


Differences in housing conditions of households in Poland in the light of household budget surveys

Aleksandra Dudek 

The Opole University

e-mail: adudek@uni.opole.pl

Krystyna Hanusik 

The Opole University

e-mail: khanusik@uni.opole.pl

Urszula Łangowska-Szczyńskiak 

The Opole University

e-mail: uls@uni.opole.pl

Abstract

The paper is devoted to the problem of inequality in a level of meeting the housing needs in Poland as the basic determinant of the standard of living. The aim of the research presented in it was an attempt to identify the spatial diversity of the housing situation of households in Poland, in 2006, as well as the subjective assessments of households and compare them with selected objective characteristics of the material situation of these entities.

The number of people per 1 room in a flat, the average number of m² per 1 person in a flat or the fact of living in an independent flat was assumed as representative indicators of a household's housing situation. Selected characteristics of housing quality were also examined. A comparative analysis of the relationship between self-assessment of the housing situation, its objective characteristics and selected characteristics of households belonging to particular socio-economic groups was carried out. The analysis showed that there is a strong relationship between satisfying the housing needs of households and the level of their income. It is worth emphasizing the significant impact of types of the place of residence (size of the city) on housing conditions and housing situation, that were more important than voivodships. Methods of statistical analysis were used in the research. The article uses source data from panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016 conducted by the Central Statistical Office.

Keywords: housing, housing needs, housing situation of households

JEL Classification: D12

1. Introduction

Dwell in an independent flat with an appropriate standard is one of the basic conditions for the proper functioning of the household. In Poland, as a result of the Second World War, the housing infrastructure has suffered enormous destruction. Reconstruction and development of housing resources during the centrally controlled economy did not bring satisfactory results in the general opinion. It seemed that the situation would improve after 1989 as a result of the privatization of some resources, the uprising of a primary and secondary housing market. However, it is still considered that the number of apartments is meagre, they are too expensive, there are not enough communal housing, the costs of renting apartments from private owners are too high. Young people who have started a family declare that apartments are still not available to them.

In turn, statistical data indicate that there was a gradual improvement in the housing situation in Poland. In 2016 the number of flats was close to the number of households, on average there were 0.7 people per one room, and on average more than 27 m² of usable floor space per person (*Gospodarka mieszkaniowa...*, 2017, p. 17 and beyond). However, the averaged indicators do not show the variation in the level of satisfaction of the housing needs of households, classified according to various criteria.

The following paper is therefore devoted to the problem of inequality in the level of meeting the housing needs in Poland. The aim of the presented studies was an attempt to identify the spatial diversity of housing conditions of households. In the studies selected characteristics of the state of housing stock and housing conditions were taken into account, as well as subjective assessments of the standard of housing compared to the financial situation of households, grouped according to the criterion of the class of locality and voivodship.

Statistical analysis methods were used. The studies uses the source of unidentifiable data from panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016 conducted by the Central Statistical Office.

2. Differentiation of a ownership structure of apartments in Poland in 2016 by the class of the place of residence of households

A form of ownership and a legal title to a flat are one of the most important factor of the housing situation of households. Furthermore one of the most important dimensions of its diversity is the class of the place of residence. Tables 1 and 2 below present results of conducted analysis of the ownership structure of apartments used by households grouped according to this criterion.

Table 1. Ownership structure of apartments used by households in Poland in 2016 by the class of locality

Specification of types of the place of residence	Ownership of a flat (shares in%)					
	Natural person	Housing cooperative*	The municipality, the State, company	TBS	Another entity	It is not known
Poland total	84.24	8.55	6.09	0.59	0.39	0.14
500 thousand residents and more	76.17	12.18	10.12	0.61	0.31	0.61
200–499 thousand residents	77.16	12.73	8.33	1.12	0.54	0.13
100–199 thousand residents	70.18	16.56	11.43	0.14	1.17	0.52
20–99 thousand residents	72.13	17.63	8.29	1.51	0.41	0.03
More than 20 thousand residents	81.66	10.19	6.68	1.06	0.39	0.02
Rural area	96.35	0.99	2.36	0.06	0.24	0.01

* Condominiums and cooperative ownership right to premises (local).

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

In Poland, in 2016, households used apartments that were primarily owned by a natural person (84.24%), wherein in rural areas private ownership of dwellings was much more frequent than in cities (respectively 96.35% and 75.36%). In cities, cooperative and municipal flats were also important (respectively 14.10% and 8.82% of resources), which were practically non-existent in the countryside. There were also small shares in social housing (TBS) in cities and especially in rural areas.

The differentiation of the ownership structure of apartments also depends on the size of the city. And so, the property of a natural person relatively often was in the smallest cities (81.66%) and the least often in medium-sized cities with a population of 100–199 thousand. (70.18%). Co-operative and municipal property of flats was in turn most frequently observed in medium-sized cities from 20–199 thousand residents.

Housing owned by individuals and ownership housing cooperative analyzed in 2016, in Poland were relatively rarely burdened with mortgage loans. In cities, it was less than 10% of such dwellings and in rural areas – 6.6%. The largest share of flats charged with mortgage loans was observed in agglomerations (13.78%) and large cities – 200–499 thousand residents (10.65%). In agglomerations, relatively often households rented apartments (26.14%). The structure of dwellings used by households from large cities, classified according to the legal title to a flat, indicates on the one hand the greater wealth of these households, and on the other hand their greater mobility.

Table 2. Legal title to flats used by households in Poland in 2016 by the class of locality

Specification of types of the place of residence	Legal title to a flat				
	Property* charged with a mortgage	Property* not mortgaged	Co-operative right to the premises	Renting	Other
Poland total	8.53	73.48	1.58	13.72	2.68
500 thousand residents and more	13.78	56.45	1.89	26.14	1.74
200–499 thousand residents	10.65	64.21	2.30	20.70	2.14
100–199 thousand residents	8.51	63.67	4.20	21.49	2.13
20–99 thousand residents	8.51	68.05	2.96	18.78	1.70
More than 20 thousand residents	8.20	72.76	1.84	14.98	2.23
Rural area	6.61	84.77	0.23	4.70	3.69

* Mortgage or cooperative ownership right to the premises.

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

The structure of apartments classified by the legal title to a flat in the countryside was diametrically different than in cities. In case of households in rural areas, the property by the ownership of a natural person not burdened with a mortgage loan dominated, this legal title to the dwelling concerned 84.77% of households. The share of households in countryside using flats owned by them but burdened with a mortgage loan was 6.61%, but these were mainly apartments built after 2007 (see also Table 3).

3. Differentiation of a housing quality in Poland in 2016 by the class of the place of residence of households

It has been assumed that the quality of housing can be indirectly evaluated on the basis of the age of the building in which the flat is located, the type of building and selected characteristics of the housing equipment. On the other hand, the quality of the dwelling is directly evidenced by the assessment of its standard by the household itself. Housing resources in our country in 2016 are relatively new. Over 80% of buildings were created after the Second World War. The largest share in these resources have buildings created in the period 1961–1980 (35%) and 1981–1995 (20%), while in the countryside buildings are slightly older than in cities (see Table 3). Analysis of the age structure of dwellings used by households according to the period of their construction allows also to conclude that after 1995 apartments were built mainly in large cities and agglomerations, as well as in countryside. In contrast, in small and medium-sized cities, the largest development of housing construction took place in 1961–1995.

Table 3. Structure of apartments used by households in Poland in 2016 according to the period of their construction/creation and the class of locality

Specification of types of the place of residence	Building construction periods (shares in%)						
	Before 1946	1946–1960	1961–1980	1981–1995	1996–2006	2007–2011	After 2011
Poland total	18.25	12.44	35.07	20.00	7.77	4.66	1.81
500 thousand residents and more	15.01	12.10	31.69	17.18	11.51	9.05	3.46
200–499 thousand residents	13.81	10.33	37.93	21.69	8.61	4.85	2.78
100–199 thousand residents	22.42	10.37	41.43	18.73	4.37	1.89	0.79
20–99 thousand residents	14.54	9.47	42.79	23.55	5.51	3.21	0.91
More than 20 thousand residents	21.24	11.78	32.06	24.90	6.12	2.71	1.19
Rural area	20.06	14.74	32.00	18.01	8.45	4.90	1.83

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

On housing resources in Poland in a similar degree consisted apartments in multi-family buildings and single-family, but in cities dominated the first one (75.66%) and in rural areas dominated housing in single-family buildings detached (77.83%). At the same time, the smaller the cities, the higher the share of flats in single-family houses (see Table 4).

Table 4. Structure of apartments used by households in Poland in 2016 according to the type of buildings and the class of locality

Specification of types of the place of residence	Type of the building (shares in %)			
	Multifamily	Single-family terraced houses	Single-family detached	Other
Poland total	49.92	6.46	43.47	0.15
500 thousand residents and more	84.50	5.90	9.53	0.06
200–499 thousand residents	80.70	5.74	13.40	0.16
100–199 thousand residents	81.44	4.24	14.22	0.10
20–99 thousand residents	74.81	5.12	20.01	0.06
More than 20 thousand residents	58.89	8.66	32.25	0.19
Rural area	14.81	7.15	77.83	0.21

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

Apartment used by households in Poland for the most part had access to the waterworks from the network and to the sewage system, they were equipped with a bathroom, flushed toilet and had running hot water. In the rural areas, however, the characteristics of access to water and sanitation and housing equipment in sanitary facilities were significantly worse than in urban areas (see Table 5). Taking into

consideration the size of the city, access of urban households to the water and sewage network and equipping with sanitary facilities is relatively little differentiated.

Table 5. Equipping residential buildings used by households in Poland in 2016 by the class of locality

Specification of types of the place of residence	Shares of households in %				
	Having an access to the water supply from the network	Equipped with a bathroom	Equipped with a flushed toilet	Not having a hot water	Not having an access to the sewage system
Poland total	92.23	96.41	97.37	3.38	2.63
500 thousand residents and more	98.28	97.46	98.74	1.68	1.26
200–499 thousand residents	98.72	97.70	99.01	1.82	0.99
100–199 thousand residents	99.35	97.04	97.62	2.55	2.38
20–99 thousand residents	98.46	97.62	98.65	2.19	1.35
More than 20 thousand residents	96.71	97.60	98.52	2.25	1.48
Rural area	84.04	94.89	95.76	5.16	4.24

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

Against the background of these objective characteristics of the quality of households flats, differences of the self-assessment of the standard of the building in which the flat is located can be regarded as justified. Households generally assessed the standard of the apartment as a “medium wealthy” (56.53%) and “modest” (32.91%). Wherein based on the self-assessment, it can be concluded that apartments with the highest standard – luxurious and affluent – occurred most commonly in cities of over 500 thousand residents and in the rural areas. At the same time in the countryside and in the cities with 100–199 thousand residents, more than in other cities, buildings were rated as poor or very poor, which indicates high differentiation of the standard of buildings (see Table 6).

Table 6. Structure of apartments used by households in Poland in 2016, according to the self-assessment of the building's standard and by the class of locality

Specification of types of the place of residence	Self-assessment of the building's standard (shares in%)					
	Luxurious	Affluent/wealthy	Medium wealthy	Modest	Poor	Very poor
Poland total	0.44	4.42	56.53	32.91	4.49	1.21
500 thousand residents and more	0.67	5.88	62.10	26.42	3.61	1.32
200–499 thousand residents	0.41	4.75	62.90	27.27	3.64	1.02
100–199 thousand residents	0.24	2.89	59.23	31.06	4.65	1.93
20–99 thousand residents	0.41	2.69	58.70	32.98	3.73	1.48
More than 20 thousand residents	0.24	3.75	57.59	33.10	4.52	0.80
Rural area	0.47	5.06	51.89	36.29	5.20	1.08

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

The housing situation of a household is influenced primarily by the size of the dwelling used, the use of the flat by the household itself, the cost of maintaining the flat in relation to the income of the household. Appropriate characteristics of the housing situation of households are presented in Table 7.

Based on data from the panel surveys of household budgets, it can be stated that about 6% of households in Poland in 2016 did not use an independent flat, in cities it was 5.37% and in rural areas 6.95% of households. The largest share of households not using an independent flat was observed in agglomerations, large cities and in the countryside. However, while in the case of cities, the lack of independent housing can be evidence of an unmet housing need, in rural areas such a situation may be also a result of the tradition of multigenerational households cohabitation. In addition, it is worth noting that the average usable floor space per person was significantly higher in rural areas than in cities. Nevertheless, the average monthly expenses for housing maintenance were over PLN 60 higher in cities than in rural areas. The share of expenses on housing maintenance in households' incomes was on average around 15% in Poland, 15.53% in cities and 14.37% in rural areas. Inability to pay housing fees households declared equally often in rural areas and in cities – and it was less than 3% of households (see Table 7). However, the most frequent difficulties in paying housing fees on time were for households from cities with a population of 100–499 thousand.

Table 7. Selected characteristics of the housing situation of households in Poland in 2016 by the class of locality

Specification of types of the place of residence	Shares of households using an independent flat in %	The average area of a flat in m ² per person	Average monthly income of households in PLN	Average monthly expenses of households for housing maintenance in PLN	Shares of households declaring difficulties in paying housing charges on time
Poland total	93.96	35.47	4036.87	607.53	2.76
500 thousand residents and more	91.73	31.87	4834.89	720.96	2.56
200–499 thousand residents	93.97	32.78	4100.43	640.30	3.41
100–199 thousand residents	95.76	32.22	3918.23	624.69	3.65
20–99 thousand residents	95.95	32.00	3808.58	595.70	2.54
More than 20 thousand residents	95.64	35.84	3765.18	599.47	2.86
Rural area	93.05	39.03	3967.47	570.10	2.60

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

4. Spatial differentiation of housing conditions of households in Poland in 2016

Apart from the class of locality, the second of the criteria for spatial differentiation of housing conditions of households is the province of residence. Therefore, the analysis of the housing situation of households classified according to this criterion was also carried out. At the same time only the age and standard of the used dwelling and selected characteristics of the housing situation were considered.

Data presented in Table 8 show that in Poland in 2016 there were large differences in the age structure of residential buildings by voivodships, both in urban and rural areas. Thus, the largest shares of buildings built before 1946 occurred in western and northern voivodships, in other provinces the share of such old buildings did not exceed 20%. In years 1961–1981 relatively many residential buildings were built in the whole country, but the least were being built in the Lower Silesia and Lubusz provinces, where the share of old buildings exceeded 62%. The most diverse by voivodships were the shares of buildings created after 2011, they are within the range of 0.16–3.80%. During this period, the most was being built in the Pomeranian Voivodship, especially in rural areas and in the Masovia Voivodship – in cities. In turn, after 2011, buildings construction in cities in the Podlachian voivodship did not develop at all. In this voivodship the share of residential buildings created in this period in cities amounted to only 0.16%.

Table 8. Structure of apartments used by households in Poland in 2016, according to the period of the building creation and the province of residence of households

Specification*		Building construction period (shares in%)						
		Before 1946	1946–1960	1961–1980	1981–1995	1996–2006	2007–2011	After 2011
Lower Silesia	u	31.55	5.44	31.71	17.65	6.98	3.86	2.80
	r	62.07	5.76	12.21	8.44	4.67	4.37	2.48
	t	42.15	5.55	24.94	14.45	6.17	4.04	2.69
Kuyavian-Pomeranian	u	28.33	10.07	28.33	19.33	6.83	4.41	2.70
	r	23.36	18.57	29.67	14.95	6.78	4.79	1.87
	t	26.17	13.77	28.91	17.43	6.81	4.57	2.34
Lublin	u	3.14	13.62	31.20	34.58	13.74	2.56	1.16
	r	6.65	17.21	39.98	21.20	8.98	4.32	1.66
	t	5.19	15.71	36.32	26.77	10.96	3.59	1.45
Lubusz	u	19.26	10.30	43.24	22.30	2.70	1.86	0.34
	r	62.65	5.16	12.29	9.34	4.42	4.42	1.72
	t	36.94	8.21	30.63	17.02	3.40	2.90	0.90
Lodzkie	u	18.74	6.95	37.48	26.64	4.84	4.14	1.21
	r	9.62	18.08	34.78	19.66	11.73	4.86	1.27
	t	15.31	11.13	36.46	24.02	7.44	4.41	1.23

Specification*		Building construction period (shares in%)						
		Before 1946	1946–1960	1961–1980	1981–1995	1996–2006	2007–2011	After 2011
Lesser Poland	u	5.92	9.38	46.37	18.90	8.52	9.45	1.46
	r	6.20	17.10	38.04	22.12	9.91	4.71	1.92
	t	6.06	13.38	42.06	20.56	9.24	6.99	1.70
Masovia	u	8.91	14.49	32.43	21.54	11.77	7.65	3.21
	r	6.07	13.41	35.76	24.95	12.18	6.21	1.42
	t	7.86	14.09	33.66	22.80	11.92	7.12	2.55
Opole	u	26.69	10.56	38.65	21.31	0.80	1.20	0.80
	r	55.20	10.40	20.81	7.01	3.18	1.91	1.49
	t	40.49	10.48	30.01	14.39	1.95	1.54	1.13
Subcarpathia	u	4.90	8.57	51.29	23.27	6.94	3.67	1.36
	r	6.39	15.22	41.03	22.05	9.62	4.72	0.96
	t	5.80	12.62	45.05	22.52	8.57	4.31	1.12
Podlachian	u	5.79	8.52	42.93	33.92	7.07	1.61	0.16
	r	5.47	19.25	46.04	16.23	6.98	3.96	2.08
	t	5.64	13.45	44.36	25.78	7.03	2.69	1.04
Pomerania	u	18.10	7.92	38.68	17.61	7.78	6.72	3.18
	r	31.37	12.62	22.55	15.20	6.50	7.97	3.80
	t	22.96	9.64	32.78	16.73	7.31	7.17	3.41
Silesia	u	21.19	12.30	41.42	19.50	3.27	1.45	0.88
	r	9.22	19.25	39.48	19.07	8.50	2.95	1.52
	t	18.08	14.10	40.91	19.39	4.63	1.84	1.05
Swietokrzyskie	u	5.71	20.51	58.99	10.99	1.90	0.85	1.06
	r	2.92	14.17	45.00	25.14	8.61	2.78	1.39
	t	4.02	16.68	50.54	19.53	5.95	2.01	1.26
Warmia-Masuria	u	19.98	12.33	36.00	22.07	6.04	2.59	0.99
	r	43.33	15.89	22.49	8.25	4.80	3.75	1.50
	t	30.51	13.94	29.91	15.83	5.48	3.11	1.22
Greater Poland	u	20.80	13.82	31.78	18.86	8.40	4.91	1.42
	r	24.57	15.15	25.63	15.48	9.03	7.58	2.57
	t	22.67	14.48	28.73	17.19	8.71	6.23	1.99
West Pomerania	u	21.06	5.83	32.82	25.87	9.20	4.09	1.12
	r	46.15	9.71	20.70	13.19	4.95	3.48	1.83
	t	30.05	7.22	28.48	21.33	7.68	3.87	1.38

* Explanation: u – urban areas, r – rural areas, t – total.

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

The age of the building does not always correspond to the quality of flats what is suggested by the spatial diversity of the self-assessment of the standard of flats used by households (see Table 9). As you can see, the high standard of housing was most often declared by households from voivodships, whose capitals were big cities and

agglomerations or voivodships with tourist assets (these were the voivodships: Lower Silesia, Masovia and Lesser Poland). In these voivodships relatively more frequent than in others, households from rural areas declared the use of wealthy and luxury dwellings. The worst assessments of standard of inhabited buildings were issued by households from Subcarpathia, Podlachian and Swietokrzyskie provinces and also Greater Poland – which may surprise.

Table 9. Structure of apartments used by households in Poland in 2016, according to the self-assessment of buildings standard and by the province of residence of households

Specification*		Self-assessment of the building's standard (shares in %)					
		Luxurious	Affluent/ wealthy	Medium wealthy	Modest	Poor	Very poor
Lower Silesia	u	0.53	5.44	56.55	31.45	4.55	1.48
	r	0.99	4.97	38.83	44.79	8.54	1.89
	t	0.69	5.28	50.40	36.08	5.93	1.62
Kuyavian-Pomeranian	u	0.27	4.23	51.89	32.73	8.09	2.79
	r	0.82	3.15	52.45	37.73	4.56	1.29
	t	0.51	3.76	52.13	34.91	6.55	2.13
Lublin	u	0.12	5.82	66.47	25.15	2.33	0.12
	r	0.25	3.74	57.94	32.25	4.74	1.08
	t	0.19	4.61	61.49	29.29	3.73	0.68
Lubusz	u	0.00	1.86	56.25	34.63	5.91	1.35
	r	0.98	6.88	48.16	35.38	8.11	0.49
	t	0.40	3.90	52.95	34.93	6.81	1.00
Lodzkie	u	0.45	3.25	58.19	30.47	5.23	2.42
	r	0.42	7.08	47.46	38.05	5.50	1.48
	t	0.44	4.69	54.16	33.32	5.33	2.07
Lesser Poland	u	0.07	3.19	70.46	25.08	0.80	0.40
	r	0.68	7.19	56.38	30.86	4.28	0.62
	t	0.38	5.26	63.17	28.07	2.60	0.51
Masovia	u	0.72	5.90	60.78	27.76	3.61	1.23
	r	0.10	4.84	55.09	33.37	5.63	0.98
	t	0.49	5.51	58.68	29.83	4.35	1.14
Opole	u	0.20	2.99	72.31	22.51	1.59	0.40
	r	1.27	5.73	57.96	31.42	2.55	1.06
	t	0.72	4.32	65.36	26.82	2.06	0.72
Subcarpathia	u	0.14	6.94	63.54	28.03	1.09	0.27
	r	0.17	4.81	57.04	33.68	3.67	0.61
	t	0.16	5.64	59.58	31.47	2.66	0.48
Podlachian	u	0.00	1.13	67.52	27.97	2.73	0.64
	r	0.57	4.15	51.70	39.06	3.96	0.57
	t	0.26	2.52	60.24	33.07	3.30	0.61

Specification*		Self-assessment of the building's standard (shares in %)					
		Luxurious	Affluent/ wealthy	Medium wealthy	Modest	Poor	Very poor
Pomerania	u	0.78	4.31	59.83	31.47	3.18	0.42
	r	0.12	3.68	49.88	38.60	6.62	1.10
	t	0.54	4.08	56.19	34.08	4.44	0.67
Silesia	u	0.44	2.83	62.89	28.08	4.21	1.54
	r	0.18	6.54	55.42	32.59	4.39	0.90
	t	0.37	3.79	60.95	29.25	4.26	1.37
Swietokrzyskie	u	0.00	2.11	46.72	47.99	1.90	1.27
	r	0.00	5.14	50.83	39.58	3.89	0.56
	t	0.00	3.94	49.20	42.92	3.10	0.84
Warmia-Masuria	u	0.49	2.96	56.23	34.40	5.06	0.86
	r	0.60	5.85	42.73	42.43	6.75	1.65
	t	0.54	4.26	50.14	38.02	5.82	1.22
Greater Poland	u	0.26	1.87	52.65	39.08	5.10	1.03
	r	0.66	3.49	50.86	39.39	4.61	0.99
	t	0.46	2.67	51.76	39.24	4.86	1.01
West Pomerania	u	0.61	3.68	53.37	33.74	5.42	3.17
	r	0.92	4.03	42.49	42.49	7.33	2.75
	t	0.72	3.81	49.48	36.88	6.10	3.02

* Explanation: u – urban areas, r – rural areas, t – total.

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

The relationship between the different housing conditions and the housing situation with incomes is confirmed by the data contained in Table 10. However, the data in this table shows that the spatial differentiation of the listed characteristics was not significant. Coefficients of spatial variation determined for the average area of a flat per person, average income and expenses for an apartment and the shares of households using an independent flat did not exceed 10%. Significant differences of voivodships occurred only in the case of shares of households who declared the inability to pay housing fees on time, with respective coefficients of variation of 32% in cities (urban areas) and 27% in rural areas.

Table 10. Selected characteristics of the housing situation of households in Poland in 2016 by the province of residence of households

Specification*		The average area of a flat in m ² per person	Average monthly income/expenses of households in PLN			Shares of households (in %)	
			Incomes	Expenses for housing maintenance	Expenditure on housing equipment	Declaring difficulties in paying housing charges on time	Using an independent flat
Lower Silesia	u	32.45	4040.45	652.99	150.17	3.33	94.34
	r	37.19	3913.00	622.73	174.69	2.18	91.66
	t	34.10	3996.18	642.48	158.69	2.93	93.41
Kuyavian-Pomeranian	u	32.12	3652.89	632.39	157.28	4.23	95.68
	r	32.84	4653.94	630.04	188.74	3.15	92.17
	t	32.43	4088.31	631.37	170.97	3.76	94.16
Lublin	u	37.03	3874.81	529.29	192.46	3.84	91.62
	r	40.37	3425.22	423.36	169.36	2.99	89.69
	t	38.98	3612.52	467.49	178.99	3.35	90.49
Lubusz	u	31.40	3964.00	639.24	150.16	2.87	98.14
	r	42.55	3975.49	680.95	137.95	2.95	96.31
	t	35.94	3968.68	656.23	145.19	2.90	97.40
Lodzkie	u	32.96	3867.86	595.04	161.88	1.91	93.69
	r	39.52	3907.15	581.06	160.24	2.75	92.71
	t	35.43	3882.64	589.78	161.26	2.23	93.32
Lesser Poland	u	31.91	4036.85	679.60	120.90	2.06	94.61
	r	41.02	4043.76	621.70	163.26	2.35	93.62
	t	36.63	4040.43	649.62	142.84	2.21	94.10
Masovia	u	31.95	4983.70	685.45	192.32	3.18	92.95
	r	39.02	4068.50	521.93	168.28	2.74	91.19
	t	34.56	4645.73	625.06	183.44	3.02	92.30
Opole	u	32.32	3802.65	525.79	165.50	0.80	97.41
	r	47.31	3707.52	524.21	151.65	3.18	90.87
	t	39.58	3756.60	525.03	158.80	1.95	94.24
Subcarpathia	u	34.97	3574.14	562.70	131.41	1.63	97.14
	r	39.75	3511.18	464.01	150.96	2.36	95.10
	t	37.88	3535.82	502.64	143.31	2.08	95.90
Podlachian	u	35.93	3513.62	558.25	146.84	2.41	94.69
	r	42.34	4046.91	461.72	167.59	2.08	94.34
	t	38.88	3758.97	513.84	156.39	2.26	94.53
Pomerania	u	31.15	4347.27	620.75	169.74	2.97	94.63
	r	35.12	4267.10	656.62	199.43	3.80	92.77
	t	32.60	4317.93	633.88	180.60	3.27	93.95

Specification*		The average area of a flat in m ² per person	Average monthly income/expenses of households in PLN			Shares of households (in %)	
			Incomes	Expenses for housing maintenance	Expenditure on housing equipment	Declaring difficulties in paying housing charges on time	Using an independent flat
Silesia	u	32.89	4000.72	674.64	163.19	3.65	93.93
	r	43.21	3857.43	675.38	160.48	3.67	93.11
	t	35.57	3963.47	674.83	162.49	3.65	93.72
Swietokrzyskie	u	32.39	3545.44	535.83	131.79	2.75	98.10
	r	39.54	3767.05	579.85	166.38	1.11	92.92
	t	36.70	3679.19	562.40	152.67	1.76	94.97
Warmia-Masuria	u	31.06	3585.39	585.99	134.87	2.22	93.46
	r	35.38	3941.61	537.88	175.46	1.65	92.20
	t	33.01	3746.14	564.28	153.19	1.96	92.90
Greater Poland	u	34.83	3988.93	674.37	124.54	3.04	96.38
	r	36.80	4353.29	624.26	149.11	1.78	96.64
	t	35.81	4169.33	649.56	136.71	2.41	96.51
West Pomerania	u	34.00	3809.35	585.84	123.58	1.53	97.44
	r	35.39	3784.15	526.59	151.39	3.11	95.60
	t	34.50	3800.32	564.61	133.54	2.10	96.78

* Explanation: u – urban areas, r – rural areas, t – total.

Source: own calculations based on unidentifiable data from GUS panel surveys of household budgets in Poland in 2016.

5. Conclusion

Based on the presented analysis of housing conditions and housing situation of households covered by the panelled study of Central Statistical Office in 2016, it can be concluded that the vast majority of Poles lived in buildings having access to water supply, sanitation, hot water and equipped with indispensable sanitary facilities. Access to water, sewage networks and sanitary equipment was slightly better in cities. In the countryside households lived mainly in detached single-family houses, they had larger usable floor area per person and lower housing costs. Almost all households in rural areas occupied dwelling belonging to them, they were also much less frequently burdened with mortgages than in the cities, in rural areas also dominated apartments located in buildings created a relatively long time ago – before 1995.

The study of spatial differentiation of housing conditions indicate better facilities and access to water and sanitation housing in case of households in urban and rural areas in the western and north-western voivodships. The largest area of flats per

person was denoted in rural areas of the Opole Voivodship, where relatively the lowest percentage of rural households declared using of an independent flat (90.78%) and the highest percentage declared using of a luxury flat (1.27%). Much worse housing conditions than the average in Poland had households in rural areas in the province of Lublin, Swietokrzyskie, Subcarpathia and Lesser Poland.

References

- Gospodarka mieszkaniowa w 2016 r. Informacje i opracowania statystyczne*, GUS, Warszawa 2017.
- Kozera A., Stanisławska J., Głowicka-Wołoszyn R., *Zjawisko ubóstwa mieszkaniowego w krajach Unii Europejskiej*, „Wiadomości Statystyczne” 2017, no. 1(668), pp. 77–89.
- Kucharska-Stasiak E., *Ekonomiczny wymiar nieruchomości*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2016.
- Wójciczek W., *Analiza porównawcza sytuacji mieszkaniowej w wybranych krajach Unii Europejskiej*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie” 2016, no. 3(951), pp. 81–98.

Sytuacja mieszkaniowa gospodarstw domowych na wsi w Polsce w 2016 roku w świetle badań budżetów gospodarstw domowych

Niniejszy artykuł został poświęcony problematyce nierówności poziomu zaspokojenia potrzeby mieszkaniowej na wsi w Polsce jako podstawowej determinanty poziomu życia. Celem zaprezentowanych w nim badań była próba identyfikacji zróżnicowania sytuacji mieszkaniowej i subiektywnych ocen gospodarstw domowych na wsi oraz porównanie ich z wybranymi obiektywnymi charakterystykami sytuacji materialnej tych podmiotów.

Za reprezentatywne wskaźniki sytuacji mieszkaniowej gospodarstwa domowego przyjęto liczbę osób przypadającą na jedną izbę w mieszkaniu, średnią liczbę metrów kwadratowych przypadającą na osobę w mieszkaniu czy fakt zamieszkiwania w samodzielnym mieszkaniu. Badano również wybrane charakterystyki jakości mieszkań. Przeprowadzono analizę porównawczą relacji między samooceną sytuacji mieszkaniowej, jej obiektywnymi charakterystykami oraz wybranymi charakterystykami gospodarstw zaliczanych do poszczególnych grup społeczno-ekonomicznych. Analiza pozwoliła wykazać, że istnieje silna zależność między zaspokojeniem potrzeby mieszkaniowej gospodarstw a poziomem dochodów (wydatków) konsumpcyjnych. Na podkreślenie zasługuje istotny wpływ grupy odniesienia, za którą uznano grupę społeczno-ekonomiczną gospodarstw domowych, na samoocenę sytuacji mieszkaniowej. W badaniach zastosowano metody analizy statystycznej. W artykule wykorzystano dane źródłowe z badań panelowych budżetów gospodarstw domowych w Polsce w 2016 roku, prowadzonych przez GUS.

Słowa kluczowe: mieszkania, potrzeby mieszkaniowe, sytuacja mieszkaniowa gospodarstw domowych

JEL: D12