

© MEASURING SOCIAL INCLUSION

Measuring Social Inclusion

Social inclusion is a complex and multidimensional concept that cannot be measured directly. To represent the state of social inclusion in European countries a number of different factors need to be taken into account, the selection of which is not always obvious. Ideas about social inclusion change over time and between different cultures. Objectives identified to improve social cohesion and the priorities set may change among people and according to political trends. In establishing the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion, the European Parliament and the European Council stated that:

The problem of poverty and social exclusion has broad, complex and multidimensional forms. They relate to a large number of factors, such as income and living standards, the need for educational and decent work opportunities, effective social protection systems, housing, access to good quality health and other services, as well as active citizenship. (European Parliament, Council of the European Union 2008)

Measuring a complex concept such as social inclusion is always challenging as the concept never coincides with the measure. This is true, firstly, because the measures of social inclusion (e.g., poverty, employment, literacy, etc.) are clearly definable, but hardly able to represent the complexity of the concept and, secondly, because the measures we believe are most useful are not always available.

Therefore, measuring social inclusion poses two major difficulties:

- **In its definition:** to define social cohesion and identify the dimensions that compose it so as to provide a framework for the indicators to be used; and
- **In its indicators:** to identify a number of indicators for which data are available for most European countries and that are able to represent relevant aspects of the different dimensions of social inclusion.

In the following section we have tried to overcome these obstacles as far as possible. With respect to the identification of the determinants of social inclusion, the approach used in this report follows that of the European institutions. Nevertheless, more dimensions of inclusion are adopted than used by the Commission (which considers mainly poverty, employment, social transfers and health) (European Commission 2008) or contained in the Social Inclusion Indicators used by Eurostat (2010).

For the purpose of this report, seven dimensions of social inclusion are analysed: poverty, employment, education, health, gender, living conditions and social participation. In this way we have attempted to represent the multidimensionality of social inclusion by splitting a complex concept into a number of determinants that may somehow represent the different elements of social exclusion.

With the dimensions identified, the next step is to select the available indicators able to represent them. In this task it is common to face some constraints in relation to the choice of indicators. It is important to stress that when comparing information among countries it is essential that the numbers are comparable and that the phenomenon is measured in the same way across the different countries being compared. This is assured by the use of one source of data for each indicator. Thus, only information already produced by international organisations is used in the analysis.

As we looked for indicators relevant to European countries (intending Europe in its proper geographical sense of 52 countries, not just the EU27 countries), most of the data is produced by UN agencies, ILO and the World Bank. When good coverage was not available, data from Eurostat or OECD was used, which obviously covers only a limited number of countries. Data availability is by far the biggest limitation on the effective representation of complex phenomena such as social inclusion. Nevertheless, a set of more than 40 indicators was selected, providing a broad picture of social inclusion in Europe.

To show the complexity of social inclusion, and in particular of social cohesion, it is important to supplement objective indicators with subjective information. Citizens' perceptions are difficult to compare among countries because of different cultures and languages, which can lead to the different interpretation of the same word; nonetheless, perceptions can be a powerful tool in evaluating phenomena that cannot be measured objectively, such as personal satisfaction with life or trust in neighbours. These aspects may be much more relevant in determining social cohesion and wellbeing than financial availability or the accessibility of public services. Yet these are also aspects in which policymakers can hardly intervene. Policymakers should, therefore, stay focused on income distribution, employment, the quality of services and the promotion of equal opportunities for all.

The large amount of information collected here provides a complex framework from which a number of general conclusions are apparent:

1. The economic crisis has hit all European countries resulting in a massive loss of jobs across the continent. The worst affected appear to be the Baltic states and Spain. Macedonia has the highest level of unemployment, but is the only country, together with Turkey, that has experienced a reduction in unemployment rates.
2. Important differences among European countries still exist in education standards (with very low enrolment in tertiary education in Caucasic republics and the Balkans) and in access to the Internet, which is increasingly becoming a prerequisite for inclusion, with the extreme case of Azerbaijan where only 10% of the population has Internet access.
3. Health statistics differ significantly in Europe. Life expectancy varies from 61 years for Russian men to 84 years for French women. Many countries still have high maternal and child mortality rates.
4. There is a lot of room for improvement in gender equity in many countries. This is particularly true in relation to the participation of women in economic activities, for which Italy, Malta and Turkey rank lowest, and in relation to the presence of women in positions of power. Women hold almost no relevant managerial or political positions in Armenia, Albania and Bosnia.
5. Social expenditure is very low in a number of countries, representing less than 30% of all revenue. In some countries, such as Russia and Armenia, social expenditure is less than 20%.
6. Social participation and trust is also very variable among countries: 74% of Norwegians believe that “most people can be trusted”, while only 10% of people in Cyprus feel the same; 65% of Romanians “would never attend a peaceful demonstration”, compared to only 21% of people in Sweden.

References

- European Commission (2008) *MEMO/08/625 – Social Protection and Social Inclusion in Europe – Key facts and figures 2008*. Brussels: EC.
- European Parliament, Council of the European Union (2008) *Decision no. 1098/2008/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2008 on the European year for combating poverty and social exclusion (2010)*. Brussels: EP, Council of the EU.
- Eurostat (2010) *Indicators of the social inclusion strand*. [Online] Available at: <epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_and_social_policy_indicators/omc_social_inclusion_and_social_protection/social_inclusion_strand> (accessed 4 October 2010).

POVERTY									
Variable	At risk of poverty		Intensity of poverty	Working poor		Child poverty		Gini coefficient	
Indicator	Share of persons with an equivalised disposable income below the at risk of poverty threshold (1) after social transfers (%), 2008	Change 2005-2008 (%)	Relative median at risk of poverty gap (%), 2008	In work at risk of poverty rate (%), 2008	Change 2005-2008 (%)	Poverty rate among children (%), 2006	Point changes since mid-1990s, 2006 (2)	Gini coefficient of income inequality, mid-2000s	Point changes since mid-1990s, mid-2000s (2)
Albania								0.33a	
Andorra									
Armenia								0.30a	-31.8
Austria	12.4	0.8	15.3	6.4	-4.5	6	6.0	0.27	11.5
Azerbaijan								0.17a	-51.4
Belarus								0.29a	
Belgium	14.7	-0.7	17.2	4.8	23.1	10	-0.8	0.27	-5.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina								0.36a	
Bulgaria	21.4	52.9	27.0	7.5	25.0			0.29a	-6.5
Croatia	18.0b		23.0b	9.0c				0.29a	7.4
Cyprus	16.2	0.6	16.6	6.4	-1.5				
Czech Republic	9.0	-13.5	18.5	3.6	2.9	10	1.7	0.27	4.2
Denmark	11.8	0.0	18.0	5.1	4.1	3	0.8	0.23	8.1
Estonia	19.5	6.6	20.3	7.3	-2.7			0.36a	20.0
Finland	13.6	16.2	15.7	5.1	37.8	4	2.1	0.27	18.1
France	13.4		18.1			8	0.3	0.27	0.0
Georgia		3.1		6.8	11.5			0.41a	10.8
Germany	15.2	24.6	22.2	7.1	47.9	16	5.1	0.30	9.5
Greece	20.1	2.6	24.7	14.3	10.9	13	0.9	0.32	-4.4
Hungary	12.4	-8.1	17.3	5.4	-38.6	9	-1.6	0.29	-1.0
Iceland	10.1	4.1	14.9	6.7	-15.2	8		0.28	
Ireland	15.4	-21.8	18.0	6.5	6.6	16	2.3	0.33	1.3
Italy	18.7	-1.1	23.0	8.9	1.1	16	-3.4	0.35	1.1
Kosovo									
Latvia	25.6	33.3	28.6	11.0	22.2			0.36a	16.1
Liechtenstein									
Lithuania	20.0	-3.4	25.7	9.4	-6.9			0.36a	12.5
Luxembourg	13.4	-2.2	16.6	9.4	-4.1	12	4.5	0.26	-0.4
Macedonia								0.43a	53.6
Malta	14.6	6.6	17.7	5.1	6.3				
Moldova								0.37a	0.0
Monaco									
Montenegro								0.37a	
Netherlands	10.5	-1.9	14.9	4.8	-17.2	12	1.0	0.27	-4.0
Norway	11.3	-0.9	22.2	5.4	17.4	5	0.9	0.28	7.8
Poland	16.9	-17.6	20.6	11.5	-17.3	22		0.37	
Portugal	18.5	-4.6	23.2	11.8	-0.8	17	0.0	0.38	7.1
Romania	23.4	30.0	32.3	17.7				0.32a	14.3
Russian Federation								0.44a	-4.3
San Marino									
Serbia								0.28a	
Slovak Republic	10.9	-18.0	18.1	5.8	-34.8	11		0.27	
Slovenia	12.3	0.8	19.3	5.1	10.9			0.31a	6.9
Spain	19.6	-0.5	23.6	10.7	2.9	17	1.9	0.32	-7.1
Sweden	12.2	28.4	18.0	6.8	23.6	4	1.5	0.23	10.8
Switzerland						9	1.2	0.28	
Turkey	26.0c		31.0c	23.0c		25	5.0	0.43	-2.4
Ukraine								0.28a	-20.0
United Kingdom	18.8		20.8	8.6		10	-3.6	0.34	-5.4
Source	Eurostat		Eurostat	Eurostat		OECD		OECD and WB	

Notes:

(1) Elaboration by Social Watch on official data

(2) Elaboration by Social Watch on official data

a: Data signed by a are by World Bank; others are by OECD

b: 2007

c: 2003

- The relative median at risk of poverty gap is calculated as the difference between the median income of persons below the at risk of poverty threshold and the at risk of poverty threshold. It provides an indication of "how poor are poor people".

- The Gini coefficient is a measure of the inequality in income distribution, a value of 0 expressing total equality and a value of 1 maximal inequality.

LABOUR						
Variable	Unemployment		Youth unemployment		Period	Hours worked
Indicator	Unemployment rate (%)	Unemployment change (previous year, same period)	Unemployment rate (%)	Unemployment change (previous year, same period)		Average weekly hours of work in manufacturing – ISCO8, employees (2009)
Albania	12.8	0.1			August 2009	
Austria	5.8	1.2	12.1	2.8	January 2010	39.6
Belarus	0.9	0.0			January 2010	
Belgium	8.2	0.5	22.6	2.8	January 2010	37.2
Bulgaria	8.7	2.6	21.4	7.8	January 2010	40.4
Croatia	11.9	2.7	31.0	5.3	January 2010	41.2
Cyprus	7.1	2.3	15.7a	7.4a	January 2010	39.1
Czech Republic	8.5	3.1	21.6	9.7	January 2010	40.2
Denmark	7.1	3.3	12.9	5.3	December 2009	37.7
Estonia	14.6	8.4			August 2009	38.9
Finland	9.2	1.6	25.7	5.9	February 2010	38.4
France	10.4	1.3	24.7	2.6	January 2010	36.0
Germany	7.9	0.5	10.3	1.3	January 2010	37.8
Greece	9.3	2.1	24.7	3.4	August 2009	41.4
Hungary	11.5	2.3	30.8	7.6	January 2010	40.2
Iceland	6.7	2.7	16.0	5.1	November 2009	42.7
Ireland	13.7	4.4	31.2	13.4	January 2010	37.3
Italy	9.3	1.4	29.9	3.0	January 2010	38.8
Latvia	23.2	10.6	42.9a	24.4a	January 2010	41.2
Lithuania	13.8	7.9	33.3	18.3	August 2009	40.3
Luxembourg	6.1	0.4	20.2	-3.9	January 2010	39.8
Macedonia	32.4	-1.1			November 2009	44.5
Malta	7.3	0.6	14.5	1.3	January 2010	39.8
Moldova	6.2	2.3			November 2009	
Netherlands	4.4	1.2	8.1	1.3	February 2010	37.3
Norway	3.1	0.5	8.0	0.9	December 2009	37.8
Poland	9.5	1.5	24.2	5.3	January 2010	41.8
Portugal	10.7	2.0	22.5	2.7	January 2010	39.9
Romania	6.8	1.4	22.3	3.1	August 2009	41.9
Russian Federation	9.2	0.5			December 2009	
Slovakia	13.8	4.0	33.2	12.7	January 2010	39.0
Slovenia	7.3	2.2	16.9a	6.0a	January 2010	39.2
Spain	19.5	3.1	39.7	6.5	January 2010	39.9
Sweden	9.3	1.3	26.8	2.0	February 2010	36.3
Switzerland	4.4	1.0			February 2010	39.6
Turkey	13.5	-0.5	24.1	-1.9	December 2009	54.2
Ukraine	9.1	2.9			June 2009	
United Kingdom	7.5	1.2	18.4	2.8	December 2009	40.0
Source	ILO		ILO		ILO	Eurostat

Notes:

a: December 2009

b: 2008

EDUCATION									
Variable	Youth literacy	Compulsory studies	Primary completion rate	Drop out rate	Children out of school	Enrolment secondary school	Tertiary education	Studying abroad	Access to Internet
Indicator	Literacy rate, youth (% aged 15-24), 2007	Duration of compulsory education, 2008 (years)	Primary completion rate, total (% of relevant age group)	Percentage of drop outs in primary school, 2007	Rate of primary school age children out of school, total (%), 2008	Gross enrolment ratio for upper secondary, all programmes, (%), 2008	Gross enrolment ratio, ISCED 5 and 6, total, 2008	Outbound mobility ratio of tertiary students (%), 2008	Internet users per 100 people (year)
Albania	99	8							15.1 2006
Andorra		9			18.3	70.56	11.0	262.7	
Armenia	100	8	97.54	2		74.80	34.2a	3.6a	56.3 2006
Austria		8	102.23	2		98.54	54.7	3.6	59.3 2008
Azerbaijan	100	8	113.34	1	3.9	115.65	15.8	3.6	10.8 2007
Belarus	100	10	92.40	0	5.2	72.34a	72.8	2.7a	29.0 2007
Belgium		9	86.38	7	1.4	107.61	63.0	2.5	65.9 2007
Bosnia and Herzegovina		10				77.50	33.5a	14.8a	34.7 2008
Bulgaria	97	9	98.17	6	2.6	90.43	51.0	8.7	30.9 2007
Croatia	100	9	101.36	0		87.62a	47.0a	4.2a	50.6 2008
Cyprus	100		99.95	0	1.0	95.47	42.6	92.6	38.0 2007
Czech Republic		9	93.22	2		91.25	58.6	2.4	48.3 2007
Denmark		8	100.67			121.98b	80.3a	2.2a	84.2 2008
Estonia	100	10	100.34	1	3.5	96.87	63.7	5.1	63.7 2007
Finland		8	97.94	0	3.8	118.18	94.4	2.1	2007
France		10	98.90b		0.9	117.27	54.6	2.1	51.2 2007
Georgia		9	91.74		1.0	89.50	34.3	6.3	81.8 2007
Germany		9	103.17	2		104.39			76.1 2008
Greece	99		101.46	2		99.33a	90.8a	5.4a	32.3 2008
Hungary	99	8	92.25	2	4.6	95.77	65.0	1.7	91.6 2007
Iceland		11	96.78		2.4	117.35	74.6	15.1	54.8 2008
Ireland		9	96.57		2.9	129.07	58.3	10.1	65.0 2007
Italy	100	10	101.86	0		98.86a	67.1a		63.5 2008
Latvia	100	9	89.54	3		95.68	69.2	3.2	48.6 2008
Liechtenstein		13	113.94		10.3	113.90	36.8	109.5	55.0 2007
Lithuania	100	9	94.82	2	3.9	97.54	77.3	3.4	65.2 2007
Luxembourg		10	84.08	10	2.5	86.68			52.9 2008
Macedonia	99		93.79	6		75.97	40.4	8.8	75.8 2007
Malta		10				101.57a	33.0a	10.5a	43.0 2008
Moldova	100		92.91	4		82.84	40.0	8.7	19.1 2007
Monaco		11							2007
Montenegro		13							45.1 2007
Netherlands					1.1	114.31	60.6	1.4	86.8 2008
Norway		11	96.76	1	1.3	127.48	73.2	5.5	84.8 2007
Poland	99	10	96.35	3			66.9a	1.5a	44.0 2007
Portugal	100	9				86.17a		3.0a	41.9 2008
Romania	97	9	120.34	5	3.5	83.81	65.6	2.1	23.9 2007
Russian Federation	100	10	93.38	5		84.19	77.2		21.1 2007
San Marino		11							51.7 2008
Serbia		11			4.2	80.94	47.8		32.1 2008
Slovak Republic		13	94.16	2		90.43	53.6	11.5	51.3 2008
Slovenia	100	11			2.5	97.72	86.7	2.1	48.7 2008
Spain	100	9			0.0	125.02	70.6	1.2	57.4 2008
Sweden		11	95.02	0	5.4	103.75	71.1	3.4	79.7 2007
Switzerland		11	87.56		0.9	84.72	49.4	4.7	75.2 2008
Turkey	96	10	97.27		5.3	72.47	38.4	1.6	33.1 2008
Ukraine	100	9	101.35	2	10.6	91.47	79.4	1.0	22.4 2008
United Kingdom		12			0.0	96.03	57.4	0.9	79.4 2008
Source	WB	UNESCO	UNESCO	UNESCO	UNESCO	UNESCO	UNESCO	UNESCO	WB

Notes:

a: 2007

b: 2000

Values higher than 100 are due to the enrolment of children younger or older than the reference age, or of foreigners, so that the total number of enrolled children exceeds the reference population.

HEALTH								
Variable	Life expectancy		Maternal mortality rate		Infant deaths		Immunization	
Indicator	Life expectancy at birth – male, 2007	Life expectancy at birth – female, 2007	Maternal mortality ratio per 100,000 live births	Year	Mortality rate before 1 year (per 1,000 births), 2007	Mortality rate, under 5 (per 1,000 children), 2007	Immunization, measles (% of children aged 12-23 months), 2007	Improved sanitation facilities (% of population with access), 2006
Albania	72.5	77.3	2.3	2004	6.2	15.2	97	97
Andorra						2.7	94	100
Armenia	70.2	76.6	22.4	2003	10.8	24.3	92	91
Austria	75.5	81.5	2.6	2006	3.7	4.4	79	100
Azerbaijan	69.7	75.1			11.6	39.3	97	80
Belarus	64.5	76.2			5.2	13.4	99	93
Belgium	77.0a	82.7a			4.0	4.6	92	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	71.3c	76.7c			6.8	14.2	96	95
Bulgaria	69.2	76.3	10.0	2004	9.2	11.8	96	99
Croatia			9.7	2006	5.6	5.8	96	99
Cyprus	76.0b	81.6b	11.5	2006		4.5	87	100
Czech Republic	73.7	79.9	2.9	2005	3.1	3.9	97	99
Denmark	75.9	80.5	3.1	2001	4.0	4.4	89	100
Estonia	67.4a	78.5a	13.9	2005		5.6	96	95
Finland	75.8	82.9	6.8	2006	2.7	3.5	98	100
France	77.2a	84.2a	5.3	2005	3.6a	4.3	87	
Georgia	70.5	79.4			13.3	30.2	97	93
Germany	76.9	82.3	6.1	2006	3.9	4.4	94	100
Greece	77.0	82.0	2.7	2006	3.5	4.1	88	98
Hungary	69.2	77.3	5.1	2005	5.9	6.8	99	100
Iceland	79.4	82.9	24.4	2001		2.5	95	100
Ireland			3.3	2005	3.7c	4.2	87	
Italy	78.1b	83.6b	5.1	2003	3.7	3.7	87	
Latvia	65.8	76.5	9.0	2006	8.7	8.6	97	78
Liechtenstein						2.5		
Lithuania	64.9	77.2	13.1	2005	5.9	8.2	97	
Luxembourg	77.6	82.7	18.6	2005		2.8	96	100
Macedonia			3.7	2003	10.3	16.6	96	
Malta	77.2	81.7	50.5	2001				
Moldova	65.0	72.6			11.3	18.2	96	79
Monaco						4.1	99	
Montenegro						10.4	90	91
Netherlands	78.0	82.3	8.1	2006	4.1	5.2	96	100
Norway	78.2	82.7	3.5	2005	3.1	3.6	92	
Poland	71.0	79.7	2.9	2006	6.0	6.8	98	
Portugal	75.2	81.6	7.1	2003	3.4	3.8	95	99
Romania	69.2	76.1	15.5	2006	12.0	14.9	97	72
Russian Federation	61.4	73.9	23.8	2006	9.2	14.5	99	87
San Marino						3.5	92	
Serbia	70.7	76.2	12.7	2006	7.1	7.7	95	92
Slovak Republic	70.5	78.1	3.7	2005	6.1	7.8	99	100
Slovenia	75.0	82.3	15.8	2006		3.9	96	
Spain	77.0b	83.5b	3.9	2005	3.5	4.3	97	100
Sweden	78.9	83.0	5.9	2005	2.5	3.2	96	100
Switzerland	79.2	84.1	5.5	2005	3.9	4.9	86	100
Turkey	69.1	74.0			16.7	23.0	96	88
Ukraine	62.5	74.2	17.6	2005	11.0	24.2	98	93
United Kingdom			6.7	2006	5.0a	5.8	86	
Source	WB		UN		WB		WB	

Notes:

a: 2006

b: 2005

c: 2003

CHILDCARE						
Variable	Paternal leave				Enrolment rates of children under age 6 in formal care or early education services (%), 2006	
Indicator	Spending on maternity and parental leave payments per child born, 2005 (spending per birth as a % of GDP per capita)	Weeks entitlement, 2006/2007	Full-time equivalent (FTE) of paid maternity, paternity and paternal leave, 2006/2007	Unpaid leave (weeks), 2006/2007	0-2 years	3-5 years
Albania						
Andorra						
Armenia						
Austria	15.4	16	16.0	0.0	10.5	74.9
Azerbaijan						
Belarus						
Belgium	15.8	15	11.3	3.7	41.7	99.8
Bosnia and Herzegovina						
Bulgaria		63	56.7	6.3	31.2	69.4
Croatia						
Cyprus					20.0	70.7
Czech Republic	60.8	28	13.7	14.3	2.6	82.3
Denmark	47.4	18	18.0	0.0	63.0	90.7
Estonia		28	28.0	0.0	36.0	85.2
Finland	58.0	17.5	16.9	0.6	26.3	67.8
France	27.5	16	16.0	0.0	42.9	100.2
Georgia	23.0					
Germany		14	14.0	0.0	13.6	89.3
Greece	8.9	17	17.0	0.0	18.2	47.3
Hungary	67.7	24	16.8	7.2	10.5	86.8
Iceland	44.3	13	10.4	2.6	55.7	95.0
Ireland	5.5	48	18.2	29.8	25.2	49.4
Italy	18.7	21	16.0	5.0	28.6	99.4
Latvia		19	19.0	0.0	8.1	77.3
Liechtenstein						
Lithuania		21	21.0	0.0	8.0	60.6
Luxembourg	39.0	16	16.0	0.0	43.4	85.2
Macedonia						
Malta		13	5.9	7.1	6.8	91.4
Moldova						
Monaco						
Montenegro						
Netherlands	12.9	16	16.0	0.0	53.9	57.6
Norway	53.7	9	9.0	0.0	42.3	90.5
Poland	24.6	18	18.0	0.0	8.6	40.7
Portugal	18.5a	17	17.0	0.0	43.6	78.9
Romania		21	15.8	5.3		72.5
Russian Federation						
San Marino						
Serbia						
Slovak Republic	51.3	28	15.4	12.6	4.9	72.7
Slovenia		15	15.0	0.0	32.5	77.5
Spain	14.5	12	12.0	0.0	33.9	97.7
Sweden	59.4	12	9.6	2.4	45.3	85.6
Switzerland		16	12.8	3.2		48.0
Turkey		12	7.9	4.1		16.0
Ukraine						
United Kingdom	10.3	39	9.3	29.7	39.7	90.5

Source: OECD

Notes:

a: 2004

- FTE is an indicator of the overall support = Duration of leave in weeks payment received by the claimant (as per cent of Average Wage earnings)

LIVING CONDITIONS						
Variable	Social contributions	Inflation	Food prices	Rooms per person	Life satisfaction	Financial satisfaction
Indicator	Social contributions (% of revenues), 2008	Consumer price index, average 2009	Consumer price index, food items, 2009	Average number of rooms per person, 2008	0 to 10 worst - best possible life (measure type 31D), latest 2006-2008	Dissatisfied with household financial situation (%) (1) (2)
Albania		2.2	5.1			
Andorra		-1.2	-0.1		4.6	16.4
Armenia	13	3.4	-0.9			
Austria	40	0.5	0.2	1.6	4.7	
Azerbaijan		20.0b	28.5b		7.2	
Belarus	29	13.0	14.0		4.6	
Belgium	35	-0.1	1.1	2.2	5.6	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	37	-0.4	-0.9		7.1	
Bulgaria	22	2.8	-0.6	1.0	4.9	60.2
Croatia	33a	2.4	1.6		4.5	
Cyprus		0.3	4.5	1.9	5.8	15
Czech Republic	45	1.0	0.2	1.2	6.2	
Denmark	34a	1.3	-0.1	1.9	6.5	
Estonia	34a	-0.1	-4.0	1.2	8.0	
Finland	31a	0.0	2.0	1.9	5.5	14.5
France	43a	0.1	0.4	1.7	7.7	20.7
Georgia	17a	10.0b			7.0	62.9
Germany	55a	0.4	-1.2	1.7	4.2	22.2
Greece	36a	1.2	1.9	1.2	6.5	
Hungary	34	4.2	4.4	1.0	0.6	
Iceland	9	12.0	17.5	1.6	5.5	
Ireland	18a	-4.5	-3.5	2.0	6.9	
Italy	36	0.7	1.8	1.4	7.6	11.8
Kosovo		-2.4	-4.4		6.8	
Latvia	30	3.5	-0.1	1.0	5.1	
Liechtenstein						
Lithuania	32	4.4	1.6	1.0	5.6	
Luxembourg	29a	0.4	1.4	1.8	6.8	
Macedonia	29	8.3a	15.3a		4.5	
Malta		2.1	6.4	2.0		
Moldova	29	0.0	-5.6		4.8	48.4
Monaco						
Montenegro					5.2	
Netherlands	34a	1.2	1.1	2.0	7.6	12.7
Norway	17	2.1	4.1	2.0	7.6	8.9
Poland	35	3.5	4.3	1.0	5.9	35.9
Portugal	33	-1.0	-3.5	1.5	5.4	
Romania	33	5.6	9.2b	0.9	5.4	46.1
Russian Federation	16	14.1b	20.9b		5.1	45.8
San Marino		2.2	2.4			
Serbia	35	7.8	4.3		4.8	44.2
Slovak Republic	41	1.6	-3.2	1.1	5.9	
Slovenia	38	0.9	0.6	1.1	5.9	18.3
Spain	52	-0.3	-1.1	1.9	7.3	19.8
Sweden		-0.3	2.9	1.7	7.5	15.1
Switzerland	36a	-0.5	-0.2		7.5	7.5
Turkey		6.2	8.0		5.1	19.4
Ukraine	36	15.9	10.9		5.2	47.8
United Kingdom	21	-0.5	5.3	1.8	7.0	14.6
Source	WB	ILO	ILO	Eurostat-SILC	World Happiness Database	World Values Survey

Notes:

a: 2007

b: 2008

(1) Percentage of people giving a score 1-4 out of 10 on the question 'How satisfied are you with the financial situation of your household?'

(2) Andorra [2005], Bulgaria [2006], Cyprus [2006], Finland [2005], France [2006], Georgia [2008], Germany [2006], Great Britain [2006], Italy [2005], Moldova [2006], Netherlands [2006], Norway [2007], Poland [2005], Romania [2005], Russian Federation [2006], Serbia [2006], Slovenia [2005], Spain [2007], Sweden [2006], Switzerland [2007], Turkey [2007], Ukraine [2006]

Social contributions include social security contributions by employees, employers and self-employed individuals, and other contributions whose source cannot be determined. They also include actual or imputed contributions to social insurance schemes operated by governments.

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION 1

Variable	NEETs (not in education, employment or training)		Suicides and violent death			Trust		Political action	
Indicator	Percentage of people aged 15-19 who were not in education or work in 2004		Estimated deaths by intentional injuries (per 100,000 inhabitants), 2002			Agree on 'trust completely' + 'trust a little' your neighbours (%) (1)	Agree on sentence 'Most people can be trusted' (%) (1)	Would never attend a lawful/peaceful demonstration (%) (1)	Would never sign a petition (%) (1)
	Men	Women	Total	Self-inflicted injuries	Violence				
Albania			0.3	0.1	0.2				
Andorra			0.0	0.0	0.0	51.3	20.1	19.3	8.3
Armenia			0.2	0.1	0.1				
Austria			1.6	1.5	0.1				
Azerbaijan	7.2	7.5	0.6	0.4	0.2				
Belarus			5.1	3.8	1.3				
Belgium	5.8	3.9	2.3	2.1	0.2				
Bosnia and Herzegovina			0.7	0.6	0.1				
Bulgaria			1.6	1.3	0.2	74.5	22.2	52.6	59.1
Croatia			1.0	0.9	0.1				
Cyprus			0.0	0.0	0.0	51.1	9.9	34.2	34.6
Czech Republic	5.0	6.4	1.8	1.7	0.1				
Denmark	0.7	2.3	0.8	0.7	0.1				
Estonia			0.6	0.4	0.2				
Finland	5.1	5.5	1.4	1.2	0.2	85.9	58.9	50.8	17.4
France	6.2	4.5	9.9	9.5	0.4	82.3	18.8	30.7	10.4
Georgia			0.4	0.2	0.2	92.0	18.1	56.0	74.3
Germany	3.5	3.7	12.0	11.4	0.6	76.2	36.8	30.2	20.1
Greece	7.6	10.7	0.5	0.4	0.1				
Hungary	6.6	5.8	3.0	2.8	0.2				
Iceland	1.4	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Ireland	8.3	8.7	0.5	0.5	0.0				
Italy	9.1	10.3	4.5	3.9	0.6	69.0	29.2	31.0	13.9
Latvia			1.0	0.7	0.3				
Liechtenstein									
Lithuania			1.9	1.6	0.4				
Luxembourg	2.1	3.1	0.1	0.1	0.0				
Macedonia			1.0	0.2	0.1				
Malta			0.0	0.0	0.0				
Moldova			1.3	0.8	0.5	54.3	17.9	48.9	57.5
Monaco			0.0	0.0	0.0				
Montenegro			1.6	1.4	0.2				
Netherlands	2.5	2.2	0.6	0.5	0.0	69.7	45.0	43.1	16.4
Norway	4.2	2.8	7.4	6.7	0.7	90.6	74.2	25.6	9.7
Poland	3.0	2.1	0.8	0.7	0.1	75.4	19.0	59.4	46.7
Portugal	9.7	11.0							
Romania			3.6	2.8	0.8	49.6	20.3	64.8	65.7
Russian Federation			123.6	59.0	47.5	67.6	26.2	55.6	69.0
San Marino									
Serbia			1.8	1.6	0.2	65.8	15.3	42.0	36.2
Slovak Republic	8.6	7.1	0.9	0.7	0.1				
Slovenia			0.6	0.6	0.0	59.7	18.1	38.3	33.8
Spain	10.0	10.8	3.8	3.4	0.4	76.0	20.0	24.5	30.0
Sweden	7.8	4.0	1.2	1.1	0.1	89.7	68.0	21.3	5.1
Switzerland	7.6	6.8	1.4	1.3	0.1	86.7	53.9	33.5	8.3
Turkey	24.7	47.1	7.9	4.7	2.4	74.6	4.9	63.1	52.7
Ukraine			25.1	17.5	7.6	73.4	27.5	56.1	66.5
United Kingdom	10.2a	10.5a	5.6	5.0	0.6	80.4	30.5	38.6	8.5
Source	OECD		WHO			World Value Survey		World Value Survey	

Notes:

(1) Andorra [2005], Bulgaria [2006], Cyprus [2006], Finland [2005], France [2006], Georgia [2008], Germany [2006], Great Britain [2006], Italy [2005], Moldova [2006], Netherlands [2006], Norway [2007], Poland [2005], Romania [2005], Russian Federation [2006], Serbia [2006], Slovenia [2005], Spain [2007], Sweden [2006], Switzerland [2007], Turkey [2007], Ukraine [2006] a: 2005

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION 2

Variable	Voluntary work		Active participation in voluntary organizations, % (1)								
	Proportion of people engaged in voluntary work, %, 2006 (2)		Charitable and humanitarian	Environ-mental	Sport or recreation	Art, music, educational	Professional	Church or religious	Political party	Labour unions	Any other
	15-29 years old	30-49 years old									
Albania											
Andorra			12.7	5.5	31.8	22.9	9.6	11.8	2.9	2.4	1.2
Armenia											
Austria	52.2	57.7									
Azerbaijan											
Belarus											
Belgium	38.1	38.4									
Bosnia and Herzegovina											
Bulgaria	7.9	7.1	0.7	0.4	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.9	2.1	3.2	78.4
Croatia											
Cyprus	50.0	48.2	6.0	1.1	12.8	7.6	6.5	8.6	8.3	7.1	4.3
Czech Republic	34.7a	31.1a									
Denmark	50.8	48.3									
Estonia	22.3	19.7									
Finland	51.3	52.8	8.3	1.6	21.6	9.5	2.3	17.6	3.3	12.0	2.7
France	33.4	33.9	8.8	6.3	22.7	11.3	6.4	4.4	2.6	5.8	1.9
Georgia			0.1	0.1	0.3	0.7	0.2	3.1	0.3	0.8	0.1
Germany	45.4	48.4	4.7	1.5	26.8	8.2	3.8	12.9	2.3	3.4	5.1
Greece	38.4a	42.5a									
Hungary	16.7	23.4									
Iceland	19.7a	39.6a									
Ireland	42.0	48.5									
Italy	26.7a	28.3a	9.3	1.4	17.3	10.0	7.0	9.2	3.4	3.3	9.4
Latvia											
Liechtenstein											
Lithuania											
Luxembourg	32.7a	29.0a									
Macedonia											
Malta											
Moldova			2.5	1.9	6.4	7.9	7.0	12.9	2.7	6.8	1.0
Monaco											
Montenegro											
Netherlands	43.6	51.2	6.8	4.1	37.4	20.5	6.0	14.4	4.2	7.8	1.9
Norway	64.3	69.7	12.3	1.3	27.1	12.6	7.5	8.3	4.3	13.6	12.5
Poland	20.1	13.8	3.1	1.6	4.2	4.6	2.6	12.9	1.1	4.4	3.3
Portugal	33.7	38.6									
Romania	17.0	18.7	0.8	0.2	1.0	1.1	1.2	5.4	2.5	3.8	0.3
Russian Federation			1.1	0.4	5.9	4.2	1.6	2.6	0.8	3.4	
San Marino											
Serbia			1.2	1.1	6.9	2.5	1.9	3.9	2.7	2.2	69.2
Slovak Republic	21.6	26.4									
Slovenia	39.3	39.8	7.7	2.7	18.2	9.2	6.4	12.4	2.1	8.9	3.8
Spain	31.7	43.1	5.1	1.1	10.0	5.7	3.4	9.1	1.1	2.7	4.4
Sweden	26.2	32.1	10.0	1.0	29.8	12.8	6.4	6.9	2.8	10.2	21.8
Switzerland	55.7	55.7	11.2	5.2	36.3	21.2	15.8	22.1	8.1	4.7	82.3
Turkey	1.8a	1.7a	0.8	0.8	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.3	2.3	1.1	0.4
Ukraine			1.9	1.1	4.2	4.0	2.1	5.6	2.1	4.4	
United Kingdom	41.5	42.5	20.9	6.0	30.0	21.7	14.6	19.2	3.3	10.1	0.8
Source	European Social Survey and World Value Survey		World Value Survey								

Notes:

(1) Andorra [2005], Bulgaria [2006], Cyprus [2006], Finland [2005], France [2006], Georgia [2008], Germany [2006], Great Britain [2006], Italy [2005], Moldova [2006], Netherlands [2006], Norway [2007], Poland [2005], Romania [2005], Russian Federation [2006], Serbia [2006], Slovenia [2005], Spain [2007], Sweden [2006], Switzerland [2007], Turkey [2007], Ukraine [2006]

(2) In the 2006 European Surveys, respondents were asked whether, over the last 12 months, they have been involved in work for voluntary or charitable organizations. The estimates derived here correspond to the proportion respondents who answered positively.

a: Data for Czech Republic, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg and Turkey are from the World Value Survey. In the 1999-2002 World Values Surveys, respondents were asked if they were currently doing unpaid voluntary work for any group they belong to. The estimate shows here the proportion of respondents doing unpaid work for at least one group.

GENDER EQUITY INDEX (GEI)				
	GEI 2009	Education gap	Economic activity gap	Empowerment gap
Albania	55	96.3	61.9	6.6
Andorra				
Armenia	58	97.1	71.2	4.6
Austria	71	95.1	61.0	56.6
Azerbaijan	60	91.1	73.3	15.3
Belarus	66	96.6	72.7	28.9
Belgium	72	96.0	64.2	56.2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	61	93.3	76.0	13.0
Bulgaria	73	96.1	71.6	52.6
Croatia	75	99.4	70.7	56.0
Cyprus	65	97.9	68.2	29.0
Czech Republic	68	96.8	64.0	43.4
Denmark	79	97.6	78.6	61.1
Estonia	73	97.6	71.2	50.8
Finland	84	98.6	78.5	75.7
France	72	96.6	71.7	47.8
Georgia	62	94.7	49.7	42.5
Germany	78	93.8	67.6	73.0
Greece	65	95.9	61.2	38.6
Hungary	70	96.1	68.3	44.9
Iceland	78	98.7	78.8	55.2
Ireland	69	98.1	63.3	46.9
Italy	64	96.8	54.6	42.1
Latvia	75	97.1	71.0	57.0
Liechtenstein				
Lithuania	76	97.3	75.6	53.8
Luxembourg	61	98.2	60.1	23.5
Macedonia	67	96.1	55.5	50.1
Malta	58	96.7	49.5	28.5
Moldova	74	97.9	71.8	51.9
Monaco				
Montenegro				
Netherlands	77	95.7	70.7	65.4
Norway	83	96.2	82.0	69.8
Poland	70	96.2	68.8	45.2
Portugal	73	97.6	69.1	52.8
Romania	71	97.3	74.6	42.0
Russian Federation	71	97.3	71.2	45.1
San Marino				
Serbia				
Slovak Republic	69	97.0	67.2	42.2
Slovenia	65	81.8	70.7	42.8
Spain	77	98.4	58.3	74.1
Sweden	88	96.3	83.8	82.9
Switzerland	62	91.8	71.3	23.4
Turkey	46	85.3	35.8	17.3
Ukraine	69	97.4	66.9	44.0
United Kingdom	74	97.5	72.8	51.1
Source	Social Watch	Social Watch elaboration on UNESCO data		Social Watch elaboration on UNESCO and IPU data

Social Watch developed the Gender Equity Index (GEI) to make gender inequities more visible. The GEI is based on information available that can be compared internationally, and it makes it possible to classify countries and rank them in accordance with a selection of gender inequity indicators in three dimensions: education, economic participation and empowerment. In most societies men and women are assigned different responsibilities, rights, benefits and opportunities in the activities they perform, in access to control of resources and in decision-making processes.

In order to measure inequities we have established the proportions or ratio between the sexes in different indicators. This is used as a basis for inferring the structure of opportunities and so countries can be compared in an agile way that is direct and intuitive. What the GEI measures is the gap between women and men, not their wellbeing. For example, a country in which young men and women have equal access to a university education receives a value of 100 on this particular indicator, and a country in which boys and girls are equally barred from completing primary education would also be awarded a value of 100. This does not mean that the quality of education does not need to be improved; it just establishes that, in this case, girls education is not inferior than that of boys.

The way the GEI is calculated is a response to the need to reflect all situations that are unfavourable to women. When there is a situation in which women are at a proportional disadvantage with respect to men, the GEI does not reach its maximum value of 100 points. The final value of the index depends on the degree of negative inequity for women prevailing in a given country or region regardless of whether there may also be inequities that are positive for women (that is to say negative for men).

GAP IN EDUCATION

We measure the gender gap in the following indicators:

- Literacy rate
- Enrolment rate in primary education
- Enrolment rate in secondary education
- Enrolment rate in tertiary education

GAP IN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

The estimation of the gender gap in economic activity is based on the gender gap in the following indicators:

- Rate of economic activity
- Estimated perceived income

EMPOWERMENT GAP

The estimation of empowerment is based on the following indicators:

- % of women in technical positions
- % of women in management and government positions
- % of women in parliament
- % of women in ministerial level positions