

IAB FB6, Dr. Markus Promberger

Tel.: 0911/ 179 31 39

e-mail: Markus.Promberger@iab.de

Register versus survey data: double sector coding in Germany

-

Some results from the german STILE WP3 exercise

Register versus survey data: double sector coding in Germany

1. Modified STILE WP3 coding exercise: double sector coding, no occupational coding in Germany
2. Two data sources: Employment register, Mikrozensus
3. Mikrozensus versus employment register: which one does ‚better‘?

Register versus survey data: double sector coding in Germany

1. Modified coding exercise

- No occupational coding of the STILE exercise data: German system is too far apart from ISCO-88
 - Two institutions doing sector coding, opportunity to compare register and survey data and coding procedures
- => Double sector coding exercise for Germany

Register versus survey data: double sector coding in Germany

2. Two datasources

1. Employment register, coding on 5-digit WZ2003, at 4-digit level identical with NACE rev. 1.1., covering alm. whole economy (2.2 mio. establishments with 1 employee min.) maintained by Federal Labour Office
2. Mikrozensus, coding on 3-digit WZ2003, annual survey data, based on a 1% sample of all german households. Delivering subsample data to CLFS.

Employment register data on sectors-characteristics

- 1 → Coders have quite a lot of informations and control the whole procedure of coding
- 2 → Establishment level
- 3 → Sector code once given stays for the whole lifetime of establishment, except changes in legal structure of ownership occurs or different trade permission is required
- 4 → If sector change is reported (see 3.), old code is kept for 2 years (stability rule).
- 5 → Main activity rule is followed by a proxy (number of employees)
- 6 → No systematic training of coders, ,industrialistic' perceptions, bias in coding

Mikrozensus sector data - characteristics

- 1 → Establishment level
- 2 → Huge part of pre-coding done during interviewing procedure, (matching of words) not under control of the coders
- 3 → Freshly reported every year, no lifelong persistence of codes
- 4 → Based on household or individual interviews with a high probability of unexactness if asked for sector
- 5 → Also some industrialistic bias of coders
- 6 → Sample data with sampling errors
- 7 → 3-digit level only, not much of disaggregation possible

3. Which one does better?

Employment register

- Exactness (5-digit, coverage, 1-hand coding)
- Low dynamics, high structural conservatism (stability, persistence, industrialistic bias)

Mikrozensus

- More dynamic, less conservatism
- huge inexactness (from Interviewers, Household data, sampling error, 3-digit level)

...thanks a lot for your attention!