

Peru 2010

1 Survey Description

Survey: Encuesta Nacional de Hogares sobre Condiciones de Vida y Pobreza (ENAHO), carried out by the National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI) of Peru, for the year 2010.

Link to the document: http://webinei.inei.gob.pe/anda_inei/index.php/catalog/197

Sample: The survey was conducted between January and December 2010. The ENAHO collects information from 24 states and is nationally representative. The sample considered is restricted to adult individuals aged 19 to 62 with information about outcome and circumstances (39,315 individuals). Section 3 of this document describes the prevalence and pattern of missing data., 55,478 individuals in the total sample and 25,270 individuals in the analysis sample. Section 3 of this document describes the prevalence and pattern of missing data.

Weights: The weights are the inverse of the probability that the observation is included because of the sampling design. It could be understood as the number of individuals in the population that an individual represents in the sample according to the 2007 Population Census and demographic projections (*weights*).

Outcome: The outcome variables are annual equivalized household disposable total (*eq_iinc*) income in dollars PPP 2017.¹

Circumstances:

- Sex (female, male)
- Race 'Ethnicity' (indigenous, afro-descendant and others, described in Table 1)
- Region of birth 'Birthplace' (25 provinces, described in Table 1)
- Father's edu. (years of education (maximum 15), described in Table 2)
- Mother's edu. (years of education (maximum 15), described in Table 2)

¹Income variable was equivalized using the square root scale.

2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Respondant's socio-demographics - 2010

	Analysis sample	Total sample
	(N=25,270)	(N=55,478)
Gender		
0 Female	7,913 (31.3%)	28,417 (51.2%)
1 Male	17,357 (68.7%)	27,061 (48.8%)
Ethnicity		
1 White	807 (3.2%)	1,810 (3.3%)
2 Mix-race	12,572 (49.8%)	25,744 (46.4%)
3 Indigenous	10,495 (41.5%)	20,071 (36.2%)
4 Afro-descendant	470 (1.9%)	912 (1.6%)
5 Other	926 (3.7%)	2,031 (3.7%)
Missing	0 (0%)	4,910 (8.9%)
Region of birth		
1 Amazonas-San Martin-Ucayali	2,193 (8.7%)	4,832 (8.7%)
2 Anchash	1,233 (4.9%)	2,710 (4.9%)
3 Apurimac	978 (3.9%)	1,961 (3.5%)
4 Arequipa	960 (3.8%)	2,081 (3.8%)
5 Ayacucho	1,258 (5.0%)	2,606 (4.7%)
6 Cajamarca	1,748 (6.9%)	4,075 (7.3%)
7 Cusco-Madre de Dios	635 (2.5%)	1,316 (2.4%)
8 Huancavelica	1,277 (5.1%)	2,810 (5.1%)
9 Huánuco	1,007 (4.0%)	2,101 (3.8%)
10 Ica	1,067 (4.2%)	2,553 (4.6%)
11 Junin-Pasco	1,711 (6.8%)	3,516 (6.3%)
12 La Libertad	1,295 (5.1%)	2,639 (4.8%)
13 Lambayeque	945 (3.7%)	2,230 (4.0%)
14 Lima	900 (3.6%)	2,105 (3.8%)
15 Callao	2,206 (8.7%)	5,141 (9.3%)
16 Loreto	1,117 (4.4%)	2,738 (4.9%)
17 Moquegua-Tacna	934 (3.7%)	1,906 (3.4%)
18 Piura-Tumbes	2,296 (9.1%)	4,718 (8.5%)
19 Puno	1,510 (6.0%)	3,322 (6.0%)
Missing	0 (0%)	118 (0.2%)

Table 2: Parental education - 2010

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max	Missing
Analysis sample - Mother's edu	25,270	4.744	4.763	3	0	15	0
Analysis sample - Father's edu	25,270	6.344	4.853	6	0	15	0
Total sample - Mother's edu	55,478	4.854	4.822	3	0	15	23,987
Total sample - Father's edu	55,478	6.447	4.878	6	0	15	27,987

Table 3: Respondant's income - 2010

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max	Missing
Analysis sample	25,270	9,123	9,197	6,818	67.86	179,444	0
Total sample	55,478	9,263	9,648	6,981	37.92	211,271	0

3 Missing data analysis

3.1 Missing patterns




Figure 1: Missing patterns: *Left*: Marginal distribution of missing observations per variable. *Right*: Combination of missingness across cases

3.2 Differences in expected total equivalized household income between samples




Figure 2: Differences in expected total equivalized household income between the sample with non-missing circumstances and the total sample

3.3 Gini coefficient

Table 4: Gini coefficient in analysis sample and total sample

Wave	Sample	Gini	Lower bound	Upper bound	Average income
Wave 2010	Analysis sample	0.433	0.422	0.434	7,845
Wave 2010	Total sample	0.433	0.424	0.433	7,826

3.4 Differences in Gini coefficient between samples




Figure 3: Differences in Gini coefficient between the sample with non-missing circumstances and the total sample