


The State of Society

Measuring Economic Success and Human Well-Being

Erwin de Leon and Elizabeth T. Boris



URBAN
INSTITUTE

CENTER ON NONPROFITS AND PHILANTHROPY

The State of Society

Measuring Economic Success and Human Well-Being

Erwin de Leon and Elizabeth T. Boris

Copyright © 2010. The Urban Institute. All rights reserved. Except for short quotes, no part of this paper may be reproduced in any form or used in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the Urban Institute.

The nonpartisan Urban Institute publishes studies, reports, and books on timely topics worthy of public consideration. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders.

Contents

Acknowledgments	iv
Summary	1
Limitations of GDP	3
Potential Indicators	8
Categories of Well-Being	9
Conclusions and Recommendations	14
References	17
Appendix A: Reports Assessed in the Study	19
Appendix B: Categories and Indicators of Well-Being from Reports Assessed in the Study	20
Appendix C: Indicators from Surveyed Reports	76

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Riane Eisler and Kimberly Otis of the Center for Partnership Studies for their careful review and thoughtful comments. The project was commissioned by the Center for Partnership Studies, based in California and Washington, D.C.

The authors also thank the members of the advisory council of the Real Wealth of Nations Public Policy Initiative for their review and support of this report:

- Randy Albelda, Professor, Economics Department, and Senior Research Fellow, The Center for Social Policy, University of Massachusetts Boston
- Ambassador Carol Moseley Braun, former U.S. Senator and Presidential candidate, and Founder, Ambassador Organics
- Jennifer Buffett, Co-chair and President, NoVo Foundation
- Jane Dutton, Robert L. Kahn Distinguished University Professor of Business Administration and Psychology, Stephen M. Ross School of Business, University of Michigan
- Pamela Eakes, former Executive Director, Mothers Against Violence, Women's Leadership Forum
- The Rev. Canon Charles P. Gibbs, Executive Director, United Religions Initiative
- Rufina Hernandez, Associate Director, National Education Association
- Carol Jenkins, Founding President, Women's Media Center and former news anchor, WNBC News
- Joan Kuriansky, Executive Director, Wider Opportunities for Women
- Shireen Mitchell, Vice Chair, National Council of Women's Organizations and Founding Director, Digital Sisters
- Terry O'Neill, President, National Organization for Women
- Gina Reiss, Executive Director, TrueChild
- Russy D. Sumariwalla, Founding President, Global Philanthropy and Nonprofits
- Mal Warwick, Principal, Mal Warwick and Associates, former Chair, Social Ventures Network
- Susan Wefald, Executive Vice President, Ms. Foundation for Women
- Valerie Young, Advocacy Coordinator, National Association of Mothers' Centers
- Elaine Zuckerman, President, Gender Action

The authors also thank Joe Cordes and Alan Abramson.

“The time is ripe for our measurement system to *shift emphasis from measuring economic production to measuring people’s well-being.*”

—Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi, 2009

Summary

This report was commissioned by the Center for Partnership Studies (CPS) to explore progress toward national indicators that measure both human well-being and economic success. These two measurements are interconnected, particularly as society moves further into the postindustrial knowledge and information age where economic success heavily depends on investment in human capacity development.

In this study, we provide an overview of a broad range of existing measures that go beyond gross domestic product (GDP) to offer a more complete and accurate picture of how a society and its economy are faring. Particular attention is given to data still generally marginalized on the economic and social status of the majority of every society—women and children—and to how this correlates with both a nation’s quality of life and its economic success.

Based on a review of the literature and an analysis of major arguments and rationales for moving beyond GDP as a measure of national well-being, this report identifies 14 categories of national well-being. It synthesizes hundreds of indicators found in 28 reports¹ that present alternative indices and systems of well-being into 79 indicators organized under these categories.

- Poverty
- Health
- Education
- Employment
- Income and wealth
- Shelter
- Natural environment
- Political participation
- Civil society
- Economic participation
- Human rights
- National stability and sustainability
- Family well-being
- Personal well-being

After examining existing indicators, we propose that new measures must assess more adequately the well-being of all segments of society—women, children, the elderly, and racial and other minorities. We recommend that particular attention be paid to the

¹ This survey of 28 reports is meant to be representative but not exhaustive. See appendix A.

economic contributions of women, especially to their caring work in both the market and nonmarket economic sectors, as the degree to which a society invests in caring work is a prime indicator of the degree to which it invests in human capacity development.

This report will be used to initiate conversations and action toward consensus around indicators that more accurately and comprehensively capture a nation's economic health and human well-being.

Limitations of GDP

The current default measure for economic and social progress is gross domestic product (GDP)—the market value of all goods and services produced in a country during a given year. However, in light of vast changes in society, the environment, and the global economy, many question whether GDP is an adequate indicator of the well-being of countries and their citizens (Dipierto and Anoruo 2006; Eisler 2007; Sen 1999; Stiglitz 2009). GDP ignores wealth variation, international income flows, household production of services, destruction of the environment, and many of the determinants of well-being such as the quality of social relations, economic security and personal safety, health, and longevity (Anheier and Stares 2002; Fleurbaey 2009; Michaelson et al. 2009).

For example, the U.S. Department of Commerce announced an increase of 5.9 percent in GDP during the fourth quarter of 2009. This follows an increase of 2.2 percent in the previous quarter.² Although these numbers give the impression of economic progress, other indicators such as unemployment reveal a different story. Based on estimates from the U.S. Department of Labor, the unemployment rate during the same period hovered around 10 percent, about 2 percentage points higher than the first quarter of 2009.³ Moreover, this official rate represents only a fraction of those without jobs, according to some economists.⁴ These indicators suggest deep economic distress. The mismatch between growing GDP and growing unemployment rates is an example of the disparity that has led some analysts to question the utility of GDP as a measure of economic well-being. Also, a country might report growth in GDP while poverty and inequity grow unabated.

To address shortcomings of GDP as an indicator of the state of a society and its members, increasing numbers of public leaders, advocates, organizations, and agencies have suggested alternative indicators and supplements to GDP.

David Loye (2007) outlines the development of quality of life and well-being measures during the past three decades. He traces the work done on measures proving the link between gender equality and global well-being to the UN Decade for Women Conferences, which started 25 years ago in Nairobi. Since then, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has created the Human Development Index while the European Union has been working on indicators of gender equality for developed countries.

Loye also cites the Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators launched by economist Hazel Henderson in tandem with the Calvert Fund in 1994 to address the

² “Gross Domestic Product: Fourth Quarter 2009 (Second Estimate),” U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, February 26, 2010.

³ Labor Force Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, accessed March 11, 2010 (http://data.bls.gov/PDQ/servlet/SurveyOutputServlet?data_tool=latest_numbers&series_id=LNS1400000).

⁴ See for example, <http://www.njfac.org/>.

inadequacy of macroeconomic indicators in assessing the national well-being of the United States. He acknowledges the work done during the past decade by the governments of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom to measure their citizens' quality of life.

The proposed alternatives and complements to GDP are numerous and varied. Some focus on a particular issue or area of concern. For example, Save the Children's Child Development Index, the Foundation for Child Development's Child and Youth Well-Being Index, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Doing Better for Children Dimensions, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Kids Count Data Book focus on the well-being of children. The Center for Partnership Studies' Gender Equity and Quality of Life Index, Save the Children's State of the World's Mothers, Social Watch's Gender Equity Index, the UNDP's Gender-Related Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure, and the World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Categories are mainly concerned with the status of women. The University of Massachusetts developed a set of indicators for care work while the London School of Economics created an index for global civil society. The National Conference of Citizenship assesses the America's civic health and Oxford University's Poverty and Human Development Initiative homes in on dimensions of poverty. OECD's Family Database is an online repository of family outcomes and policies for OECD countries. The Economic Policy Institute's State of Working America looks at the lives of the country's workers.

Other alternatives take a multidimensional approach to measuring the state of society. Among them are the Social Science Research Council's American Human Development Project, the Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators, the Fund for Peace's Failed States Index, Redefining Progress' Genuine Progress Indicators, UNDP's Human Development and Poverty Indices, Fordham Institute for the Innovation in Social Policy's Index of Social Health, New Economic Foundation's National Accounts of Well-Being and (Un)Happy Planet Index, the OECD's Social Indicators, the United Nations Population Fund's State of the World Population Indicators, and the United Nation's System of National Accounts.

Most recently, to bring national attention to the need for quality of life indicators, the State of the USA project has been developing a variety of measures that will be posted on its web site for public feedback and discussion, and a section of the recently passed health care reform bill (Section 5605 of P.L. 111-148) establishes, for the first time, a key national indicator system for the United States.⁵ These are major steps toward

⁵ The work that led to a Key National Indicator System for the United States began at the national level in 2003. In February 2003, a forum on creating a national system of indicators was convened by the Government Accountability Office in partnership with the National Academy of Sciences. More than 60 leaders from around the country met at the forum and discussed the need to develop a key national indicator system to create a more informed and accountable democracy. A report on the forum "Assessing

establishing a system of alternative indicators in the United States and bringing both policy and public attention to the fact that, in the words of State of USA president Christopher Hoenig, “the world is truly what we make it, and how we measure it.”⁶

The underpinnings to alternatives and supplements to GDP have been developed by a variety of scholars who have called for broader measures of well-being while acknowledging both the merits and the shortcomings of GDP.

Nancy Folbre (2001) and Riane Eisler (2007), for example, do not discount the value of GDP as an economic indicator but do argue that GDP does not give a full and accurate assessment of a country’s economic production and condition. Eisler emphasizes the need to measure the status of women and children as fundamental indicators of the well-being and economic strength of societies.

Eisler’s main critique of GDP is that it does not fully account for all economic activities, especially those that exist outside the realm of monetary exchange. For instance, GDP does not add in the monetary value of “the caring economy”—the unpaid care of households, children, the elderly, and the disabled by family members. She proposes a new economic map that includes these six sectors:

- Household economy
- Unpaid community economy
- Market economy
- Illegal economy
- Government economy
- Natural economy

Others have also noted that GDP does not take into account the work done within families and communities for free (Rowe 2008). For example in Massachusetts, these goods and services are not counted in the commonwealth’s GDP:

- Residents 16 years and older spent an average of 4.8 hours a day providing unpaid care or supervising those who need care;
- Residents perform 24.9 million hours a day of unpaid care work (the equivalent of 3.1 million full-time workers);
- Valuing unpaid care work at the typical wages for paid care workers, the total value of unpaid care time is \$151.6 billion annually.
- Women compose 75 percent of paid care workers and provide 64 percent of all time devoted to unpaid care activities (Albelda, Duffy, and Folbre 2009).

Still others argue that not only is GDP inadequate as an economic index, it simply fails as a measure of social welfare. GDP does not adequately take into account variables

the Nation’s Position and Progress” was released the following May (<http://www.stateoftheusa.org/about/history/>).

⁶ Christopher Hoenig, “Working Toward a Key National Indicator System,” <http://www.stateoftheusa.org/content/working-toward-a-key-national-indicator-system.php>, blog post, accessed: May 18, 2010.

such as the quality of a health care system, the environment, the level of sanitation, and the extent and quality of education (Abdallah et al. 2009; Dipierto and Anoruo 2006). GDP does not speak to the quality of life and well-being of individuals, families, and communities.

Andrew Oswald points to the Easterlin Paradox (the empirical finding that increasing wealth does not make countries happier) and to global warming, which for him is a sign that people should produce less and enjoy the planet more. Oswald makes the following arguments:

- Life is now more complex and services dominate;
- as a society, we need to measure well-being per se;
- official government statistics should blend objective and subjective well-being data; and
- sustainability must be a criterion.⁷

Economist Joseph Stiglitz (2009) challenges what he calls “GDP fetishism.” He questions whether current statistics provide the correct roadmaps for action. He encourages a more critical stance toward what GDP and other macroeconomic indicators actually tell us.

If we have poor measures, what we strive to do (say, increase GDP) may actually contribute to a worsening of living standards ... Statistical frameworks are intended to summarize what is going on in our complex society in a few easily interpretable numbers. It should have been obvious that one couldn't reduce everything to a single number, GDP.

In his seminal work *Development as Freedom* (1999), Amartya Sen contrasts the remarkable economic progress and wealth created in the last century to the devastating deprivation, destitution, and oppression suffered by billions of people worldwide, especially women and children. He argues for an integrative framework in economics that moves the focus from market expansion to the improvement of individual lives, which will invariably lead to sustainable economic growth.

In February 2008, President Nicholas Sarkozy asked Stiglitz, Sen, and another leading economist, Jean Paul Fitoussi, to create the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Development and Social Progress (popularly known as the Sarkozy Commission), whose aim was to “identify the limits of GDP as an indicator of economic progress, including the problems with its measurement; to consider what additional information might be required for the production of more relevant indicators of social progress; to assess the feasibility of alternative measurement tools; and to discuss how to

⁷ *The Economist*, 2010, “GDP,” <http://www.economist.com/debate/days/view/501>, *Economist Debates*, accessed April 21, 2010.

present the statistical information in an appropriate way” (Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi 2009).

Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi accepted President Sarkozy’s challenge. Their report assesses GDP and recommends other ways to measure the efficiency of economic and social welfare policies. They argue for a system of indicators of well-being as well as better ways to understand inequalities, rather than a focus on averages and aggregates. In their opinion, “GDP is not wrong *as such*, but is wrongly used”—a reference to the use of GDP as an all-encompassing indicator of well-being (Stiglitz et al. 2009).

Among the commission’s critiques of GDP and other commonly used or predominant statistical measurements of socioeconomic phenomena:

- When there are large changes in inequality (more generally in income distribution), GDP or any other aggregate computed per capita may not provide an accurate assessment of the situation in which most people find themselves.
- The commonly used statistics may not be capturing some phenomena that have an increasing impact on the well-being of citizens (externalities).

The GDP macro-level view of the world does not factor in the lives and activities of individuals, families, and communities. Hence, policy decisions based on macro-level analyses may be inefficient and at times counterproductive.

To assess the state of suggested alternatives and supplements to GDP we reviewed the literature for current indicators, systems, and indices meant to go beyond traditional macroeconomic indicators and selected 28 reports from a variety of sources to examine in detail (see appendix A).

Potential Indicators

While the literature suggests that GDP is a proven and successful measure of a country's economic activity, it is widely acknowledged that GDP does not provide an adequate and full assessment of the state of a society because it does not account for the condition and well-being of individuals, families, and communities. Moreover, GDP does not include economic activities outside the market such as caring for people in households, even though without caregiving there would be no work force.

Across the board, indices and systems of well-being developed by governments, nongovernmental organizations, and other agencies are taking a multidimensional approach, factoring in a variety of categories or dimensions of well-being simultaneously.

Based on the literature, we identified 14 major categories of well-being. Hundreds of indicators found in the reports we reviewed (appendix B) were synthesized into 79 indicators and organized under these 14 categories (appendix C).

Taken together, these categories provide a substantial foundation from which a comprehensive assessment of the state of societies from the country level down to communities, families, and individuals can be built. Missing, however, across all categories are indicators that adequately assess the well-being of all segments of society, particularly women, children, the elderly, and minorities (e.g. racial/ethnic populations; indigenous peoples; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals; religious groups). The majority of well-being reports do include some indicators on women and children, but these are usually marginal and fail to give a full picture of the situation of women and children, much less how this affects a nation's quality of life and economic health. Indicators on the elderly and minorities are sorely lacking. Lacking under the employment, income and wealth, and economic participation categories are indicators on care work and unpaid labor.

In the following section, the 14 categories of well-being are described. Under each heading, we identify additional indicators (those not mentioned in any of the reports) which could contribute to a fuller assessment of societal well-being.

Categories of Well-Being

The reports we reviewed include a mix of these 14 categories, although not one covered all categories. All categories interact to determine the well-being of entire countries down to family units and individuals. Although a statistical model that relates these variables to come up with a single number like GDP is not part of this study, a systematic analysis of traditional macroeconomic indicators in relation to alternative measures is an important stepping stone toward an informed consideration of options for expanding or supplementing GDP to meet the demands of our age.

Poverty: This category usually measures the percentage of a population living under the poverty level. Although the poverty rates of families and children are common indicators, the poverty rates of women, particularly families led by single women and elderly women, are not generally included. Also missing are poverty rates among minorities within a given society.

Health: The often used health indicators are life expectancy, maternal and infant mortality, death rate, and morbidity (nonfatal health conditions). Information on children's health, nutrition, and access to health insurance are often included, but access to contraception and abortion is not as frequently counted. Moreover, nutrition is not broken down by gender despite the prevalence of female malnutrition.⁸

Education: This dimension is ordinarily measured by literacy, school enrollment, and dropout or completion rates. Data on the literacy and enrollment rates of both women and men are regularly collected and compared. This category can be enriched by the addition of indicators of the education of different demographic groups independently and in comparison with other groups.

Employment: Employment is frequently cited as an indicator of economic progress. It is measured mainly through unemployment and underemployment rates and the amount of labor force participation. However, existing unemployment and underemployment measures tend to grossly understate these rates. Most critically, caring labor and other unpaid work are completely overlooked in the vast majority of indices (see economic participation).

Income and wealth: This category includes measures of comparative income but usually only among income groups (e.g., quintiles, top 5

⁸ In India, for example, gender inequality in nutrition is present from infancy to adulthood and females are 25 percent more malnourished than males (Dewan 2008). Although this is considered one of the more important dimensions of social welfare, lacking are measures of food security among women, children, and minorities; the health of minority populations; access to preventative care; and eating disorders.

percent or bottom 20 percent). Although income inequality between females and males is measured, it does not factor in the lifetime earning disparities due to women dropping out of the labor force to care for children or the elderly,⁹ and indicators of income disparities among various populations in society are generally missing.¹⁰ There is also a need for an indicator of wealth ownership or control of property and a ratio of ownership between top and bottom groups of the population, between women and men, and between minorities and dominant groups. The wealth gap between groups not only disadvantages certain segments of society, but it can significantly limit the economic prospects of future generations.

Indicators of access to social welfare mechanisms such as pensions, unemployment, and disability benefits are also missing.

Shelter: The main indicators that fall into this dimension are homeownership rate and rental costs. The homeownership rates and rental costs incurred by women, particularly single heads of household, and by other minority groups are not indicated separately.

Also missing in this category is an indicator of the size and condition of informal settlements (i.e., slums) in any given country. With more than half of the world's population living in urban areas and a majority of urban dwellers residing in informal settlements (Davis 2006), indicators that document this phenomenon are integral to assessing the well-being of huge numbers of people.

Natural environment: There is a growing sense of urgency about the state of the environment from climate change to dwindling natural resources. The state of the environment is assessed through indicators such as environmental quality, effects on human health, and the status of natural resources and ecosystems. A measure of capacity and readiness to respond to an environmental disaster is missing.

Political participation: The range of political participation indicators include voting rates, legal and social rights guaranteed by law, and the proportion of the population permitted and willing to take part in a political activity. More and more focus has been put on the political participation of women with indicators such as the ratio of female to male shares of parliamentary seats and heads of state. These measures

⁹ Rose and Hartmann (2004). Across the 15 years of the study, the average prime age working woman earned only \$273,592 while the average working man earned \$722,693 in the United States (in 1999 dollars). This gap of 62 percent is more than twice as large as the 23 percent gap commonly reported.

¹⁰ The only indicator of this kind found in the scan of reports is income growth for middle-income immigrant and nonimmigrant families.

supplement other indicators of a population's involvement in governance. The political participation of other groups such as minorities, immigrants, and the disabled is missing and must be included as they are often without a political voice.

Civil society: Under this category are indicators on voluntary civic associations and institutions, such as the proportion of the population who are members of civil society and the density of international NGO (nongovernmental organization) membership. Possible additions to measures of civil society are the existence and implementation of laws affecting the ability to establish NGOs and to freely associate and petition government on behalf of a cause, and the existence of entities to represent civil society in government.

Indicators on civility or intergroup relations also fall under this heading. This includes measures such as the proportion of the population who do not object to having immigrants, foreign workers, and other minorities as neighbors; the proportion of the population who say it is important to encourage children to be tolerant and respectful of others; the bridging of social capital; citizen-centered engagement; and level of trust in government, business, and other institutions.

Economic participation: This category lists indicators that assess the ability of all members of society to be part of all aspects of the economy. Measures assessing the status of women in the paid workforce have been developed, such as the ratio of female to male labor force participation and ratio of women to men in professional and technical jobs. Volunteer work is also valued. Missing are indicators of the economic participation of minorities and other populations. Also missing are categories of unpaid labor in households and caring work.

Human rights: This category assesses the degree to which basic rights and freedoms are accorded to various groups living within a nation state. Indicators include human rights ratings,¹¹ the status of prisoners (such as the number of prisoners under sentence of death by race), and prisoner executions by civil authorities. This dimension is also measured by the number of refugees fleeing the country, an indication of the lack of political and human rights.

¹¹ Indices that assess a nation's protection of basic rights and freedoms codified in the International Bill of Human Rights and subsequent conventions.

A missing indicator is the availability of civil rights and legal protections for women, children, and minorities (e.g. a nation's failure to enact laws protecting girls and women from violence or failure to enforce such laws and hate crimes legislation that seeks to protect lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgenders, as well as religious and racial groups).

National stability and sustainability: This dimension includes measures that assess the risks and challenges to a nation state's political and social stability, which are crucial to its total well-being. Indicators look at issues such as mounting demographic pressures; uneven economic development along gender, racial, and class group lines; suspension or arbitrary application of the rule of law; and overall national security.

Family and household well-being: This category examines the state of the building block of all societies, the family. Indicators that fall under this heading consider factors such as family size and composition, children in families, and living arrangements of children. Other measures include fertility measures (fertility rates, mean age of mother at first childbirth, share of births outside marriage, teen births, and childlessness) and marital and partnership status. Parental workplace hours and time for caring are included (weekly working hours among women and men; distribution of working hours among two-parent and single-parent families; and family-friendly workplace practices). Missing is the availability and government support for parental leave, child care, and other policies that support families.

Personal well-being: Among all the dimensions, this is the one that focuses most on the micro level. An individual's assessment of emotional and overall well-being is taken into consideration as are his or her capabilities, personal activities, social connections, and sense of security (or insecurity).

These dimensions of well-being supplement GDP by providing a more comprehensive assessment of the well-being of a nation and its citizens. It has to be acknowledged, however, that there are challenges. For instance, not all countries have the capacity to measure many of these indicators. In certain cases, governments may have reason not to quantify certain conditions such as the lack of human rights. The number and variety of indicators require different information to be gathered from across a wide range of countries and cultures, which poses standardization problems.

Nonetheless, the need remains for a systematic approach that factors in key indicators of well-being alongside GDP. A more comprehensive and helpful assessment tool or tools seems quite possible given the work that has already been accomplished. It will take

collaboration, negotiation, and detailed analysis to develop widely accepted standardized indicators, data definitions, collection procedures, analysis methods, and reporting formats. Data collected well and used properly could be eye-opening and have salutary effects on public policies around the world.

The Istanbul Declaration signed by representatives of the European Commission, the Organisation for Co-operation and Development, the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank reads,

We are encouraged that the initiatives to measure societal progress through statistical indicators have been launched in several countries and on all continents. Although these initiatives are based on different methodologies, cultural and intellectual paradigms, and degrees of involvement of key stakeholders, they reveal an emerging consensus on the need to undertake the measurement of societal progress in every country, going beyond conventional economic measures such as GDP per capita.¹²

¹² Signed at the close of the second OECD World Forum on Statistics, Knowledge, and Policy, held in Istanbul, Turkey, on June 30, 2007.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Critical analyses of the GDP document its strengths and weaknesses. While its relative simplicity makes it easy to use, there is a growing acknowledgement that it is not adequate to the task of measuring aspects of current societies that policymakers and the public consider important. There are many academic and popular candidates for revisions of the GDP. This report attempts to capture the rationales and indicators of representative efforts and synthesize the common elements as a starting place for a serious conversation on next steps.

Based on the literature and a scan of reports, this study identified categories of indicators that can supplement GDP. It also notes missing indicators such as those of unpaid work and the status and access to resources by various population groups within any given society (women, children, the elderly, the disabled, and racial and other minorities).

We suggest that when exploring these dimensions, special attention be given to unpaid labor, especially care work. In terms of child care for instance, Warner (2009) describes this sector as an iceberg. In the United States, just above the waterline are paid child care workers, which she estimates add up to about 1.7 million individuals. Below the waterline are at least 2.4 million unpaid care workers on top of unpaid parental care, which approximates 17 million workers.

Care work, both paid and unpaid, is a form of human capacity development which needs to be acknowledged and measured. This investment in human infrastructure is critical for both well-being and economic effectiveness, especially in the postindustrial knowledge information era.

Measures of this investment could include a number of components. These range from degree of investment in education for caregiving (such as education for child care) and the pay for professions that entail caregiving (such as child care and elementary school teaching) to the degree to which business and government policies support care for children in both the market and nonmarket spheres (e.g., paid parental leave, flex time, subsidies for caregiving in homes).

Closely related to investment in human infrastructure is the status of women. Among reasons for this is that women are still the primary caregivers of children worldwide and studies show that the first years of life are critical for capacity development (see, e.g., Niehoff 1999; National Research Council 2000; and Perry 2002). Yet while the status of women is an integral component of most categories, not all the referenced reports explicitly account for gender disparities.

In spite of the growing international awareness of the centrality of gender issues and the need to empower women, many countries still fail to make ending discrimination and violence against girls and women a priority (Eisler 2011). And no country has managed

to eliminate the gender gap (Lopez-Carlos and Zahidi 2005), a negative drag on many economies.

The situation of the next generation also needs to be assessed. Reports show that there is a correlation between child welfare and the status of women (Bruce and Lloyd 1997; Eisler, Loye, and Norgaard 1995; Hausman, Tyson, and Zahidi 2009). And while no one will dispute the truism that children are the future drivers of our societies and economies, the statistics on child poverty and deprivation worldwide reveal that not much worth is accorded to children:

- 9.2 million children die every year before they reach their 5th birthday,
- 97 percent of child deaths occur in 68 developing countries,
- A quarter of all children are underweight,
- A third have stunted growth, and
- 75 million primary-school-age children—mostly girls—are not enrolled in school (Hague 2008).

This represents a vast waste of human potential and a block to economic and social development. Hague (2008) argues that investing in children's well-being is good for communities and countries. She calculates that on average, a 5 percentage point improvement in child mortality raises economic growth by 1 percentage point per year over the following decade.

The lives and well-being of minorities also have to be measured in any assessment of national well-being and economic productivity. Among the referenced reports, little or no attention is given to the status of minorities—racial/ethnic populations; indigenous peoples and tribes; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals; religious groups; castes; and others—on their own, or in comparison to dominant groups and those in power.

In closing, it must be stressed that these dimensions of well-being cannot give the full picture of the state of a society and its citizens if taken individually, independent of other dimensions. These categories need to be considered in relationship to one another, each making a contribution to measuring well-being. For example, studies suggest that the status of women can be a good predictor of a nation's general quality of life. This raises the question of how the relationship between quality of life and gender indicators should be highlighted, and how gender and the closely related indicators on the situation of children should be weighted in statistical terms (Eisler et al. 1995).

While this proposed list of categories of well-being might not provide the convenience of simpler statistical modeling, it promises to give a more robust picture of a nation's condition. By making visible what is otherwise invisible, it raises flags for further research on what factors are good predictors of quality of life, which in turn can lead to more effective policies and economies.

As OECD Secretary General Angel Gurría told participants in the 2007 World Forum on Statistics, Knowledge, and Policy, "In the end, what we are trying to do is not just

measure progress and well-being but to achieve it.” He reasons that the development of alternative indicators to GDP can provide “a unique opportunity to improve the ways in which our policies are made and breathe new life into the democratic processes.”¹³

This report is designed to provide a wide-angle view of efforts to expand measures of economic status and progress beyond the current GDP. It provides a platform from which further action can be taken and will be used to initiate conversations about what is feasible and desirable. It can lead to an organized, coordinated effort by various stakeholders—international agencies, policymakers, scholars, nonprofit organizations, and others—to reach consensus around developing and using indicators that fully capture the state of societies.

¹³ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2007, “OECD and International Organizations to Develop New Approach to Measuring Progress of Societies,” February 7, http://www.oecd.org/documentprint/0,3455,en_2649_34487_38883800_1_1_1_1,00.html. (Accessed March 17, 2010.)

References

- Abdallah, Saamah, Sam Thompson, Juliet Michaelson, Nic Marks, and Nicola Steuer. 2009. "The (Un)Happy Planet Index 2.0: Why Good Lives Don't Have to Cost the Earth." London: New Economics Foundation.
- Albelda, Randy, Mignon Duffy, and Nancy Folbre. 2009. "Counting on Care Work: Human Infrastructure in Massachusetts." Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.
- Anheier, Helmut, and Sally Stares. 2002. "Introducing the Global Civil Society Index." In *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2002*, edited by Marlies Glasius, Mary Kaldor, and Helmut K. Anheier (241–54). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bruce, Judith, and Cynthia B. Lloyd. 1997. "Finding the Ties That Bind: Beyond Headship and Household," In *Intrahousehold Resources Allocation in Developing Countries: Methods, Models, and Policy*, edited by Lawrence Haddad, John Hoddinott, and Harold Alderman (213–30). Baltimore: International Food Policy Research Institute and Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Davis, Mike. 2006. *Planet of Slums*. London: Verso Books.
- Dewan, Manju. 2008. "Malnutrition in Women." *Studies on Home and Community Science* 2(1): 7–10.
- Dipietro, William R., and Emmanuel Anoruo. 2006. "GDP Per Capita and Its Challengers as Measures of Happiness." *International Journal of Social Economics* 33(10): 698–709.
- Eisler, Riane. 2007. *Real Wealth of Nations*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Riane Eisler. 2011. "Protecting the Majority of Humanity: Toward an Integrated Approach to Crimes against Present and Future Generations," In *Securing the Rights of Future Generations: Sustainable Development and the International Criminal Law Regime in Practice*, edited by Sébastien Jodoin, Marie-Claire Cordonier Segger, and Maja Göpel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisler, Riane, David Loye, and Kari Norgaard. 1995. "Women, Men, and the Global Quality of Life." Pacific Grove, CA: The Center for Partnership Studies.
- Fleurbaey, Marc. 2009. "Beyond GDP: The Quest for a Measure of Social Welfare." *Journal of Economic Literature* 47(4): 1029–75.
- Folbre, Nancy. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York: The New Press.
- Hague, Sarah. 2008. "The Child Development Index: Holding Governments to Account for Children's Wellbeing." London: Save the Children.

- Hausman, Ricardo, Laura D. Tyson, and Saadia Zahidi. 2009. "The Global Gender Report 2009." Geneva, CH: World Economic Forum.
- Lopez-Carlos, Augusto, and Saadia Zahidi. 2005. "Women's Empowerment: Measuring the Global Gender Gap." Geneva, CH: World Economic Forum.
- Loye, David. 2007. *Measuring Evolution: A Leadership Guide to the Health and Wealth of Nations*. Carmel, CA: Benjamin Franklin Press.
- Michaelson, Juliet, Saamah Abdallah, Nicola Steuer, Sam Thompson, and Nic Marks. 2009. "National Accounts of Well-Being: Bringing Real Wealth onto the Balance Sheet." London: New Economics Foundation.
- National Research Council. 2000. *From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Niehoff, Deborah. 1999. *The Biology of Violence*. New York: Free Press.
- Perry, Bruce. 2002. "Aggression and Violence: The Neurobiology of Experience." http://teacher.scholastic.com/professional/bruceperry/aggression_violence.htm. (Accessed May 24, 2010.)
- Rose, Stephen J., and Heidi I. Hartmann. 2004. "Still a Man's Labor Market: The Long-Term Earnings Gap." Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Rowe, Jonathan. 2008. "Rethinking the Gross Domestic Product as a Measurement of National Strength." Testimony before the United States Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, Subcommittee on Interstate Commerce, March 12.
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2009. "GDP Fetishism." *Economist's Voice*, September.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E., Amartya Sen, and Jean-Paul Fitoussi. 2009. "Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress." Paris: Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.
- Warner, Mildred E. 2009. "Recession, Stimulus, and the Child Care Sector: Understanding Economic Dynamics, Calculating Impact." Linking Economic Development and Child Care Research Project. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Appendix A

Reports Assessed in the Study

America's Children (Forum on Child and Family Statistics)

America's Civic Health Index (National Conference on Citizenship)

American Human Development Report (The Social Science Research Council)

The Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators

The Child and Youth Wealth-Being Index Report (The Foundation for Child Development)

The Child Development Index (Save the Children)

Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress

Counting on Care Work (University of Massachusetts)

Doing Better for Children (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)

The Failed States Index (The Fund for Peace)

The Gender Equity and Quality of Life Index (The Center for Partnership Studies)

Gender Equity Index (Social Watch)

Genuine Progress Indicator (Redefining Progress)

Global Civil Society Index (London School of Economics)

The Global Gender Gap Report (World Economic Forum)

The Human Development Index (United Nations Development Programme, includes the Human Poverty Indices, Gender-Related Development Index, and Gender Empowerment Measure)

Index of Social Health (Fordham Institute for Innovation in Social Policy)

The Kids Count Data Book (The Annie E. Casey Foundation)

Missing Dimensions of Poverty Data (Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative)

National Accounts of Well-Being (The New Economics Foundation)

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Family Database

Society at a Glance (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)

The State of Working America (The Economic Policy Institute)

State of World Population Report (United Nation's Population Fund)

State of the World's Mothers (Save the Children)

System of National Accounts (United Nations)

The (Un)Happy Planet Index 2.0 (New Economics Foundation)

The World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency)

Appendix B

Categories and Indicators of Well-Being from Reports Assessed in the Study

America's Children (Forum on Child and Family Statistics)

http://www.childstats.gov/pdf/ac2009/ac_09.pdf

Report: *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2009*

This report is a compendium of indicators illustrating both the promises and the difficulties confronting the Nation's young people. It presents 40 key indicators on important aspects of children's lives. This year's report continues to present key indicators grouped by the seven sections identified in the restructured 10th anniversary report (2007): family and social environment, economic circumstances, health care, physical environment and safety, behavior, education, and health.

Indicators of Children's Well-Being

<http://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/index.asp>

1. **Family and social environment:** The seven indicators include family structure and children's living arrangements, births to unmarried women, child care, presence of a foreign-born parent, language spoken at home and difficulty speaking English, adolescent births, and child maltreatment.
2. **Economic circumstances:** Indicators of economic resources include income and poverty status of children's families and an indicator on secure employment of children's parents. An indicator on food security presents information on families with children that report difficulty obtaining adequate food. These indicators provide a broad perspective on children's economic situations.
3. **Health care:** This section presents information on selected determinants of health care utilization for children (e.g., having health insurance coverage and having a usual source of health care) and measures of utilization of health care (e.g., childhood immunization, children having a dental visit, and children with untreated dental caries).
4. **Physical environment and safety:** This section presents indicators on how environmental conditions such as outdoor and indoor air quality, drinking water quality, and exposure to lead may affect children. In addition, indicators of housing problems, youth victims of serious violent crimes, and child and adolescent injury and mortality are presented.
5. **Behavior:** The indicators in this section focus on illegal and high-risk behaviors. Substance use behaviors are shown for regular cigarette smoking, alcohol use, and illicit drug use. Other indicators in this section present data on behaviors such as sexual activity and perpetration of serious violent crime.
6. **Education:** This section presents key indicators of how well children are learning and progressing from early childhood through postsecondary school. An indicator

on family reading to young children suggests the extent of home support for early learning. Scores on national assessments of mathematics and reading for elementary, middle, and high school students are presented, followed by an indicator on advanced coursetaking. High school completion and college enrollment rates indicate the extent to which students have attained a basic education and are prepared for higher levels of education or the workforce. By contrast, the indicator on youth neither enrolled in school nor working tracks the extent to which youth are at risk of limiting their future prospects at a critical stage of their lives.

- 7. Health:** This section presents indicators of several important aspects or determinants of child health. Some of the indicators in this section relate to birth outcomes such as low birthweight, preterm birth, and infant mortality. Other indicators describe key health conditions, including emotional or behavioral difficulties, adolescent depression, overweight, and asthma. An indicator on the quality of children's diets compares children's dietary intake to recommended national dietary guidelines. The indicator on activity limitation presents a global measure that gauges the effect of chronic health conditions on children's functioning.

America's Civic Health Index (National Conference on Citizenship)

<http://www.ncoc.net/index.php?tray=topic&tid=top5&cid=9>

Report: *2009 Civic Health Index: Civic Health in Hard Times*

An annual report that elevates the discussion of the nation's civic health by measuring a wide variety of civic indicators, America's Civic Health Index is an effort to educate Americans about their civic life and to motivate citizens, leaders, and policymakers to strengthen it. The creation of America's Civic Health Index and report is a cooperative effort of the NCoC, the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) at the Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University, and Harvard University's Saguaro Seminar, "Civic Engagement in America," as well as members of a Civic Health Index working group.

Indicators of Civic Health

<http://www.ncoc.net/index.php?tray=content&tid=top5&cid=2gp76>

1. **Connecting to civic and religious groups:** Such groups are the seedbeds of democracy. They recruit and educate citizens, bring them together for discussion, and increase their capacity for improving society.
2. **Trusting other people:** Trust correlates with associational membership because one must have at least limited trust in at least some others before one can work with them voluntarily, and collaborative work often enhances trust.
3. **Connecting to others through family and friends:** Close interaction with families and friends promotes health and well-being and supports civil society by providing the information, encouragement, and networks that people need to engage in larger groups and communities.
4. **Citizen-centered engagement:** "Citizen-centered" engagement means bringing diverse groups of citizens together both to discuss and define an issue and to work voluntarily to address it. Citizen-centered engagement thus combines deliberation with action.
5. **Giving and volunteering:** Voluntary contributions of time and money address serious public problems and support civil society.
6. **Staying informed:** Valuable participation requires information, which can be gleaned from other citizens, the news media, the Internet, and many other sources.

7. **Understanding civics and politics:** Related to the previous category, these measures measure to what degree Americans feel informed.
8. **Participating in politics:** Regardless of one's political views and attitudes toward government, it is important to influence democratic institutions.
9. **Trusting and feeling connected to major institutions:** Trust in government and the mass media can be understood as a subjective attitude that often (but not invariably) correlates with taking voluntary political action. Trust can also be understood as a measure of how trustworthy our institutions actually are.
10. **Expressing political views:** Voting is a powerful means of making choices, but it communicates the voter's views imperfectly. Fortunately, citizens have other opportunities to say more precisely what they believe about public issues.

American Human Development Project (The Social Science Research Council)

<http://www.measureofamerica.org/2008-2009-report/about/>

Report: *The Measure of America: American Human Development Report 2008–2009*

Produced by the American Human Development Project, the report is modeled on the United Nations Development Programme’s global Human Development Report, which has provided authoritative analysis and a ranked index for countries around the world for almost two decades. *The Measure of America*, published by Columbia University Press and the Social Science Research Council, is the first time the human development approach has been applied in the United States or any other industrialized nation. Using official government statistics and robust peer-reviewed analysis, the American Human Development Report presents human development rankings for U.S. states, congressional districts, and ethnic groups. It reveals where America is today and sets a benchmark for monitoring progress tomorrow. Unlike the many existing measurements used to assess health, education, or income alone, the American Human Development Index (HD Index) combines these factors into one easy-to-understand measurement. This more comprehensive measure allows for a better understanding of the opportunities open to different groups of Americans.

The American Human Development Index

http://measureofamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/05/measureofamerica_methodology.pdf

The modified American Human Development Index measures the same three basic dimensions as the standard HD Index, but it uses different data to better reflect the U.S. context and to maximize available data. All data come from official U.S. government sources. The most recent year for which data are available is 2005, owing to the typical lag time of two to three years.

1. **A long and healthy life** is measured using life expectancy at birth, calculated from mortality data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Center for Health Statistics and population data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2005.
2. **Access to knowledge** is measured using two indicators: school enrollment for the population age 3 and older, and educational degree attainment for the population 25 and older. Both indicators are from the American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau, 2005.

-
-
- 3. Decent standard of living** is measured using median earnings from the American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau, 2005.

The Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators

<http://www.calvert-henderson.com/>

The Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators are a contribution to the worldwide effort to develop comprehensive statistics of national well-being that go beyond traditional macroeconomic indicators. A systems approach is used to illustrate the dynamic state of our social, economic, and environmental quality of life. The dimensions of life examined include education, employment, energy, environment, health, human rights, income, infrastructure, national security, public safety, recreation, and shelter.

The Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators

<http://www.calvert-henderson.com/overview.htm>

1. Education

- a. Education Completed in the U.S.
- b. Average Annual Earnings by Education and Sex
- c. U.S. Adult Literacy Rates
- d. Poverty by Literacy Level
- e. Dropout Rate by Family Income Level, 1970–2007
- f. College Enrollment Rates, 1967–2007
- g. Cost of College versus Income, 1964–2007
- h. Country Comparisons on 8th Grade Math and Science Scores, 2003
- i. Educational Expenditures as Percent of Gross Domestic Product, 1949–2007

2. Employment

- a. Civilian Labor Force, 1948—2009 (updated February 2010)
- b. Selected Civilian Unemployment Rates, 1975–2009
- c. Duration of Employment, 1968–2009 (updated February 2010)
- d. Reason for Unemployment, 1967–2009
- e. Selected Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates, 1970–2009
- f. Labor Force Participation Rate and Employment-to-Population Ratio, 1948–2009
- g. Distribution of Full-Time and Part-Time Workers in 2001 (latest available)
- h. Contingent and Noncontingent Workers in 2005 (latest available)
- i. Multiple Job Holders, 1999–2009
- j. Employed Workers with Alternative Work Arrangements, 2005

3. Energy

- a. U.S. Energy and Related Time-Series Data
- b. Global CO₂ Emissions by Region from 1980–2008
- c. Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases by U.S. Companies

4. Environment

- a. Environmental Quality
- b. Natural Resources and Ecosystems
- c. Industry and Infrastructure
- d. Consumers and Products
- e. Wastes

5. Health

- a. Infant Mortality Rates According to Race and Ethnicity of Mother
- b. Infant Mortality Rates by Geographic Region and State
- c. Infant Mortality Rates by Mother's Education, Race, and Ethnicity
- d. Infant Mortality Rates, Selected Countries and Years
- e. Life Expectancy at Birth in the United States
- f. Life Expectancy at Birth According to Race and Sex
- g. Life Expectancy at Birth According to Sex: Selected Countries
- h. Percent of People Reporting Fair or Poor Health

6. Human Rights

- a. Prisoners under Sentence of Death by Race
- b. Prisoner Executions by Civil Authority
- c. Percentage of Population Who Voted during Presidential Election Years
- d. Resident Population by Race (American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut)
- e. Number of Poor and Poverty Rate by Race

7. Income

- a. Median Family Income, 1947–2007
- b. Median Family Income
- c. Annual Growth of Median Family Income, 1947–2007
- d. Shares of Family Income Going to Various Income Groups
- e. Real Family Income Growth by Income Group, 1979–2006
- f. Wages for Female Workers by Wage Percentile, 1973–2007
- g. Wages for Male Workers by Wage Percentile, 1973–2007
- h. Wages for All Workers by Wage Percentile, 1973–2007
- i. Dimensions of Wage Inequality, 1973–2007
- j. Women's Wage Inequality, 1973–2007
- k. Men's Wage Inequality, 1973–2007

1. 90/10 Percentile Wage Inequality, 1973–2007

8. Infrastructure

- a. Infrastructure Capital Stock, 1950–1999
- b. Annual Change in Per Capita Public and Private Infrastructure Capital Stocks
- c. Selected Elements of the Public Infrastructure Capital Stock Per Capita
- d. Selected Elements of the Private Infrastructure Capital Stock Per Capita

9. National Security

- a. Names and Dates of International Treaties Since 1948
- b. Major Armed Conflicts, 1986–2002
- c. Value of World Arms Transfer Deliveries, 1978–1997
- d. Worldwide Military Expenditures, 1978–1997
- e. Completed Peacekeeping Missions
- f. Current Peacekeeping Missions, May 15, 2003
- g. International Terrorist Incidents, 1977–2004 and 2005–2008
- h. Casualties Caused by International Terrorism, 1970–2000

10. Public Safety

- a. Ten Leading Causes of Death in the United States, 2006
- b. Death Rates from Injuries and Infectious Diseases, 1910–1998
- c. Years of Potential Life Lost Before Age 65 by Cause of Death, 2006
- d. External Causes of Deaths from Injuries, 1997–2006
- e. Death Rates from Injury by Cause, 1981–2006
- f. Death Rates from Motor Vehicle Crashes and Firearms, 1981–2006
- g. Driver Deaths in Passenger Vehicles, 2008

11. Recreation

- a. Self-Improvement
- b. Religious Activities
- c. Participation in the Arts
- d. Hobbies
- e. Virtual Games
- f. Sports
- g. Social Celebrations
- h. Gambling
- i. Travel

12. Shelter

- a. Homeownership Rate, 1940–2008
- b. Overcrowding, 1940–2005
- c. Units Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities, 1940–2005
- d. Rental Cost Burdens, All Renters, 1978–2003
- e. Rental Cost Burdens, Very Low Income Renters, 1978–2003
- f. Changes in Concentrated Poverty by Region, 100 Largest Metro Areas
- g. High-Poverty Tracts by Location, 1980 and 2000
- h. High-Poverty Tracts by Predominant Race/Ethnicity, 1980 and 2000
- i. African American/White Differences in Housing Conditions

The Child and Youth Well-Being Index Report (The Foundation for Child Development)

http://www.fcd-us.org/usr_doc/Final-2009CWIRreport.pdf

Report: *The 2009 Foundation for Child Development Child and Youth Well-Being Index (CWI) Report*

The Foundation for Child Development Child and Youth Well-Being Index Project at Duke University issues an annual comprehensive measure of how children are faring in the United States. The Child Well-Being Index is based on a composite of 28 key indicators of well-being that are grouped into seven quality-of-life/well-being domains, including economic well-being, health, safety, educational attainment, community connectedness, social relationships, and emotional/spiritual well-being. Taken together, changes in the performance of these 28 key indicators and the seven domains into which they are grouped provide a view of the changes in the overall well-being of children and youth in American society. Each domain represents an important area that affects well-being/quality of life. The performance of the nation on each indicator also reflects the strength of America's social institutions: its families, schools, and communities. All of these key indicators are either well-being indicators that measure outcomes for children and youths or surrogate indicators of the same.

The Child and Youth Well-Being Index

1. Family economic well-being domain

- a. Poverty rate (all families with children)
- b. Secure parental employment rate
- c. Median annual income (all families with children)
- d. Rate of children with health insurance

2. Health domain

- a. Infant mortality rate
- b. Low birth weight rate
- c. Mortality rate (ages 1–19)
- d. Rate of children with very good or excellent health (as reported by parents)
- e. Rate of children with activity limitations (as reported by parents)
- f. Rate of overweight children and adolescents (ages 6–19)

3. Safety/behavioral domain

- a. Teenage birth rate (ages 10–17)
- b. Rate of violent crime victimization (ages 12–19)

- c. Rate of violent crime offenders (ages 12–17)
- d. Rate of cigarette smoking (grade 12)
- e. Rate of binge alcohol drinking (grade 12)
- f. Rate of illicit drug use (grade 12)

4. Educational attainment domain

- a. Reading test scores (ages 9, 13, and 17)
- b. Mathematics test scores (ages 9, 13, and 17)

5. Community connectedness

- a. Rate of persons who have received a high school diploma (ages 18–24)
- b. Rate of youths not working and not in school (ages 16–19)
- c. Rate of prekindergarten enrollment (ages 3–4)
- d. Rate of persons who have received a bachelor's degree (ages 25–29)
- e. Rate of voting in presidential elections (ages 18–20)

6. Social relationships domain

- a. Rate of children in families headed by a single parent
- b. Rate of children who have moved within the last year (ages 1–18)

7. Emotional/spiritual well-being domain

- a. Suicide rate (ages 10–19)
- b. Rate of weekly religious attendance (grade 12)
- c. Percent who report religion as being very important (grade 12)

The Child Development Index (Save the Children)

<http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/en/docs/child-development-index.pdf>

Report: *The Child Development Index: Holding Governments to Account for Children's Well-Being*

Political leaders and economic policymaking and analysis generally devote too little attention to the distributional effects of economic growth. This oversight is particularly pronounced when it comes to children. It is generally still assumed that increases in household income will improve well-being, and that these improvements will benefit all family members, including children, to the same extent. This report challenges this assumption. Save the Children has developed the first ever global, multidimensional tool that enables the organization to monitor how individual countries are performing in relation to the well-being of their children—the Child Development Index. The index will help ensure that governments are held to account for the impact of their policies and priorities on children.

The Child Development Index

The Child Development Index is made up of three indicators of three areas of child well-being. The indicators were chosen because they are easily available, commonly understood, and clearly indicative of child well-being.

1. **Health:** the under-5 mortality rate (the probability of dying between birth and 5 years of age, expressed as a percentage on a scale of 0 to 340 deaths per 1,000 live births).
2. **Nutrition:** the percentage of under-5s who are moderately or severely underweight.
3. **Education:** the percentage of primary-school-age children who are not enrolled in school.

These three indicators are aggregated by simply calculating the average score between them for each period under review, meaning that they each have equal weighting in the index scores.

Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress

<http://media.ft.com/cms/f3b4c24a-a141-11de-a88d-00144feabdc0.pdf>

Report: *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*

In February 2008, French President Nicholas Sarkozy, unsatisfied with the present state of statistical information about the economy and the society, asked Joseph Stiglitz, Amartya Sen, and Jean Paul Fitoussi to create a commission, subsequently called the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. The commission's aim has been to identify the limits of GDP as an indicator of economic performance and social progress, including the problems with its measurement; to consider what additional information might be required for the production of more relevant indicators of social progress; to assess the feasibility of alternative measurement tools, and to discuss how to present the statistical information in an appropriate way.

Key Dimensions of Well-Being

The commission recommends a multidimensional definition of well-being and has identified the following key dimensions that should be taken into account. All these dimensions shape people's well-being, and yet many of them are missed by conventional income measures.

1. Material living standards (income, consumption, and wealth)
2. Health
3. Education
4. Personal activities including work
5. Political voice and governance
6. Social connections and relationships
7. Environment (present and future conditions)
8. Insecurity, of an economic as well as a physical nature

Counting on Care Work (University of Massachusetts)

http://www.mccormack.umb.edu/centers/csp/documents/counting_on_care_web_fullPercent200909.pdf

Report: *Counting on Care Work: Human Infrastructure in Massachusetts*,
September 2009

This report measures the role of care work in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by examining in detail three intersecting spheres: paid care work, unpaid care work, and government investment in care. The authors include in the care sector the labor and resources devoted to the daily care of state residents, especially children, the elderly, and those who are disabled; the provision of K–12 education; and the administration of health care to both the well and the sick, regardless of age.

The Three Spheres of Care Work

1. **Paid care work:** To measure paid care work, the authors turn to the American Community Survey, an annual survey that provides information on workers across the nation. By identifying the industries devoted to care, coupled with occupations within those industries, they are able to count the number of workers involved in care industries in Massachusetts, as well as explore their demographic characteristics and wages.
2. **Unpaid care work:** The American Time Use Survey allows the authors to add up the amount of time adults (persons 16 and older) spend maintaining their households and caring for themselves and their family members. The authors estimate hours spent in care for all men and women and also take a closer look at adults ages 25–64. To translate hours into dollars, they apply median wages for paid care workers to unpaid care work.
3. **Government investment in care:** Having measured the value of both paid and unpaid care work, the authors then compare those values to the Bureau of Economic Analysis's (BEA) information on gross domestic product (GDP) by state for Massachusetts. The GDP measures the output produced and paid for in the state economy as a whole, and comparing the value of care work to state GDP demonstrates the relative size of the care sector.

Finally, they look at the FY07 state operating budget and local expenditures to tease out the combined amounts invested in care of children, elders, and the disabled, in K–12 education, and in health care. They compare state versus local government spending on care in Massachusetts. Finally, they weigh the combined government spending against the total paid care sector as measured in the BEA's accounts.

Doing Better for Children (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)

http://www.oecd.org/document/10/0,3343,en_2649_34819_43545036_1_1_1_37419,00.html

The well-being of children is high on the policy agenda across the OECD. But what is the actual state of child well-being today? How much are governments spending on children and are they spending it at the right times? What social and family policies have the most impact during children's earliest years? Is growing up in a single-parent household detrimental to children? Is inequality that persists across generations a threat to child well-being? *Doing Better for Children* addresses these questions and more.

Six Dimensions of Child Well-Being

<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/19/4/43570328.pdf>

1. Material well-being

- a. Average disposable income
- b. Children in poor homes
- c. Educational deprivation

2. Housing and environment

- a. Overcrowding
- b. Poor environmental conditions

3. Educational well-being

- a. Average mean literacy score
- b. Literacy inequality
- c. Youth NEET (neither in education nor in employment) rates

4. Health and safety

- a. Low birth weight
- b. Infant mortality
- c. Breastfeeding rates
- d. Vaccination rates
- e. Physical activity
- f. Mortality rates
- g. Suicide rates

5. Risk behaviors

- a. Smoking
- b. Drunkenness
- c. Teenage births

6. Quality of school life

- a. Bullying
- b. Liking school

The Failed States Index (The Fund for Peace)

http://www.fundforpeace.org/web/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=391&Itemid=549

Report: *Failed States Index 2009*

The Failed States Index focuses on the indicators of risk and is based on thousands of articles and reports that are processed by the Fund for Peace's CAST software from electronically available sources.

The Failed States Index

1. Social indicators

- a. Mounting demographic pressures
- b. Massive movement of refugees or internally displaced persons creating complex humanitarian emergencies
- c. Legacy of vengeance-seeking group grievance or group paranoia
- d. Chronic and sustained human flight

2. Economic indicators

- a. Uneven economic development along group lines
- b. Sharp and/or severe economic decline

3. Political indicators

- a. Criminalization and/or delegitimization of the state
- b. Progressive deterioration of public services
- c. Suspension or arbitrary application of the rule of law and widespread violation of human rights
- d. Security apparatus operates as a "state within a state"
- e. Rise of factionalized elites
- f. Intervention of other states or external political actors

The Gender Equity and Quality of Life Index (The Center for Partnership Studies)

Report: *Women, Men, and the Global Quality of Life*

Purposes of the report

1. Test the hypothesis that gender equity is strongly related to quality of life throughout the world, using data gathered from a majority of nations.
2. Utilize the cultural transformation theory of one of the authors as the framework for testing such a connection.
3. Support the development of adequate measurement criteria for assessing quality of life.
4. Provide empirical and theoretical support for the use of gender equity and quality of life as key variables in the shaping of global economic and social policy.

Measures to assess the degree of gender equity among nations

1. Number of literate females for every 100 literate males
2. Female life expectancy as a percentage of male life expectancy
3. Number of women for every 100 men in parliaments and other governing bodies
4. Number of females in secondary education for every 100 males
5. Maternal mortality
6. Contraceptive prevalence
7. Access to abortion
8. Social equality for women
9. Economic equality for women

Measures used to assess quality of life

1. Overall life expectancy
2. Human rights ratings
3. Access to health care
4. Access to clean water
5. Literacy
6. Infant mortality
7. Number of refugees fleeing the country
8. Percentage of daily caloric requirements consumed
9. Gross domestic product
10. Percentage of GNP distributed to the poorest 40 percent of households
11. Ratio of GDP going to the wealthiest versus poorest 20 percents of the population
12. Percentage of forest habitat remaining
13. Compliance with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species

Gender Equity Index (Social Watch)

<http://www.socialwatch.org/node/11563>

Social Watch developed the Gender Equity Index (GEI) to make gender inequities more visible and to monitor their evolution in the different countries of the world. 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 decisionmaking processes. In order to measure inequities the authors 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 well-being.

The Three Gaps and Indicators

1. The gap in education

- a. Literacy rate
- b. Enrollment rate in primary education
- c. Enrollment rate in secondary education
- d. Enrollment rate in tertiary education

2. The gap in economic activity

- a. Rate of economic activity
- b. Estimated perceived income

3. The empowerment gap

- a. Percent of women in technical positions
- b. Percent of women in management and government positions
- c. Percent of women in parliament
- d. Percent of women in ministerial-level positions

Genuine Progress Indicator (Redefining Progress)

http://www.rprogress.org/sustainability_indicators/genuine_progress_indicator.htm

Redefining Progress created the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) as an alternative to the gross domestic product (GDP). The GPI enables policymakers at the national, state, regional, or local level to measure how well their citizens are doing both economically and socially. The GPI is one of the first alternatives to the GDP to be vetted by the scientific community and used regularly by governmental and nongovernmental organizations worldwide.

GPI Measurements

1. Income distribution
2. Housework, volunteering, and higher education
3. Crime
4. Resource depletion
5. Pollution
6. Long-term environmental damage
7. Changes in leisure time
8. Defensive expenditures
9. Lifespan of consumer durables and public infrastructure
10. Dependence on foreign assets

Global Civil Society Index (London School of Economics)

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/Publications/Yearbooks/2002/2002chapter910.pdf>

By “global civil society” the authors mean the socio-sphere of ideas, values, organizations, networks, and individuals located primarily outside the institutional complexes of family, market, and state and beyond the confines of national societies, polities, and economies. This operational definition includes two fundamental units of analysis: individuals and their ideas, values, identities, opinions, and actions; and organizations, including associations and networks of many kinds. While the latter makes up the infrastructure of global civil society, the former gives it meaning and agency (individual action). The authors are looking for indicators for each unit that are closely linked to global civil society and are seeking to aggregate the resulting data at the national level.

The Global Society Indicators

1. **Organizational infrastructure** of global civil society as measured by the density of international NGOs and associations over a given population.
2. **Civility** of individuals as a measure of cosmopolitan values such as tolerance and possibly also democratic values or hospitality.
3. **Participation** of individuals as measured by membership in and volunteering for global civil society organizations and the participation of individuals in political action.

The Global Civil Society Index would be a composite measure of separate component indicators, each measuring a distinct aspect, but unlike the Human Development Index it would cover two units of analysis: organizations and individuals. Specifically, *infrastructure* would refer to the density of international NGOs and associations in a particular country. *Civility* would be a combined measure of cosmopolitan values such as tolerance. Data for these measures are from individual population surveys like the World Values Survey and the European Values Survey. *Participation* would be a measure of individual involvement in and voluntary work for organizations, associations, or networks related to global civil society and political action, and would complement organization-based indicators and link the global civil society to measures of social capital.

The Global Gender Gap Report (World Economic Forum)

<http://www.weforum.org/en/Communities/WomenPercent20LeadersPercent20andPercent20GenderPercent20Parity/GenderGapNetwork/index.htm>

Report: *The Global Gender Gap 2009*

<http://www.weforum.org/pdf/gendergap/report2009.pdf>

The Global Gender Gap Index is a framework for capturing the magnitude and scope of gender-based disparities and tracking their progress. The index benchmarks national gender gaps on economic-, political-, education-, and health-based criteria and provides country rankings that allow for effective comparisons across regions and income groups, and over time. The rankings are designed to create greater awareness among a global audience of the challenges posed by gender gaps and the opportunities created by reducing them. The straightforward methodology and quantitative analysis behind the rankings are intended to serve as a base for designing effective measures for reducing gender gaps. The Global Gender Gap Index examines the gap between men and women in four fundamental categories: economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, political empowerment, and health and survival.

The Global Gender Gap Fundamental Categories

1. **Economic participation and opportunity:** This area is captured through three concepts: the participation gap, the remuneration gap, and the advancement gap. The participation gap is captured through the difference in labor force participation rates. The remuneration gap is captured through a hard data indicator (ratio of estimated female-to-male earned income) and a qualitative variable calculated through the World Economic Forum's Executive Opinion Survey (wage equality for similar work). Finally, the gap between the advancement of women and men is captured through two hard data statistics (the ratio of women to men among legislators, senior officials, and managers, and the ratio of women to men among technical and professional workers).
2. **Educational attainment:** In this category, the gap between women's and men's current access to education is captured through ratios of women to men in primary-, secondary-, and tertiary-level education. A longer-term view of the country's ability to educate women and men in equal numbers is captured through the ratio of the female literacy rate to the male literacy rate.
3. **Political empowerment:** This category includes mainly measures of the gap between men and women in political decisionmaking at the highest levels. This concept is captured through the ratio of women to men in minister-level positions

and the ratio of women to men in parliamentary positions. In addition, we include the ratio of women to men in terms of years in executive office (prime minister or president) in the last 50 years. A clear drawback in this category is the absence of any variables capturing differences between the participation of women and men at local levels of government. Should such data become available at a global level in future years, they will be considered for inclusion in the Global Gender Gap Index.

- 4. Health and survival:** This category attempts to provide an overview of the differences between women and men's health. To do this, we use two variables. First, we use the gap between women and men's healthy life expectancy, calculated by the World Health Organization. This measure provides an estimate of the number of years that women and men can expect to live in good health, by taking into account the years lost to violence, disease, malnutrition, or other relevant factors. The second variable included in this subindex is the sex ratio at birth. This variable aims specifically to capture the phenomenon of "missing women" prevalent in many countries with a strong son preference.

The Human Development Index (United Nations Development Programme)

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/>

The origins of the Human Development Index can be traced to the United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Reports. The indicators were formulated by economist Mahbub ul Haq in 1990 "to shift the focus of development economics from national income accounting to people-centered policies."¹⁴ Amartya Sen's work on capabilities and functionings provided the underlying framework.¹⁵

The **HDI** (<http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/hdi/>)—human development index—is a summary composite index that measures a country's average achievements in three basic aspects of human development: health, knowledge, and a decent standard of living.

1. **Health** is measured by life expectancy at birth.
2. **Knowledge** is measured by a combination of the adult literacy rate and the combined primary, secondary, and tertiary gross enrollment ratio.
3. **Standard of living** by GDP per capita (purchasing power parity [PPP] US\$).

The educational component of the HDI is comprised of adult literacy rates and the combined gross enrolment ratio for primary, secondary, and tertiary schooling, weighted to give adult literacy more significance in the statistic. Since the minimum adult literacy rate is 0 percent and the maximum is 100 percent, the literacy component of knowledge for a country where the literacy rate is 75 percent would be 0.75. The statistic for combined gross enrollment is calculated in an analogous manner. The life expectancy component of the HDI is calculated using a minimum value for life expectancy of 25 years and maximum value of 85 years, so the longevity component for a country where life expectancy is 55 years would be 0.5. For the wealth component, the goalpost for minimum income is \$100 (PPP) and the maximum is \$40,000 (PPP). The HDI uses the logarithm of income to reflect the diminishing importance of income with increasing GDP. The scores for the three HDI components are then averaged in an index. The HDI facilitates instructive comparisons of the experiences within and between different countries.

¹⁴ Mahbub ul Haq, 1995, *Reflections on Human Development* (New York: Oxford University Press).

¹⁵ Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, 2003, "The Human Development Paradigm: Operationalizing Sen's Ideas on Capabilities," *Feminist Economics* 9(2), 301–17.

The Human Poverty Indices (United Nations Development Programme)

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/>

If human development is about enlarging choices, poverty means that opportunities and choices most basic to human development are denied. Thus a person is not free to lead a long, healthy, and creative life and is denied access to a decent standard of living, freedom, dignity, self-respect, and the respect of others. From a human development perspective, poverty means more than the lack of what is necessary for material well-being.

For policymakers, the poverty of choices and opportunities is often more relevant than the poverty of income. The poverty of choices focuses on the causes of poverty and leads directly to strategies of empowerment and other actions to enhance opportunities for everyone. Recognizing the poverty of choices and opportunities implies that poverty must be addressed in all its dimensions, not income alone.

The Human Development Report 1997 introduced a human poverty index (HPI) in an attempt to bring together in a composite index the different features of deprivation in the quality of life to arrive at an aggregate judgment on the extent of poverty in a community.

The Three Indicators of the Human Poverty Index

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/hpi/>

Rather than measure poverty by income, the HPI uses indicators of the most basic dimensions of deprivation: a short life, lack of basic education, and lack of access to public and private resources. The HPI concentrates on the deprivation in the three essential elements of human life already reflected in the HDI: longevity, knowledge, and a decent standard of living. **The HPI is derived separately for developing countries (HPI-1) and a group of select high-income OECD countries (HPI-2) to better reflect socioeconomic differences and the widely different measures of deprivation in the two groups.**

1. The first deprivation relates to **survival**—the likeliness of death at a relatively early age—and is represented by the probability of not surviving to ages 40 and 60 respectively for the HPI-1 and HPI-2.
2. The second dimension relates to **knowledge**—being excluded from the world of reading and communication—and is measured by the percentage of adults who are illiterate.
3. The third aspect relates to a **decent standard of living**, in particular, overall economic provisioning.

For the HPI-1, it is measured by the unweighted average of the percentage of the population without access to safe water and the percentage of underweight children for their age. For the HPI-2, the third dimension is measured by the percentage of the population below the income poverty line (50 percent of median household disposable income).

In addition to the three indicators mentioned above, the HPI-2 also includes social exclusion, which is the fourth dimension of the HPI-2. It is represented by the rate of long-term unemployment.

Gender-Related Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure

http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/gdi_gem/

The Human Development Report 1995 introduced two new measures of human development that highlight the status of women. The first, the **Gender-Related Development Index (GDI)**, measures achievement in the same basic capabilities as the HDI does, but takes note of inequality in achievement between women and men. The methodology used imposes a penalty for inequality, such that the GDI falls when the achievement levels of both women and men in a country go down or when the disparity between their achievements increases. The greater the gender disparity in basic capabilities, the lower a country's GDI compared with its HDI. The GDI is simply the HDI discounted, or adjusted downward, for gender inequality.

The second, the **Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM)**, is a measure of agency. It evaluates progress in advancing women's standing in political and economic forums. It examines the extent to which women and men are able to actively participate in economic and political life and take part in decisionmaking. While the GDI focuses on expansion of capabilities, the GEM is concerned with the use of those capabilities to take advantage of the opportunities of life.

The indices have often been misinterpreted, particularly the GDI. The GDI is not a measure of gender inequality. It is the HDI adjusted for gender disparities in its basic components. To get a measure of gender inequality, one should use the difference or the ratio of two indicators. In addition, the differences between the HDI and the GDI tend to be small because those captured by the three dimensions tend to be small, giving a misleading impression that gender gaps are irrelevant. Due to the aversion to inequality formula used to calculate the GDI, gender disparities relating to employment and quality of education, for example, are not captured.

The GEM on the other hand measures political participation and decisionmaking power, economic participation, and command over resources. Its calculation mirrors that of the GDI. As a practical implication of the use of the estimated earned income used to measure economic participation, a poor country cannot achieve a high value for the GEM, and vice versa for rich countries.

Index of Social Health (Fordham Institute for Innovation in Social Policy)

http://www.fordham.edu/images/Graduate_Schools/GSSS/2003%20Index%20of%20Social%20Health.doc

Report: *2003 Index of Social Health: Monitoring the Social Well-Being of the Nation*

The Index of Social Health is based on the premise that familiar economic measures – the Gross Domestic Product, the stock market, the Index of Leading Economic Indicators, the balance of trade, the rate of inflation – do not provide a sufficient assessment of the strength, progress, and well-being of the nation and its people. In order to widen and deepen national dialogue, bring it closer to daily concerns, and create more effective public policy, there is a need to carefully monitor the social aspects of national life and acknowledge that these also require constant attention.

The Index of Social Health

The Index of Social Health combines sixteen social indicators. Taken together, performance on these sixteen social indicators provides a comprehensive view of the social health of the nation.

1. Children

- a. Infant mortality
- b. Child abuse
- c. Child poverty

2. Youth

- a. Teenage suicide
- b. Teenage drug abuse
- c. High school dropouts

3. Adults

- a. Unemployment
- b. Average weekly wages
- c. Health insurance coverage

4. Aging

- a. Poverty among those aged 65 and over
- b. Out-of-pocket health costs among those aged 65 and over

5. All ages

- a. Homicides
- b. Alcohol-related traffic fatalities
- c. Food stamp coverage
- d. Access to affordable housing
- e. Income inequality

The Kids Count Data Book (The Annie E. Casey Foundation)

<http://datacenter.kidscount.org/databook/2009/Default.aspx>

Kids Count is a national and state-by-state project of the Casey Foundation to track the status of children in the United States. At the national level, the principal activity of the initiative is the publication of the annual Kids Count Data Book, which uses the best available data to measure the educational, social, economic, and physical well-being of children state by state. The data book also provides background information for each state, including demographic and family income data.

Kids Count Measures

1. Percent low birth weight babies
2. Infant mortality rate
3. Child death rate
4. Rate of teen deaths by accident
5. Homicide, and suicide
6. Teen birth rate
7. Percent of children living with parents who do not have full-time, year-round employment
8. Percent of teens who are high school dropouts
9. Percent of teens not attending school and not working
10. Percent of children in poverty
11. Percent of families with children headed by a single parent.

Missing Dimensions of Poverty Data (Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative)

<http://www.ophi.org.uk/subindex.php?id=research2>

The objective of human development is to expand the freedoms that people value and have reason to value, enabling people to live more fulfilled lives and to flourish. Data on people's freedoms are needed to guide and evaluate development actions. More such data already exist than in any previous generation. Still, a critical bottleneck is a dearth of high-quality internationally comparable indicators of key freedoms. The authors' current goal is to identify and advocate the collection of data for a small set of indicators on "missing" dimensions of human development that often matter to poor people.

Missing Dimensions of Poverty

1. **Employment:** including both formal and informal employment, with particular attention to the quality of employment.
2. **Empowerment** (or agency): the ability to advance goals one values and has reason to value.
3. **Physical safety:** focusing on security from violence to property and person, as well as domestic violence and perceived violence.
4. **The ability to go about without shame:** to emphasize the importance of dignity, respect, and freedom from humiliation.
5. **Psychological and subjective well-being:** to emphasize meaning, satisfaction and their determinants.

National Accounts of Well-Being (The New Economics Foundation)

<http://www.nationalaccountsofwell-being.org/learn/>

The New Economics Foundation has set out a radical proposal to guide the direction of modern societies and the lives of people who live in them. In contrast to a narrow focus on economic indicators, it calls for governments to directly measure people's subjective well-being: their experiences, feelings, and perceptions of how their lives are going. These measures should be collected on a regular, systematic basis and published as National Accounts of Well-Being. They provide a new way of assessing societal progress, based on people's real experience of their lives.

The well-being indicators and data come from the first working model for National Accounts of Well-Being, which governments can use to measure the well-being of their citizens. It was devised using data from the award-winning cross-national European Social Survey. In 2006–2007, the survey included a detailed module of 50 well-being questions, designed by the University of Cambridge, New Economics Foundation, and other partners. This is the most comprehensive and detailed international survey of well-being ever undertaken.

National Accounts of Well-Being Indicators

<http://www.nationalaccountsofwell-being.org/explore/indicators/zpersonal>

1. Overall well-being
2. Personal well-being
 - a. Emotional well-being
 - i. Positive feelings
 - ii. Absence of negative feelings
 - b. Satisfying life
 - c. Vitality
 - d. Resilience and self-esteem
 - i. Self-esteem
 - ii. Optimism
 - iii. Resilience
 - e. Positive functioning
 - i. Autonomy
 - ii. Competence
 - iii. Engagement
 - iv. Meaning and purpose

3. Social well-being

- a. Supportive relationships
- b. Trust and belonging

4. Others

- a. Well-being at work

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Family Database
http://www.oecd.org/document/4/0,3343,en_2649_34819_37836996_1_1_1_1,00.html

The OECD has developed an online database on family outcomes and family policies with indicators for all OECD countries. The database brings together information from different OECD databases (e.g., the OECD Social Expenditure database, the OECD Benefits and Wages database, or the OECD Education database, and databases maintained by other (international) organizations. An indicator under one of these headings in the database typically presents the data on a particular issue as well as relevant definitions and methodology, comparability and data issues, information on sources and, where relevant, includes the raw data or descriptive information across countries. The structure of the Family database does not include indicators that cover issues related to the position (and care needs) of elderly family members.

Information in the Family Database Headings

1. The structure of families

- a. Families and children
 - i. Family size and composition
 - ii. Children in families
 - iii. Further information on living arrangements of children
- b. Fertility indicators
 - i. Fertility rates
 - ii. Mean age of mother at first childbirth
 - iii. Share of births outside marriage and teenage births
 - iv. Childlessness
- c. Marital and partnership status
 - i. Marriage and divorce rate
 - ii. Cohabitation rate and prevalence of other forms of partnership

2. The labor marker position of families

- a. Families, children, and employment status
 - i. Children in families by employment status
 - ii. Maternal employment
 - iii. Maternal employment by family status
 - iv. Employment profiles over the life course
 - v. Gender pay gaps for full-time workers and earnings by educational attainment
 - vi. Gender differences in employment outcomes
- b. Workplace hours and time for caring

- i. Usual weekly working hours among men and women by broad hours groups
- ii. The distribution of working hours among couple families and adults in couple families individually, by broad hours groups, presence of children, and age of youngest child
- iii. The distribution of working hours among single persons by broad hours groups, presence of children, and age of youngest child
- iv. Family-friendly workplace practices
- v. Time used for work, care and daily household chores
- vi. Time spent travelling to and from work

3. Public policies for families and children

- a. General tax/benefit support for families with children
 - i. Public spending on family benefits
 - ii. Public spending on education
 - iii. Family cash benefits
 - iv. Gender-neutrality of tax/benefits systems
 - v. Child support (maintenance) systems
- b. Child-related leave
 - i. Key characteristics of parental leave systems
 - ii. Use of leave benefits by mothers and fathers
 - iii. Additional leave entitlements of working parents
- c. Formal care and education for very young children
 - i. Public spending on child care and early education
 - ii. Enrollment in day care and preschools
 - iii. Child care support
- d. Typology of child care and early education services
 - i. Typology of child care and early education services
 - ii. Quality of child care and early education services
 - iii. Out-of-school-hours care

4. Child outcomes

- a. Child health
 - i. Infant mortality
 - ii. Low birth weight
 - iii. Vaccination rates
 - iv. Breastfeeding rates
 - v. Disease-based indicators: Prevalence of diabetes and asthma among children
 - vi. Overweight and obesity at age 15, by gender
 - vii. Regular smokers among 15-year-olds, by gender

- b. Child poverty
 - i. Trends in the income position of different household types
 - ii. Child poverty
- c. Education/literacy
 - i. Educational attainment by gender and average years spent in formal education
 - ii. Gender differences in university graduates by fields of study
 - iii. Literacy scores by gender at age 10
 - iv. Literacy scores by gender at age 15
 - v. Young people not in education or employment
- d. Societal participation
 - i. Participation in voluntary work and membership of NGOs for young adults, 15–29
 - ii. Participation rates of first-time voters
 - iii. Substance abuse by young people
 - iv. Teenage suicides

Society at a Glance 2009—OECD Social Indicators

http://www.oecd.org/document/24/0,3343,en_2649_34637_2671576_1_1_1_1,00.html#data

How are OECD societies progressing? How effective are their actions in promoting social progress? Society at a Glance provides a basis for addressing these twin questions. It offers a concise overview of quantitative social trends and policies across the OECD. This 2009 edition includes a wide range of information on social issues—such as demography and family characteristics, employment and unemployment, poverty and inequality, social and health care expenditure, and work and life satisfaction—as well as a guide to help readers understand the structure of OECD social indicators.

Social Data and Indicators

1. General context indicators

- a. Net national income per capita
- b. Fertility rates
- c. Migration
- d. Marriage and divorce

2. Self-sufficiency indicators

- a. Employment
- b. Unemployment
- c. Child care
- d. Student performance
- e. Not in employment, education, or training
- f. Age of labor force exit
- g. Spending on education

3. Equity indicators

- a. Income inequality
- b. Poverty
- c. Poverty among children
- d. Adequacy of benefits of last resort
- e. Public social spending
- f. Total social spending

4. Health indicators

- a. Life expectancy
- b. Perceived health status
- c. Infant health

- d. Obesity
- e. Height
- f. Mental health
- g. Long-term care recipients
- h. Health care expenditure

5. Social cohesion indicators

- a. Life satisfaction
- b. Work satisfaction
- c. Crime victimization
- d. Suicides
- e. Bullying
- f. Risky behavior

The State of Working America (The Economic Policy Institute)

<http://www.stateofworkingamerica.org/>

The book explores the growing gap between the economy's potential and its real impact on people's lives. The book provides background important for understanding and reporting on the challenges American workers face today. For example, the "Family Income" chapter traces the rising income inequality in the U.S., tracking trends by income class, the shift from labor income to capital income, and the impact of changing family work hours. "Income-Class Mobility" examines the increasingly erroneous belief that America is a place where anyone can move up. "Jobs" explores trends in employment, unemployment, job characteristics and stability, and other trends that define the workplace experience. "Wealth" explores topics such as stock and homeownership, the housing meltdown, and debt, and the class and racial divides that exist. "Poverty" delves deeper into the trends and challenges confronting low-wage workers and their families. And "International Comparisons" evaluates how the U.S. is doing in all these areas compared to our peer nations around the world.

State of Working America Indicators

<http://www.stateofworkingamerica.org/tabfig.html>

1. Family income

- a. Real median family income, 1947–2007
- b. Years for median family income to regain prior peak
- c. Median family income, 1947–2006 (2006 dollars)
- d. Income growth in the 1990s and 2000s and the roles of earnings, hours, and hourly wages
- e. Change in average real family income following peak years, by selected income quintiles
- f. Forecasted real income losses given predicted unemployment, 2006–09
- g. Median family income by race/ethnic group, 1947–2007 (2007 dollars)
- h. Ratio of black and Hispanic to white median family income, 1947–2007
- i. Full employment, African American family income, unemployment, and inflation, 1949–2006
- j. Income growth for middle-income immigrant and nonimmigrant families
- k. Median family income by age of householder, 1979–2007 (2007 dollars)
- l. Median family income by race/ethnic group, 1947–2006 (2006 dollars)
- m. Productivity and real median family income growth, 1947–2006
- n. Real family income growth by quintile, 1947–2006
- o. Ratio of family income of top 5 percent to lowest 20 percent, 1947–2006
- p. Shares of family income going to income fifths and to the top 5 percent, 1947–2007

- q. Real family income by income group, 1947–2007, upper limit of each group (2007 dollars)
- r. Low-, middle -, and high-income growth, 1947–2006
- s. Share of income held by top 1 percent, 1913–2006
- t. Income share (investment and labor income), top 0.1 percent, 1916–2005
- u. Share of household income, bottom 99.5 percent
- v. Household income growth by income group, 1979–2005, pre- and post-tax
- w. Effective federal tax rates for all households, by comprehensive household income quintile, 1979–2005
- x. Change in income shares, pre- and post-tax, 2003–05
- y. Real expenditures by income fifth, 2000–06
- z. Increase in consumption inequality, 1986–2001
- aa. Consumption inequality among children, 1981–2001
- bb. Effective federal tax rates for all households, by comprehensive household income quintile, 1979–2005 (28)
- cc. Effective tax rates for selected federal taxes, 1979–present
- dd. Federal and state/local revenue as a share of GDP, 1959–2007
- ee. Composition of federal and state/local tax revenue, by progressive and regressive components, 2000 and 2007
- ff. Impact of 2001–06 tax cuts on 2008 income
- gg. Family income by income categories, 1969–2006
- hh. The impact in inequality on income shares, 1979 and 2000
- ii. Inequality and income shares, 1979
- jj. Sources of income by income group and distribution of income types, 2006
- kk. Shares of market-based personal income by income type, 1959–2007
- ll. Share of capital income received by income groups, 1979–2005
- mm. Shares of market-based personal income by income type, 1959–2007
- nn. Corporate sector profit rates and shares, 1959–2007
- oo. Capital shares in the corporate sector, 1959–2007
- pp. Before- and after-tax return to capital, 1959–2007
- qq. Trends in hours worked, weekly and annual
- rr. Annual hours of work, married men and women, 25–54, with children, 1979–2006, by income fifth

2. Income class mobility

- a. Income mobility between quintiles, 1984–94 and 1994–2004 (two-year income averages)
- b. Real median income growth by cohort, age 30–50, 1947–2006

- c. Intergenerational income persistence, sons and daughters, 2000
- d. Likelihood that low-income son ends up above various percentiles
- e. Intergenerational mobility, 1950–2000
- f. Income mobility, children by race
- g. Percent of children in bottom fifth as adults, based on parents' income
- h. Mobility in the United States versus the European Union
- i. Intergenerational correlations, fathers and sons, U.S., U.K., Europe, and Scandinavia
- j. Mobility for sons of low-income fathers
- k. Mobility for daughters of low-income fathers
- l. Intergenerational wealth, parents to children
- m. Education correlations, parents and children
- n. Intergenerational mobility, role of education
- o. Income position of the entering class at top colleges and community colleges
- p. College completion by income status and test scores
- q. Intergenerational mobility, by college education
- r. Cumulative growth in family income volatility since 1973
- s. Prevalence of a 50 percent or greater drop in family income

3. Wages

- a. Median wage and compensation growth and productivity annual growth in recoveries, 1975–2007
- b. Productivity and median compensation by education, 1995–2007
- c. Trends in average wages and average hours, 1967–2006 (2007 dollars)
- d. Growth of average hourly wages, benefits, and compensation, 1948–2007 (2007 dollars)
- e. Hourly and weekly earnings of private production and nonsupervisory workers, 1947–2007 (2007 dollars)
- f. Hourly wage and compensation growth for production/nonsupervisory workers, 1959–2007
- g. Wages for all workers by wage percentile, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- h. Wages for male workers by wage percentile, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- i. Change in real hourly wages for men by wage percentile, 1973–2007
- j. Wages for female workers by wage percentile, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- k. Change in real hourly wages for women by wage percentile, 1973–2007
- l. Distribution of employment by wage level, all workers and whites, 1973–2007
- m. Distribution of employment by wage level, blacks and Hispanics, 1973–2007
- n. Share of workers earning poverty-level wages, by gender, 1973–2007

- o. Share of workers earning poverty-level wages, by race, 1973–2007
- p. Top 1 percent share of total wages and salaries, 1947–2006
- q. Changes in the distribution and level of wages and salaries, 1979–2006
- r. Annual wage growth, by wage group, 1973–2006
- s. Growth of specific fringe benefits, 1987–2007 (2007 dollars)
- t. Change in private-sector employer-provided health insurance coverage, 1979–2006
- u. Change in private-sector employer-provided pension coverage, 1979–2006
- v. Private-sector employer-provided health insurance coverage, 1979–2006
- w. Share of pension participants in defined-contribution and defined-benefit plans, 1980–2004
- x. Dimensions of wage inequality, 1973–2007
- y. Men’s wage inequality, 1973–2007
- z. Women’s wage inequality, 1973–2007
- aa. 95/50 percentile wage inequality, 1973–2007
- bb. College/high school wage premium, 1973–2007
- cc. Productivity and hourly compensation growth, 1973–2007
- dd. Real hourly wage for all by education, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- ee. Real hourly wage for men by education, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- ff. Real hourly wage for women by education, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- gg. Educational attainment of the employed, 2007
- hh. Hourly wages of entry-level and experienced workers by education, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- ii. Entry-level wages of male and female high school graduates, 1973–2007
- jj. Entry-level wages of male and female college graduates, 1973–2007
- kk. Health and pension benefit coverage for recent high school graduates, 1979–2006
- ll. Health and pension benefit coverage for recent college graduates, 1979–2006
- mm. Hourly wages by decile within education groups, 1973–2007 (2007 dollars)
- nn. Decomposition of total and within-group wage inequality, 1973–2007
- oo. Hourly wage growth by gender, race/ethnicity, 1989–2007
- pp. The gender wage ratio, 1973–2007
- qq. Wage gap profile by cohort
- rr. Impact of rising and falling unemployment on wage levels and wage ratios, 1979–2000
- ss. Unemployment, 1973–2007
- tt. Employment growth by sector, 1979–2007
- uu. Annual pay of expanding and contracting industries, 1979–2007

- vv. Imports, exports, and trade balance as percent of GDP
- ww. Manufacturing imports as a share of U.S. GDP
- xx. Relative productivity of U.S. trading partners
- yy. Effect of trade on composition of employment by education level, 1979–2005
- zz. Estimated relative wage impact of trade based on Krugman CGE model
- aaa. Characteristics of offshorable jobs
- bbb. Wage premium of offshorable jobs
- ccc. Share of Mexican and other immigrants in workforce, 1940–2007
- ddd. Percent distribution of educational attainment of immigrants, 1940–2007
- eee. Union coverage rate in the United States, 1973–2007
- fff. Union wage premium by demographic group, 2007
- ggg. Union premiums for health, retirement, and paid leave
- hhh. Union impact on paid leave, pension, and health benefits
- iii. Effect of declining union power on male wage differentials, 1978–2005
- jjj. Union wage premium for subgroups
- kkk. Impact of unions on average wages of high school graduates
- lll. Real value of the minimum wage, 1960–2009
- mmm. Value of the minimum wage, 1960–2009
- nnn. Minimum wage as a percent of average hourly earnings, 1964–2007
- ooo. Characteristics of workers affected by minimum wage increase to \$7.25 by 2009
- ppp. Value of federal minimum wage compared to share of workforce covered by higher state minimums
- qqq. Changes in the college wage premium and the supply and demand for college educated workers, 1915–2005
- rrr. Growth in relative demand for college graduates, 1950–2005
- sss. Ratio of average and median CEO total direct compensation to average worker pay, 1965–2007
- ttt. Executive annual pay, 1989–2007 (2007 dollars)
- uuu. CEO pay in advanced countries, 1988–2005 (\$2005)
- vvv. Effect of changing occupational composition on education and training requirements and earnings, 2006–16
- www. Education requirements of current and future jobs, 2006–16

4. Jobs

- a. Labor force and total nonfarm employment, 1979–2008
- b. Number of months to regain peak–level employment after a recession, current and prior business cycles

- c. Annualized peak-to-peak growth in employment, 1960–2007
- d. Gross job gains and losses, 1990q2–2007q3
- e. Peak-to-peak annual growth rates by industry, 1979–2007
- f. Good jobs as percent of total employment
- g. Unemployment rate and its trend, January 1948–April 2008
- h. Labor force share and unemployment rate by age category, 1980q1–2007q
- i. Actual and simulated unemployment rate, January 1980–April 2008
- j. Unemployment rates, 1969–2007
- k. Percentage point change in unemployment rates between business cycle peaks
- l. Unemployment rates by gender, race, and educational status (25 years or older), 1992–2007
- m. Unemployment rates of foreign-born and native-born workers, 1994–2007
- n. Long-term unemployment as a share of total unemployment and the unemployment rate, 1968–2008
- o. Unemployment and the 2000s recovery period
- p. Shares of unemployment and long-term unemployment, 2000 and 2007
- q. Underemployment, 2000–07 (in thousands)
- r. Labor force participation rates, 1973–2008q1
- s. Annual labor force participation rate for college graduates (age 25–34), 1979–2007
- t. Actual and simulated unemployment rates (age 25–54), 1979–2007
- u. Employment rates (age 25–54), 1973–2008
- v. Peak-to-peak change in employment rate (age 25–54)
- w. Peak-to-peak change in employment rates by race and ethnicity, 1979–2007
- x. Annual employment rates of workers 55 years and older, 1973–2007
- y. Nonstandard workers in the U.S. workforce, 2005
- z. Access to job-based retirement plan by work arrangement, 2005
- aa. Part-time status, as a share of total employment, 1973–2008
- bb. Employment in temporary help industry as share of nonfarm employment, 1990–2008
- cc. Average years of job tenure by age, gender, and education, 1973–2006
- dd. Share of employed workers in long-term jobs by age, gender, and education, 1973–2006
- ee. Labor force status postdisplacement, 1981–2005
- ff. Average decline in weekly earnings for displaced full-time workers who find new full-time work, 1981–2005

5. Wealth

- a. Growth of household net worth, 1965–2007

- b. Distribution of income and wealth, 2004
- c. Distribution of wealth by wealth class, 1983–2004
- d. Changes in the distribution of wealth, 1962–2004
- e. Changes in the distribution of wealth, 1962–2004
- f. The ratio of the wealthiest 1 percent to median wealth in the United States
- g. Annual net worth of Forbes 400 wealthiest individuals
- h. Households with low net worth, 1962–2004 (percent of all households)
- i. Wealth by race, 1983–2004 (thousands of 2004 dollars)
- j. Distribution of asset ownership across households, 2004
- k. Growth of U.S. stock market, 1955–2007
- l. Share of households owning stock, 1989–2004
- m. Average household assets and liabilities by wealth class, 1962–2004 (thousands of 2004 dollars)
- n. Distribution of stock market wealth by wealth class, 1989–2004
- o. Distribution of growth in stock market holdings by wealth class, 1989–2004
- p. Concentration of stock ownership by income level, 2004
- q. Homeownership rates, 1965–2007
- r. Homeownership rates by income, 2005
- s. Homeownership rates by race, 1975–2007
- t. Retirement income inadequacy, 1989–2004
- u. Household debt by type, 1949–2007
- v. Debt as a percentage of disposable income, 1947–2007
- w. Distribution of growth in debt, 1989–2004
- x. Financial obligations ratio, 1980–2007 (as a percent of disposable personal income)
- y. Household debt service as a share of household income, by income percentile, 1989–2004
- z. Share of households with high debt burdens, by income percentile, 1989–2004
- aa. Share of households late paying bills, by income percentile, 1989
- bb. Consumer bankruptcies per 1,000 adults
- cc. Home prices and homeownership rates
- dd. Homeowners' equity as a percent of home value, 1969–2007
- ee. Volume of prime and subprime mortgage originations, 2001–06
- ff. Subprime share of loans for home purchase by race, 2006
- gg. Foreclosures per 1,000 owner-occupied households

6. Poverty

- a. Poverty and twice-poverty rate, 1959–2006
- b. Percent and number of persons in poverty and twice poverty, 1959–2006

- c. Change in poverty and productivity, 1979–89 and 2000–07
- d. Poverty rates by race/ethnicity, 1973–2006
- e. Persons in poverty, by race/ethnicity, 1959–2006
- f. Percent of children in poverty, by race, 1979–2006
- g. Family poverty, by race/ethnicity of family head and for different family types, 1959–2006
- h. Average poverty gap, 1959–2006 (2006 dollars)
- i. Family poverty gap and family poverty rates, 1959–2006
- j. Percent of the poor below half the poverty line, 1975–2006
- k. Poverty by nativity, 1993–2006
- l. Poverty, native and foreign born, 1993–2006
- m. Poverty rates, official compared to NAS alternatives, 1999 to 2006
- n. Official and alternative poverty thresholds, 1996–2006, for a family of four (two parents, two children)
- o. Official versus alternative poverty rates, 1996–2006
- p. Official and alternative poverty rates, 1996–2005, by demographics
- q. Official and relative poverty, 1979–2006
- r. Real low-wage growth, productivity, and unemployment: Three five–year periods
- s. Poverty rate, actual and simulated, 1959–2006
- t. The impact of economic, demographic, and education changes on poverty rates
- u. The impact of family structure changes on poverty rates, 1969–2006
- v. Poverty determinants, 1969–2006
- w. Annual hours worked, low-income women with children, 1979–2006
- x. The effects of work supports on family resources and expenses, assuming full receipt: Single mother of two with full-time employment at \$8 an hour, Chicago
- y. Low income growth, single-mother families with children, 1991–2005
- z. Diminished effect of safety net: Share of children lifted above deep poverty
- aa. Characteristics of low-wage workers, 2007 (part 1 of 2)
- bb. Characteristics of low-wage workers, 2007 (part 2 of 2)
- cc. Percent change in wage given 1 point decline in unemployment
- dd. Real hourly wages of low-wage workers, 1973–2007

7. Health

- a. Employer-provided health insurance, population under 65 years old, 2000–06

- b. Employment-based health insurance and Medicaid/ State Children's Health Insurance Program for children under 18 in the United States, 2000–06
- c. Status of enrollees of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, 2002
- d. Duration without coverage, between 2001–03
- e. Source of health insurance, 2005
- f. Access to health insurance via own employer, 2005
- g. Life expectancy (in years) by socioeconomic deprivation groups, 1980–2000
- h. Absolute difference in life expectancy between top- and bottom-decile socioeconomic deprivation groups, 1980–2000
- i. Racial differences in health care insecurity, 2007
- j. Growth rate index of health premiums, workers' earnings, and overall inflation, 1999–2007
- k. Percent of persons with total family out-of-pocket burdens by insurance and poverty status (under 65), 1996 and 2003
- l. Employer contributions to health insurance and wages as a share of total compensation, 1979–2006
- m. Public and private expenditures on health care spending (as percent of GDP), 2005
- n. Life expectancy at birth and health spending per capita, 2005
- o. Infant mortality, per 1,000 live births
- p. Percent of adults going without needed health care due to costs, 2004

8. International comparisons

- a. Annual growth rates of per capita income using PPP, 1950–2007 (2007 dollars)
- b. Productivity growth rates in G-7 countries
- c. Per capita income using purchasing-power parity, 1950–2007 (2007 dollars)
- d. Productivity levels and growth, 1950–2007 (2007 dollars)
- e. Employment rates, 1979–2006
- f. Average annual hours worked, 1979–2006
- g. Decomposition of per capita income, 2006
- h. Work and leave policies
- i. Work and family policies
- j. Employment rates by gender, 1979–2006
- k. Employment growth, 1979–2006
- l. Standardized unemployment rates, 1979–2006
- m. Unemployment rates by education level (persons aged 25–64), 2005

- n. Collective bargaining coverage in relation to inequality and productivity, 2000
- o. Relative hourly compensation of manufacturing production workers, 1979–2006 (U.S.= \$1.00)
- p. Annual growth in real hourly compensation (using PPP exchange rates) of manufacturing production workers, 1979–2006
- q. Household income inequality, 2005
- r. Relative household income dispersion, 2005
- s. Household income dispersion relative to the U.S. median, 2005
- t. Top 0.1 percent income share in selected countries
- u. Poverty rates, 2000
- v. Child poverty rates before and after taxes and transfers, 2000
- w. Social expenditure versus child poverty, 2001

State of World Population Report (United Nations Population Fund)

<http://www.unfpa.org/swp/>

Report: *State of World Population 2009—Facing a Changing World: Women, Population and Climate*

http://www.unfpa.org/swp/2009/en/pdf/EN_SOWP09.pdf

UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund, is a development agency that promotes the right of every woman, man, and child to enjoy a life of health and equal opportunity and that helps reduce poverty. The 2009 edition of the *State of World Population* shows that climate change is more than an issue of energy efficiency or industrial carbon emissions; it is also an issue of population dynamics, poverty, and gender equity. This report shows that women have the power to mobilize against climate change, but this potential can be realized only through policies that empower them. It also shows the required support that would allow women to fully contribute to adaptation, mitigation, and building resilience to climate change.

State of World Population Indicators

1. Mortality

- a. Infant mortality: total per 1,000 live births
- b. Life expectancy M/F
- c. Maternal mortality ratio

2. Education

- a. Primary enrollment (gross) M/F
- b. Proportion reaching grade 5 M/F
- c. Secondary enrollment (gross) M/F
- d. Percent illiterate (>15 years) M/F

3. Reproductive health

- a. Births per 1,000 women ages 15–19
- b. Contraceptive prevalence
- c. HIV prevalence rate (percent) ages 15–49

4. Demographic, social, and economic indicators

- a. Total population (millions) (2009)
- b. Projected population (millions) (2050)
- c. Average population growth rate (percent) (2005–2010)
- d. Percent urban (2009)
- e. Urban growth rate (2005–2010)

- f. Population per hectare of arable and permanent crop land
- g. Total fertility rate (2009)
- h. Percent births with skilled attendants
- i. GNI per capita PPP\$ (2007)
- j. Expenditures/primary student (percent of GDP per capita)
- k. Health expenditures, public (percent of GDP)
- l. External population assistance (US\$, thousands)
- m. Under-5 mortality M/F estimates (2005–2010)
- n. Per capita energy consumption
- o. Access to improved drinking water sources

State of the World's Mothers (Save the Children)

<http://www.savethechildren.org/publications/state-of-the-worlds-mothers-report/>

Report: *Women on the Front Lines of Health Care: State of the World's Mothers 2010*

<http://www.savethechildren.org/publications/state-of-the-worlds-mothers-report/SOWM-2010-Women-on-the-Front-Lines-of-Health-Care.pdf>

The focus of Save the Children's 11th annual *State of the World's Mothers* report is on the critical shortage of health workers in the developing world and the urgent need for more female health workers to save the lives of mothers, newborn babies, and young children.

State of the World's Mothers Indicators

1. Health status

- a. Lifetime risk of maternal death
- b. Percentage of women using modern contraception
- c. Skilled attendance at delivery
- d. Female life expectancy

2. Educational status

- a. Expected number of years of formal female schooling

3. Economic status

- a. Ratio of estimated female to male earned income
- b. Maternity leave benefits

4. Women's political status

- a. Participation of women in national government

5. Children's well-being

- a. Under-5 mortality rate
- b. Percentage of children under age 5 moderately or severely underweight
- c. Gross pre-primary enrollment ratio
- d. Gross primary enrollment ratio
- e. Gender parity index (GPI)
- f. Gross secondary enrollment ratio
- g. Percentage of population with access to safe water

System of National Accounts (United Nations)

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/nationalaccount/>

Report: *System of National Accounts 2008*

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/nationalaccount/SNA2008.pdf>

The System of National Accounts is the internationally agreed standard set of recommendations on how to compile measures of economic activity in accordance with strict accounting conventions based on economic principles. The recommendations are expressed in terms of a set of concepts, definitions, classifications, and accounting rules that comprise the internationally agreed standard for measuring such items as gross domestic product, the most frequently quoted indicator of economic performance. The accounting framework of the SNA allows economic data to be compiled and presented in a format that is designed for purposes of economic analysis, decision-taking, and policymaking. The accounts themselves present in a condensed way a great mass of detailed information, organized according to economic principles and perceptions, about the working of an economy. They provide a comprehensive and detailed record of the complex economic activities taking place within an economy and of the interaction between the different economic agents and groups of agents that takes place on markets or elsewhere.

National Accounts Statistics: Main Aggregates and Detailed Tables

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/nationalaccount/nasp.asp#sequence>

Based on availability of official data, the following data for each country or area are provided:

1. Gross domestic product by expenditures at current prices
2. Gross domestic product by expenditures at constant prices
3. Relations among product, income, savings, and net lending aggregates at current prices
4. Value added by industries at current prices
5. Value added by industries at constant prices
6. Output, gross value added, and fixed assets by industries at current prices
7. Government final consumption expenditure by function at current prices
8. Individual consumption expenditure of households, NPISHs (nonprofit institutions serving households), and general government at current prices
9. Total economy at current prices
10. Rest of the world at current prices
11. Nonfinancial corporations at current prices
12. Financial corporations at current prices
13. General government at current prices

14. Households at current prices
15. Nonprofit institutions serving households at current prices
16. Combined sectors: nonfinancial and financial corporations at current prices
17. Combined sectors: households and NPISH at current prices
18. Cross classification of gross value added by industries and institutional sectors at current prices

The (Un)Happy Planet Index 2.0 (New Economics Foundation)

<http://www.happyplanetindex.org/learn/index.html>

Report: *The (Un)Happy Planet Index 2.0: Why Good Lives Don't Have To Cost the Earth*

<http://www.happyplanetindex.org/public-data/files/happy-planet-index-2-0.pdf>

The HPI is an innovative measure that shows the ecological efficiency with which human well-being is delivered around the world. It is the first ever index to combine environmental impact with well-being to measure the environmental efficiency with which, country by country, people live long and happy lives.

The index doesn't reveal the "happiest" country in the world. It shows the relative efficiency with which nations convert the planet's natural resources into long and happy lives for their citizens. The nations that top the index aren't the happiest places in the world, but the nations that score well show that achieving, long, happy lives without overstretching the planet's resources is possible.

The HPI shows that around the world, high levels of resource consumption do not reliably produce high levels of well-being, and that it is possible to produce high well-being without excessive consumption of the Earth's resources. It also reveals that there are different routes to achieving comparable levels of well-being. The model followed by the West can provide widespread longevity and variable life satisfaction, but it does so only at a vast and ultimately counterproductive cost in terms of resource consumption.

Components of the HPI

1. Life expectancy
2. Life satisfaction
3. Ecological footprint

The World Factbook (Central Intelligence Agency)

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>

The World Factbook provides information on the history, people, government, economy, geography, communications, transportation, military, and transnational issues for 266 world entities.

Country Profiles

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/docs/profileguide.html>

Among the information that might be available for a particular country are the following:

1. Birth rate
2. Death rate
3. Distribution of family income—Gini index
4. Education expenditure
5. Environment
6. Ethnic groups
7. GDP
8. GNP
9. HIV/AIDS
10. Infant mortality rate
11. Internet users
12. Labor force
13. Land use
14. Life expectancy at birth
15. Major infectious diseases
16. Median age
17. Net migration rate
18. Population below poverty level
19. Refugees and internally displaced persons
20. School life expectancy
21. Suffrage
22. Trafficking in persons
23. Unemployment rate
24. Urbanization

Appendix C

Indicators from Surveyed Reports

Indicators found in the reports (appendix B) were synthesized into 79 indicators and organized under the 14 categories below. (This does not include indicators suggested to fill in the gap of missing measures on women, children, the elderly, and minorities.)

1. Poverty

- a. Poverty rates, such as percentage of people living below the poverty line and percentage of children living in poverty by race/ethnicity and of all families with children
- b. Percentage of adults living in poverty by literacy level
- c. Percentage of children in single-parent families
- d. Children in poor homes

2. Health

- a. Life expectancy at birth
- b. Mortality, such as infant mortality rate, infant mortality rate by mother's race/ethnicity, under-5 mortality rate, mortality rate for children ages 1–19, and maternal mortality
- c. Survival rate
- d. Children's health, such as percentage of low birth weight babies, percentage of children underweight for their age, rate of children with very good or excellent health, rate of children with activity limitations, rate of overweight children and adolescents, rate of cigarette smoking (grade 12), rate of binge alcohol drinking (grade 12), rate of illicit drug use (grade 12), and teen birth rate
- e. Death rate, such as child and teen death rate
- f. Morbidity, that is, percentage of people reporting fair or poor health
- g. Nutrition and percentage of daily caloric requirements consumed
- h. Access to health care, such as rate of children with health insurance
- i. Access to contraception and abortion
- j. Access to clean water
- k. Obesity
- l. Mental health

3. Education

- a. Literacy rate, such as female and male adult literacy rate, adult illiteracy rate, reading test scores, and math test scores

- b. Enrollment rate, such as female and male gross enrollment ratio (all levels), college enrollment rates by race, percentage of primary-school-age children who are not enrolled in school, and rate of prekindergarten enrollment
 - c. Drop-out/completion rate such as percentage of teens who are high school dropouts, drop-out rate by family income level, rate of persons who have received a high school diploma, and rate of persons who have received a bachelor's degree
 - d. Cost, such as yearly college cost as a percent of median family income
4. Employment
- a. Jobs
 - b. Civilian labor force
 - c. Hours, such as annual hours, child labor, and trends in hours worked
 - d. Secure parental employment rate
 - e. Unemployment and underemployment, such as unemployment and underemployment rates, duration of employment, reason for unemployment, distribution of full-time and part-time workers, contingent and non-contingent workers, multiple job holders, employed workers with alternative work arrangement, unemployment and inflation, percent of teens not attending school and not working, percent of children living in families where no parent has full-time, year-round employment
 - f. Unpaid labor, such as the care of households, children, the elderly, and the disabled
 - g. Labor force participation such as selected civilian labor force participation rates and employment-to-population ratio
 - h. Gender pay gaps and other differences
5. Income and wealth
- a. Comparative income such as average annual earnings by education level, income growth for middle-income immigrant and nonimmigrant families, shares of market-based personal income by income type, and female and male estimated earned income
 - b. Median income such as median weekly earnings of full-time workers, median family income by race/ethnic group, median annual income (all families with children), ratio of black and Hispanic to white median income, annual growth of median family income, years for median family income to regain prior peak, and median family income by age of householder

- c. Various income groups such as low, middle and high income growth, share of income held by top 1 percent, share of household income by bottom 99 percent, shares of family income going to various income groups, ratio of family income of top 5 percent to lowest 20 percent, sources of income by income group, share of capital income received by income groups, and shares of market-based personal income by income type
 - d. Income growth/loss such as change in average real family income following peak years by selected income quintiles and household income growth by income group
 - e. Wages such as wages for female and male workers by wage percentile, dimensions of wage inequality, and wage equality between women and men for similar work
 - f. Tax rates such as effective federal tax rates for all households by income quintile, effective tax rates for selected federal taxes, change in income shares, pre- and post-tax, impact of tax cuts in income, and before- and after-tax return to capital
 - g. Consumption/expenditure such as real expenditure by income fifth, increases in consumption inequality, and consumption inequality among children
 - h. Income inequality such as ratio of estimated female earned income to male value and impact of inequality on income shares
 - i. Social and economic equality of different population groups—gender, age, minority, immigrant, and disabled
6. Shelter
- a. Homeownership rate
 - b. Condition of housing such as overcrowding and units lacking plumbing facilities or heat
 - c. Rental costs such as rental cost burdens for all renters and rental cost burdens for very low income renters
 - d. Informal settlements
7. Natural environment
- a. Environmental quality such as outdoor air pollution, indoor air pollution, industrial waste/pollution, noise pollution, per capita energy use and carbon dioxide emissions, total energy use and carbon emissions, companies voluntarily reporting greenhouse gas, CO₂ emissions from energy by region, and world per capita CO₂ emissions

- b. Effects on human health such as the number of premature deaths from pollution
 - c. Access to environmental services such as clean water, sanitation, and recreational areas
 - d. Natural resources and ecosystems such as ecological footprint, and percentage of forest habitat remaining
8. Political participation
- a. Political voice and governance such as rate of voting in presidential elections; participation in governance; constitutional guarantees; legal guarantees for basic economic needs; political and social rights guaranteed by law; ratification of international treaties for equality, human rights, etc.; functioning legal institutions; arrests and detention of political prisoners; proportion of population willing to take part in political activity for or against a cause; understanding civics and politics; and expressing political values
 - b. Political participation by gender, age, minority status, and access to political leadership such as shares of parliamentary seats and other governing bodies, ratio of women to men at ministerial level, and ratio of women to men in number of years as head of state or government
9. Civil society
- a. Civil society participation such as giving and volunteering, the proportion of population who are members of civil society associations, and health of civil society organizations
 - b. Civility or intergroup relations, such as proportion of population who do not object to having immigrants, foreign workers, and other minorities as neighbors; proportion of population who say it is important to encourage children to be tolerant and respectful of others; bridging social capital; citizen-centered engagement; freedom of association; and level of trust in government, business, and other institutions
10. Economic participation
- a. Labor force participation, such as female workforce participation over male and female and male shares of professional and technical positions
 - b. Rate of economic activity
 - c. Social and economic equality for women
11. Human rights
- a. Human rights rating

- b. Prisoners, such as those under sentence of death by race and prisoner executions by civil authority
- c. Number of refugees fleeing the country

12. National stability and sustainability

- a. Mounting demographic pressures that can lead to instability
- b. Massive movement of refugees of internally displaced people
- c. Legacy of vengeance-seeking group grievance or group paranoia
- d. Chronic and sustained human flight
- e. Uneven economic development among group lines
- f. Sharp and/or severe economic decline
- g. Criminalization and/or delegitimization of the state
- h. Progressive deterioration of public services
- i. Suspension of arbitrary application of the rule of law and widespread violation of human rights
- j. Security apparatus operating as a “state within a state”
- k. Rise of factionalized elites
- l. Intervention of external political actors
- m. National security, such as international treaties, major armed conflicts, world arms transfers, worldwide military expenditures, completed peacekeeping missions, current peacekeeping missions, international terrorist incidents, and casualties caused by international terrorism

13. Family and household well-being

- a. Families and children, such as family size and composition, children in families, and living arrangements of children
- b. Fertility indicators, such as fertility rates, mean age of mother at first childbirth, share of births outside marriage and teenage births, and childlessness
- c. Marital and partnership status, such as marriage and divorce rate, cohabitation rate, and prevalence of other forms of partnership
- d. Workplace hours and time for caring, such as usual weekly working hours among women and men, distribution of working hours among families (two-parent and single parent), and family-friendly workplace practices

14. Personal well-being

- a. Emotional well-being such as well-being at work, vitality, and suicide rate
- b. Subjective total well-being
- c. Capabilities such as freedom, resilience and self-esteem, and positive functioning

- d. Personal activities, such as paid work, unpaid domestic work, commuting, leisure time, self-improvement, religious activities, participation in the arts, hobbies, virtual games, sports, social celebrations, gambling, and travel
- e. Social connections, such as social isolation, rate of youths not working and not in school, rate of children who moved within the last year, informal support, social trust, religious engagement, belonging to a group or organization, attending a club meeting, working at a community project, connecting to others through family and friends, giving and volunteering, staying informed, and trusting and feeling committed to major institutions
- f. Safety and insecurity, such as domestic violence, rate of violent crime victimization by age, rate of violent crime offenders by age, sexual abuse, and deaths from external causes
- g. Economic insecurity, such as insecurity due to unemployment and associated with old age

 **URBAN
INSTITUTE**
2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

(202) 833-7200

paffairs@urban.org

<http://www.urban.org>