
Castilla-La Mancha	582	100.00	410	70.45	172	29.55	96	16.49	75	12.89	1	0.17
Cataluña	3,183	100.00	2,102	66.04	1,081	33.96	610	19.16	444	13.95	27	0.85
Comunitat Valenciana	2,130	100.00	1,201	56.38	929	43.62	319	14.98	598	28.08	12	0.56
Extremadura	414	100.00	305	73.67	109	26.33	64	15.46	43	10.39	2	0.48
Galicia	954	100.00	734	76.94	220	23.06	119	12.47	90	9.43	11	1.15
Madrid (Comunidad de)	1,396	100.00	826	59.17	570	40.83	271	19.41	293	20.99	6	0.43
Murcia (Región de)	959	100.00	748	78.00	211	22.00	97	10.11	104	10.84	10	1.04
Navarra (Cdad. Foral de)	763	100.00	506	66.32	257	33.68	158	20.71	97	12.71	2	0.26
País Vasco	4,693	100.00	2,964	63.17	1,729	36.83	522	11.13	1,180	25.14	26	0.56
Rioja (La)	618	100.00	385	62.30	233	37.70	119	19.26	110	17.80	4	0.65
Ceuta and Melilla	272	100.00	183	67.28	89	32.72	66	24.26	13	4.78	10	3.68

Refusals, in turn, represent 15.6% of the surveyable dwellings on a national level, with Canarias being the Community with the highest percentage of the same (32.8%) and Murcia presenting the lowest percentage (10%).

Table 3 shows the breakdown of the incidences into incumbent dwellings and reserve dwellings. It can be observed that the weight of the framework defects (unsurveyable dwellings) is similar for both types of dwelling. Regarding non-response, it is clear that its weight is greater in the reserve dwellings, and in particular, that of absences.

TABLE 3. Breakdown of the incidences in the incumbent and reserve dwellings

Type of incidence	Incumbent dwellings		Reserve dwellings	
	No.	%	No.	%
Total	27,678	100.00	21,989	100.00
Unsurveyable dwelling	2,965	10.71	2,664	12.12
-Empty	1,689	6.10	1,374	6.25
-Unlocatable	821	2.97	815	3.71
-Rest	455	1.64	475	2.16
Inaccesible	122	0.44	111	0.50
Surveyable dwelling	24,591	88.85	19,214	87.38
-Surveyed	16,084	58.11	10,438	47.47
-Refusals	3,827	13.83	3,757	17.09
-Absences	4,431	16.01	4,794	21.80
-Inability to answer	249	0.90	225	1.02

The following comments on a series of non-response tables, but with data obtained from the Register, as the information collected through the evaluation questionnaires has been very scarce.

For the compilation of these tables, we have not considered Andalucía, Galicia, Cataluña or País Vasco, as the incidences on a dwelling level are not available for these Autonomous Communities.

In turn, the same have been compiled with the information corresponding to all those persons aged 16 years old and over in the surveyable incumbent dwellings, given that the identity of the reference person of the dwelling is unknown.

Table 4 presents the distribution of non-response in the incumbent households, according to the number of members. As a reference, this table also includes the percentage distribution of the households of the surveyable incumbent dwellings (surveyed plus non-response), having obtained the information from the surveyed households from the Register as well. It can be observed that the most numerous household modality is that of one member, representing 26% of the total.

On comparing the distribution of refusals with that of surveyable incumbents, and taking the latter as a valid reference, it can be observed that it is in the households with one and three members where this type of incidence is mainly concentrated. In the case of absences, we see that they are fundamentally concentrated in one-member households.

Table 4bis illustrates this same case from a different perspective, showing the distribution of incidences in each type of household (depending on the number of members) with non-response. In the same table, we observe that in all types of household, except in those with one and two members, the main incidence is the refusal to participate, reaching its highest percentage (55.6%) in those households with five members. In those households with one and two members, the most common incidence is absences, above all in one-member households, representing 54.5% of non-response.

TABLE 4. Distribution of non-response in the incumbent households, by number of members

Number of members	Non-response								Surveyable incumbents	
	Total		Refusal		Absence		Inability to answer			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	(%)
Total classified	3,728	100.00	1,819	100.00	1,821	100.00	88	100.00	10,445	100.00
1 member	1,152	30.90	491	26.99	628	34.49	33	37.50	2,715	25.99
2 members	966	25.91	466	25.62	475	26.08	25	28.41	2,665	25.51
3 members	775	20.79	424	23.31	335	18.40	16	18.18	2,262	21.66
4 members	603	16.17	312	17.15	285	15.65	6	6.82	1,950	18.67
5 members	187	5.02	104	5.72	78	4.28	5	5.68	677	6.48
6 or more members	45	1.21	22	1.21	20	1.10	3	3.41	176	1.69

TABLE 4bis. Distribution of the households with non-response of the incumbent dwellings, according to type of incidence and size

Number of members	Non-response							
	Total		Refusals		Absences		Inability to answer	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	3,728	100.00	1,819	48.79	1,821	48.85	88	2.36
1 member	1,152	100.00	491	42.62	628	54.51	33	2.86
2 members	966	100.00	466	48.24	475	49.17	25	2.59
3 members	775	100.00	424	54.71	335	43.23	16	2.06
4 members	603	100.00	312	51.74	285	47.26	6	1.00
5 members	187	100.00	104	55.61	78	41.71	5	2.67
6 or more members	45	100.00	22	48.89	20	44.44	3	6.67

Table 5 analyses the incidences in the incumbent households with non-response, by sex and age of the persons aged 16 years old and over in the same. This has also included, in the same table, the distribution of the persons aged 16 years old and over, by sex and age, in the surveyable incumbent dwellings.

TABLE 5. Distribution of non-response in the incumbent households, by sex and age of the persons aged 16 years old and over

Sex/Age	Non-response								Surveyable incumbents	
	Total		Refusals		Absences		Inability to answer			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	(%)
Total	7,788	-	3,976	-	3,628	-	184	-	23,110	
Men	3,823	100.00	1,898	100.00	1,830	100.00	95	100.00	11,343	100.00
16-25 years old	495	12.95	255	13.44	229	12.51	11	11.58	1,573	13.87
26-35 years old	868	22.70	365	19.23	473	25.85	30	31.58	2,446	21.56
36-45 years old	814	21.29	394	20.76	400	21.86	20	21.05	2,268	19.99
46-55 years old	570	14.91	294	15.49	268	14.64	8	8.42	1,812	15.97
56-65 years old	443	11.59	234	12.33	198	10.82	11	11.58	1,279	11.28
Over 65 years old	633	16.56	356	18.76	262	14.32	15	15.79	1,965	17.32
Women	3,965	100.00	2,078	100.00	1,798	100.00	89	100.00	11,767	100.00
16-25 years old	502	12.66	275	13.23	216	12.01	11	12.36	1,570	13.34
26-35 years old	797	20.10	362	17.42	414	23.03	21	23.60	2,218	18.85
36-45 years old	765	19.29	387	18.62	364	20.24	14	15.73	2,200	18.70
46-55 years old	563	14.20	302	14.53	249	13.85	12	13.48	1,801	15.31
56-65 years old	487	12.28	250	12.03	225	12.51	12	13.48	1,346	11.44
Over 65 years old	851	21.46	502	24.16	330	18.35	19	21.35	2,632	22.37

If we compare the distribution of persons in the surveyable incumbent dwellings, with the distribution of persons in the households that have refused, we can observe that the differences between the two are not very significant, as the greater is barely 2.3 percentage points, and is obtained in the modality of males aged *26 to 35 years old*, this percentage being higher in those surveyable incumbent households that have refused to participate. In the case of the absent households, the differences with regard to the distribution of the surveyable incumbents are somewhat greater, with the greatest difference (somewhat more than four percentage points) being obtained, for both men and women, in the category aged *26 to 35 years old*, with this percentage being lower in both cases in the surveyable incumbent dwellings.

The distribution of persons aged 16 years old and over in households with non-response, according to the level of studies of the same, can be viewed in **table 6**. In this table, persons have been classified into the four large groups of levels of study used in the Register, as a greater breakdown level could entail some risks, given the encoding system used in this administrative register, which in many cases does not allow for discerning the educational level corresponding to each person. At the end of the table, this has also included the distribution of those persons aged 16 years old and over in the theoretical sample (surveyable incumbent dwellings).

TABLE 6. Distribution of non-response in the incumbent households, by level of studies of the persons aged 16 years old and over

Level of studies	Non-response								Surveyable incumbents	
	Total		Refusals		Absences		Inability to answer			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	(%)
Total	7,788		3,976		3,628		184		23,110	-
No data recorded	61	0.78	27	0.68	32	0.88	2	1.09	172	0.74
Total classified	7,727	100.00	3,949	100.00	3,596	100.00	182	100.00	22,938	100.00
Unable to read or write	210	2.72	127	3.22	74	2.06	9	4.95	694	3.03
Educational level lower than school graduate	2,662	34.45	1,432	36.26	1,150	31.98	80	43.96	8,478	36.96
School graduate or equivalent	2,549	32.99	1,302	32.97	1,190	33.09	57	31.32	7,492	32.66
High school graduate or 2nd degree VT or equivalent or higher degrees	2,306	29.84	1,088	27.55	1,182	32.87	36	19.78	6,274	27.35

If we compare the distribution of the households with non-response with that corresponding to the theoretical sample, and consider the latter as a reference, we can observe that in the case of the refusals, both distributions are very similar, while in the case of absences, these are fundamentally concentrated in the group of persons with *High school graduate or 2nd degree Vocational Training, or equivalent or higher degrees*.

Table 7 shows the incidences in those households with non-response, according to the nationality of the persons aged 16 years old and over in said households. The same table also includes, as a reference, the distribution of persons aged 16 years old and over in the surveyable incumbent dwellings.

TABLE 7. Distribution of non-response in the incumbent households, according to the nationality of the persons aged 16 years old and over

Nationality	Non-response								Surveyable incumbents	
	Total		Refusals		Absences		Inability to answer			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	(%)
Total classified	7,788	100.00	3,976	100.00	3,628	100.00	184	100.00	23,110	100.00
Spanish	7,016	90.09	3,716	93.46	3,222	88.81	78	42.39	20,930	90.57
Foreign	772	9.91	260	6.54	406	11.19	106	57.61	2,180	9.43

If we compare this last distribution with those of refusals and absences, we observe that, in both cases, the differences are not considerable, although as regards the data, it could be stated with certain caution, given the small number of classified persons, that the refusals tend to be concentrated in households where there is a predominance of persons with Spanish nationality, whereas the absences tend to be recorded in households with a high proportion of persons with foreign nationalities.

Table 8 shows different percentage distributions of households according to the educational level (obtained from the Register) of those persons aged 16 years old and over resident therein. The purpose of this table is to compare the results obtained in the sample of incumbent households and in the effective sample.

Table 8. Comparative table of percentage distributions of households, according to the level of studies of the persons aged 16 years old and over therein

Educational level	Sample of surveyable incumbents	Effective sample of incumbents (surveyed incumbents)	Replacement households (surveyed reserves)	Total effective sample (total surveyed)
	%	%	%	%
Total classified	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Unable to read or write	3.03	3.18	3.28	3.22
Educational level lower than school graduate	36.96	38.24	37.70	38.03
School graduate or equivalent	32.66	32.50	32.62	32.54
High school graduate or 2nd degree VT or equivalent or higher degrees	27.35	26.09	26.40	26.21

It can be seen that the two distributions of incumbents (surveyable incumbents and surveyed incumbents) are fairly similar, as is the case with replacements and the total effective sample. If we compare the distribution of the surveyable incumbents (including the surveyed incumbents plus the incumbents with non-response) with the total effective sample (surveyed incumbents plus surveyed reserves), we observe that, although they are very much alike, in practice, fundamentally households with a high proportion of persons with *High school graduate or 2nd degree Vocational Training or equivalent or higher degrees* have been replaced by households with a high proportion of persons with an *educational level lower than school graduate*.

Table 9 shows different percentage distributions of households, according to the number of members in the same. The purpose of this table is likewise to compare the results obtained in the sample of incumbent households and in the effective sample.

Table 9. Comparative table of percentage distributions of households, by number of members

Number of members	Sample of surveyable incumbents	Effective sample of incumbents (surveyed incumbents)	Replacement households (surveyed reserves)	Total effective sample (total surveyed)
	%	%	%	%
Total classified	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
1 member	25.99	23.27	23.16	23.23
2 members	25.51	25.29	26.33	25.69
3 members	21.66	22.14	21.32	21.82
4 members	18.67	20.05	20.20	20.11
5 members	6.48	7.29	7.39	7.33
6 or more members	1.69	1.95	1.60	1.81

It can be observed that the greatest differences, though small, are recorded between the distribution of surveyable incumbents and the remaining three, which are relatively similar among themselves.

If we compare the distribution of surveyable incumbents (which include the surveyed incumbents plus the incumbents with non-response) with the total effective sample (surveyed incumbents plus surveyed reserves), we observe that in practice, fundamentally single-person households have been replaced by larger households, above all, those with 4 and 5 members, as is customary.

Table 10 shows different percentage distributions of households, according to the age of those persons aged 16 years old and over resident in the same. As in the previous tables, the purpose of this table is to compare the results obtained in the sample of the incumbent households and in the effective sample.

Table 10. Comparative table of percentage distributions of households, according to the age of the persons aged 16 years old and over therein

Age	Sample of surveyable incumbents	Effective sample of incumbents (surveyed incumbents)	Replacement households (surveyed reserves)	Total effective sample (total surveyed)
	%	%	%	%
Total classified	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
16-25 years old	13.60	14.01	13.40	14.09
26-35 years old	20.18	19.57	19.66	19.29
36-45 years old	19.33	18.86	19.56	18.98
46-55 years old	15.63	16.19	15.93	16.03
56-65 years old	11.36	11.06	11.66	11.25
Over 65 years old	19.89	20.32	19.79	20.35

If we compare the distribution of the surveyable incumbents (which includes the surveyed incumbents plus the incumbents with non-response) with the total effective sample (surveyed incumbents plus surveyed reserves), we observe that in practice, fundamentally households with persons aged 26 to 35 years old and aged over 65 years old have been replaced by households with persons aged 16 to 25 years old.

Lastly, **table 11** shows different percentage distributions of households, according to the nationality of the persons aged 16 years old and over resident therein.

It can be observed that the greatest differences occur between the distribution of the replacement households and the remaining three. Thus, if we compare the distribution of the surveyable incumbent households with that of the replacements, we observe that in the latter, the percentage of persons with Spanish nationality is one percentage point higher than in the former, with the contrary occurring with persons with foreign nationalities.

Table 11. Comparative table of percentage distributions of households, by nationality

Nationality	Sample of surveyable incumbents	Effective sample of incumbents (surveyed incumbents)	Replacement households (surveyed reserves)	Total effective sample (total surveyed)
	%	%	%	%
Total classified	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Spanish	90.57	90.81	91.63	90.87
Foreign	9.43	9.19	8.37	9.13

If we now focus our attention on the distributions of the surveyable incumbents (which include the surveyed incumbents plus the incumbents with non-response) and the total effective sample (surveyed incumbents plus surveyed reserves), we can observe that in practice, households with persons with foreign nationalities have been replaced by households with persons with Spanish nationality, although eventually the differences between the two distributions are quite small.