

Measuring democracy

How do we measure democracy? Similarly, how should we measure democracy? With almost everyone clamouring to be “democratic” or, at the very least, seeking to impose its democratic credentials, influence and power, it is important to (re)consider what we really mean by democracy. The section on this website asking *What is democracy?* is a good place contextualize the formal (and informal) interpretations of democracy. Below, we have assembled a number of ways of measuring democracy, all of them using different criteria, factors, weighting, data-gathering techniques, and presentation methods based on diverse philosophical, socio-political, economic and epistemological considerations. We have assembled this diverse grouping of measures to underscore the fluid complexity and messiness of democracy: can we have democracy with unacceptable levels of poverty, militarization, corruption, social inequities and a lack of prospects for change, not to mention limited educational development? Here, like elsewhere, a vigorous, sustained and critical debate on what we really mean by democracy is, in our view, essential to the ultimate process of engaging in, and building, democracy.

(NOTE: The text provided to describe each of the websites listed is taken from the actual websites themselves, at times edited for space considerations and also to provide a succinct presentation. The links to the websites are provided so that further research and investigation can be undertaken. The html links have been left embedded so that quick access to measures, data, rankings, etc. can be quickly accessed.)

Name and Website	Description	Category
Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE) Development Blog http://www.cipe.org/blog/about/#.Ukecfoasim4	This blog is developed and managed by the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE). For more information about CIPE visit www.cipe.org The CIPE Development blog discusses international development issues in light of CIPE’s programs and world events. CIPE and its partners in more than 100 countries operate in the belief that economic and political liberties are intertwined and that democracies and market economies are essentially two sides of the same coin. In strengthening democracies through private enterprise and market-oriented reform, CIPE focuses on a number of key development themes including democratic governance, anti-corruption, corporate governance, informal sector, entrepreneurship, and women and youth empowerment. CIPE believes that the private sector plays a key role in making democracies work. Engaging the business community in the policymaking process builds a foundation for democracies that deliver socio-economic benefits for all segments of the population. One of the most exciting trends of the last 20 years has been a growing global commitment to democracy – not only by the United States and other developed countries, but also by new democracies in Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere, which increasingly support democratic reform within their regions. While the world has undeniably become more democratic, defining exactly how to measure “democracy” remains a contentious issue. The mere presence of a parliament, a constitution that protects basic rights, or regular elections is not enough. Even the Soviet Union, the very model of a totalitarian state, held	Democracy

	<p>regular elections and had a constitution that guaranteed many individual rights. The United Kingdom, the cradle of modern parliamentary democracy, has functioned for hundreds of years without a written constitution and is still nominally headed by an unelected monarch. Democracy comes in many different flavors – as does authoritarianism.</p> <p>While these indices are valuable for researchers and policymakers, no single number can truly capture the essence of democratic governance – especially when a country’s democratic institutions are dominated by an unaccountable elite, when local and regional governments are unresponsive to their citizens, or when well-designed institutions are hollowed out by corruption. But measuring democracy doesn’t have to remain an academic pursuit. Given the wealth of data now available for free online, and increasing calls for governments around the world to open up their own (often vast) data repositories, citizens have access to more and more information on how their governments are performing in a wide range of areas, as well as regional and global comparisons. When access to information is free, citizens can take their own measure of democracy</p>	
<p>(The Economist’s) The Democracy Index http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy_Index & http://www.eiu.com/</p>	<p>The Democracy Index is an index compiled by the Economist Intelligence Unit, that measures the state of democracy in 167 countries, of which 166 are sovereign states and 165 are United Nations member states. The index is based on 60 indicators grouped in five different categories: electoral process and pluralism, civil liberties, functioning of government, political participation, and political culture. In addition to a numeric score and a ranking, the index categorizes countries as one of four regime types <i>full democracies</i>, <i>flawed democracies</i>, <i>hybrid regimes</i>, and <i>authoritarian regimes</i>. The index was first produced for 2006, with updates for 2008, 2010, 2011, and 2012.</p> <p>As described in the report, the democracy index is a weighted average based on the answers of 60 questions, each one with either two or three permitted alternative answers. Most answers are "experts' assessments"; the report does not indicate what kinds of experts, nor their number, nor whether the experts are employees of the Economist Intelligence Unit or independent scholars, nor the nationalities of the experts. Some answers are provided by public-opinion surveys from the respective countries. In the case of countries for which survey results are missing, survey results for similar countries and expert assessments are used in order to fill in gaps.</p> <p>The questions are distributed in the five categories: electoral process and pluralism, civil liberties, functioning of government, political participation, and political culture. Each answer is translated to a mark, either 0 or 1, or for the three-answer alternative questions, 0.5. With the exceptions mentioned below, the sums are added within each category, multiplied by ten, and divided by the total number of questions within the category. There are a few modifying dependencies, which are explained much more precisely than the main rule procedures. In a few cases, an answer yielding zero for one question voids another question; e.g., if the elections for the national legislature and head of</p>	<p>Democracy</p>

	<p>government are not considered free (question 1), then the next question, "<i>Are elections... fair?</i>" is not considered, but automatically marked zero. Likewise, there are a few questions considered so important that a low score on them yields a penalty on the total score sum for their respective categories, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Whether national elections are free and fair"; 2. "The security of voters"; 3. "The influence of foreign powers on government"; 4. "The capability of the civil servants to implement policies". <p>The five category indices, which are listed in the report, are then averaged to find the democracy index for a given country. Finally, the democracy index, rounded to one decimal, decides the regime type classification of the country.</p> <p>The report discusses other indices of democracy, as defined e.g. by Freedom House, and argues for some of the choices made by the team from the Economist Intelligence Unit. In this comparison, a higher emphasis has been put on the public opinion and attitudes, as measured by public surveys, but on the other hand, economic living standard has not been weighted as one criterion of democracy (as seemingly some other investigators have done).</p>	
<p>The Legatum Institute http://www.li.com/about/about-li</p>	<p>Based in London, the Legatum Institute (LI) is an independent non-partisan public policy organisation whose research, publications, and programmes advance ideas and policies in support of free and prosperous societies around the world. At a time when democratic capitalism is on trial in many places around the world, we have a vision of a more prosperous world based on greater economic and political liberty balanced with personal and institutional responsibility. And as we are bearing witness to historic political changes in the Arab world and beyond, we are dedicated to the study of political and economic transitions and the promotion of open economies and democracy. In an era of hyper-specialisation, our approach is a different one. We seek to lift ourselves out of our silos to think broadly about big issues of the day by engaging with gifted thinkers and practitioners from across disciplines. We strive to explore the foundations of prosperity through the lens of politics, economics, culture, and philosophy, and we believe that studying the past is crucial if we are to think sensibly about the future. We advocate a humble and self-critical approach. Ideas and arguments need to be in a constant state of testing, sharpening, and adaptation. If capitalism is moral, then capitalists must act ethically, with wisdom and restraint. If limited government and free enterprise are keys to prosperity, then a vibrant civil society is essential, and each of us as individuals has a responsibility to serve others and our communities.</p> <p>LI's signature annual publication is the Legatum Prosperity Index™, a unique global assessment of national prosperity based on both wealth and wellbeing. LI is the co-publisher of Democracy Lab, a journalistic joint-venture with Foreign Policy Magazine dedicated to covering political and economic transitions around the world. The Legatum Institute is based in London and an</p>	<p>Democratic capitalism</p>

	<p>independent member of the Legatum Group, a private investment group with a 25 year heritage of global investment, allocating proprietary capital to businesses and to programmes that promote sustainable human development.</p>	
<p>Project Muse http://muse.jhu.edu/about/index.html</p>	<p>Although democracy is a widely held value, concrete measurement of it is elusive. Gerardo L. Munck’s constructive assessment of the methods used to measure democracies promises to bring order to the debate in academia and in practice. Drawing on his years of academic research on democracy and measurement and his practical experience evaluating democratic practices for the United Nations and the Organization of American States, Munck’s discussion bridges the theories of academia with practical applications. In proposing a more open and collaborative relationship between theory and action, he makes the case for reassessing how democracy is measured and encourages fundamental changes in methodology. Munck’s field-tested framework for quantifying and qualifying democracy is built around two instruments he developed: the UN Development Programme’s Electoral Democracy Index and a case-by-case election monitoring tool used by the OAS. Measuring Democracy offers specific, real-world lessons that scholars and practitioners can use to improve the quality and utility of data about democracy.</p>	<p>Democracy</p>
<p>Happy Planet Index http://www.happyplanetindex.org/</p>	<p>The Happy Planet Index (HPI) is the leading global measure of sustainable well-being. The HPI measures what matters: the extent to which countries deliver long, happy, sustainable lives for the people that live in them. The Index uses global data on life expectancy, experienced well-being and Ecological Footprint to calculate this. The index is an efficiency measure, it ranks countries on how many long and happy lives they produce per unit of environmental input. The 2012 HPI report ranks 151 countries and is the third time the index has been published.</p> <p>The index uses global data on life expectancy, experienced well-being and Ecological Footprint.</p> $\text{Happy Planet Index} \approx \frac{\text{Experienced well-being} \times \text{Life expectancy}}{\text{Ecological footprint}}$ <p>Each of these components is based on a separate measure:</p> <p>Experienced well-being. If you want to know how well someone’s life is going, your best bet is to ask them directly. In this year’s HPI, experienced well-being is assessed using a question called the ‘Ladder of Life’ from the Gallup World Poll. This asks respondents to imagine a ladder, where 0 represents the worst possible life and 10 the best possible life, and report the step of the ladder they feel they currently stand on.</p> <p>Life expectancy. Alongside experienced well-being, the HPI includes a universally important measure of health – life expectancy. We used life expectancy data from the 2011 UNDP Human Development Report</p> <p>Ecological Footprint</p>	<p>Ecology</p>

	<p>The HPI uses the Ecological Footprint promoted by the environmental charity WWF as a measure of resource consumption. It is a per capita measure of the amount of land required to sustain a country's consumption patterns, measured in terms of global hectares (g ha) which represent a hectare of land with average productive biocapacity.</p> <p>This discussion paper aims to outline some of the major factors to consider should it be decided that global goal(s) covering democratic governance are included in a new post-MDG framework. In contrast to the existing MDGs, which are focused on socio-economic development indicators, democratic governance is not easy to measure because it means different things to different people, because it is packed with a number of different variables and dimensions and because the quality of democratic governance is a politically, culturally and ideologically charged determination.</p> <p>That being said, the paper makes a case for a global goal on democratic governance and explores four possible approaches for targets and indicators to support a goal. These are (1) global targets with global indicators (2) global targets with national indicators (3) regional targets with national indicators and (4) national targets with national indicators. The paper describes some of the main methodological issues for selecting democratic governance targets and indicators in the post-MDG framework.</p> <p>UNDP Discussion Paper - Measuring Democracy and Democratic Governance in a post-2015 Development Framework http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Democratic%20Governance/OGC/Post2015%20governance%20metrics%20_14%20Aug.pdf</p>	
<p>Institute for Economics & Peace http://economicsandpeace.org/</p>	<p>The Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) is a non-profit research organization dedicated to shifting the world's focus to peace as a positive, achievable, and tangible measure of human well-being and progress.</p> <p>It achieves its goals by developing new conceptual frameworks to define peacefulness; providing metrics for measurement; uncovering the relationship between peace, business and prosperity, and by promoting a better understanding of the cultural, economic and political factors that drive peacefulness.</p> <p>IEP is developing a series of nation-specific peace indices which allow regional differences within countries to be measure and taken into account. The recently released United Kingdom Peace Index (UKPI) explores the fabric of peace in the UK over the last decade. The United States Peace Index (USPI) ranks all 50 states of the U.S. based on their levels of peace.</p> <p>Find out more about IEP's National Peace Indices</p>	<p>Economics & peace</p>
<p>Uppsala Conflict Data Program http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/program_overview/</p>	<p>The Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) collects information on a large number of aspects of armed violence since 1946. Since the 1970s, the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) has recorded ongoing violent conflicts. This effort continues to the present day, now coupled with the collection of information on an ever broadening scope of aspects pertaining to organised violence, such as the resolution and dynamics of conflict. The UCDP data is</p>	<p>Conflict</p>

	<p>one of the most accurate and well-used data-sources on global armed conflicts and its definition of armed conflict is becoming a standard in how conflicts are systematically defined and studied. Data on armed conflicts have been published yearly in the report series States in Armed Conflict since 1987, in the SIPRI Yearbook since 1988, the Journal of Peace Research since 1993 and in the Human Security Reports since 2005. In addition UCDP researchers conduct theoretically and empirically based analyses of armed conflict: its causes, escalation, spread, prevention and resolution. These studies are regularly featured in international journals and books.</p> <p>Since 2004, the UCDP also operates and continuously updates its online database (UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia) on armed conflicts and organised violence, in which several aspects of armed conflict such as conflict dynamics and conflict resolution are available. The latest expansion is the UCDP's Georeferenced Event Data (GED).</p>	
<p>Global Peace Index http://www.visionofhumanity.org/#/page/indexes/global-peace-index</p>	<p>The Global Peace Index (GPI) is the world's leading measure of national peacefulness. The GPI measures the state of peace in 162 countries. The index uses qualitative and quantitative data to gauge internal and external levels of peace. The GPI Report provides an analysis of the data, identifying trends in peace over time, as well as the key drivers of peace and an economic calculation of the impact of violence to the global economy.</p> <p>By generating new information about the state of peace at the global level, the GPI aims to make a valuable contribution to better understand how civil society, researchers, policymakers and government can create a more peaceful society.</p> <p>Peace is notoriously difficult to define. The GPI defines peace as: “the absence of violence and the absence of the fear of violence”, which is commonly understood as negative peace. The GPI report now includes a Positive Peace Index, which measures the strength of the attitudes, structures and institutions that move a society away from violence and towards peace.</p> <p>The GPI is a composite index, comprised of 22 qualitative and quantitative indicators. The indicators were selected by an international expert panel and are reviewed annually. GPI indicators can be classified under three broad themes: ongoing domestic and international conflict, societal safety and security and militarisation.</p> <p>INDICATORS:</p> <p>Ongoing Domestic and International Conflict</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of external and internal conflicts fought • Number of deaths from organised conflict (external) • Number of deaths from organised conflict (internal) • Level of organised conflict • Relations with neighbouring countries <p>Societal Safety and Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of perceived criminality in society • Number of refugees and displaced people as a percentage of the total 	<p>Peace</p>

	<p>population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political instability • Political Terror Scale • Terrorist activity • Number of homicides per 100,000 people • Level of violent crime • Likelihood of violent demonstrations • Number of jailed population per 100,000 people • Number of internal security officers and police per 100,000 people <p>Militarisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military expenditure as a percentage of GDP • Number of armed-service personnel per 100,000 people • Volume of transfers of major conventional weapons as recipients (import) per 100,000 people • Volume of transfers of major conventional weapons as supplier (export) per 100,000 people • Financial contribution to UN peacekeeping missions • Nuclear and heavy weapons capability • Ease of access to small arms and light weapons <p>All of the GPI indicators are given a normalised score on a scale of 1-5, whereby qualitative indicators are also provided estimates.</p> <p>The overall GPI score assigned to each country applies a weight of 60% for internal peace and 40% for external. Internal peace measures how peaceful a country is internally and external peace measures the state of peace beyond a country's borders.</p> <p><i>The Institute for Economics and Peace</i></p> <p>The GPI was founded by technology entrepreneur and philanthropist Steve Killelea. The GPI is produced annually by the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP), a global think tank dedicated to building a greater relationship between economics, business and peace. IEP also produces a series of National Peace Indices as well as a Global Terrorism Index.</p>	
<p>Transparency International – the global coalition against corruption</p> <p>http://www.transparency.org/</p>	<p>One global movement sharing one vision: a world in which government, business, civil society and the daily lives of people are free of corruption.</p> <p>In 1993, a few individuals decided to take a stance against corruption and created Transparency International. Now present in more than 100 countries, the movement works relentlessly to stir the world's collective conscience and bring about change. Much remains to be done to stop corruption, but much has also been achieved, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the creation of international anti-corruption conventions • the prosecution of corrupt leaders and seizures of their illicitly gained riches • national elections won and lost on tackling corruption • companies held accountable for their behaviour both at home and abroad. <p>Through more than 100 national chapters worldwide and an international</p>	<p>Corruption</p>

	<p>secretariat in Berlin, we work with partners in government, business and civil society to put effective measures in place to tackle corruption.</p> <p>We are politically non-partisan and place great importance on our independence. We alone determine our programmes and activities – no donor has any input into Transparency International’s policies. Our sources of funding are made transparent as is our spending.</p>	
<p>Media Sustainability Index (IREX)</p> <p>http://www.irex.org/project/media-sustainability-index-msi</p>	<p>IREX prepared the Media Sustainability Index (MSI) in cooperation with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) as a tool to assess the development of media systems over time and across countries. IREX staff, USAID, and other media-development professionals contributed to the development of this assessment tool.</p> <p>The MSI assesses five "objectives" in shaping a successful media system:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legal and social norms protect and promote free speech and access to public information. 2. Journalism meets professional standards of quality. 3. Multiple news sources provide citizens with reliable, objective news. 4. Media are well-managed enterprises, allowing editorial independence. 5. Supporting institutions function in the professional interests of independent media. <p>These objectives were judged to be the most important aspects of a sustainable and professional independent media system, and serve as the criteria against which countries are rated. A score is attained for each objective by rating between seven and nine indicators, which determine how well a country meets that objective. The objectives, indicators, and scoring system are presented below.</p> <p>The scoring is done in two parts. First, a panel of local experts is assembled in each country, drawn from the country’s media outlets, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), professional associations, and academic institutions. Panelists may be editors, reporters, media managers or owners, advertising and marketing specialists, lawyers, professors or teachers, or human rights observers. Additionally, panels comprise the various types of media represented in a country. The panels also include representatives from the capital city and other geographic regions, and they reflect gender, ethnic, and religious diversity as appropriate. For consistency from year to year, at least half of the previous year’s participants are included on the following year’s panel. IREX identifies and works with a local or regional organization or individual to oversee the process.</p> <p>Panel participants are provided with a questionnaire that explains the objectives, indicators, and scoring system. Each panelist individually reviews the questionnaire and scores each indicator. Descriptions of each indicator explain their meaning and help organize the panelist’s thoughts. For example, the questionnaire asks the panelist to consider not only the letter of the legal framework, but its practical implementation, too. A country without a formal freedom-of-information law that enjoys customary government openness may</p>	<p>Media & journalism</p>

	<p>well outperform a country that has a strong law on the books that is frequently ignored. Furthermore, the questionnaire does not single out any one type of media as more important than another; rather it directs the panelist to consider the salient types of media and to determine if an underrepresentation, if applicable, of one media type impacts the sustainability of the media sector as a whole. In this way, we capture the influence of public, private, national, local, community, and new media.</p>	
<p>Gini coefficient http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gini_coefficient</p>	<p>The Gini coefficient is a measure of statistical dispersion intended to represent the income distribution of a nation's residents. The Gini coefficient measures the inequality among values of a frequency distribution (for example levels of income). A Gini coefficient of zero expresses perfect equality, where all values are the same (for example, where everyone has an exactly equal income). A Gini coefficient of one (100 on the percentile scale) expresses maximal inequality among values (for example where only one person has all the income). However, a value greater than one may occur if some persons have negative income or wealth. For larger groups, values close to or above 1 are very unlikely in practice however.</p> <p>Gini coefficient is commonly used as a measure of inequality of income or wealth. For OECD countries, in the late 2000s, considering the effect of taxes and transfer payments, the income Gini coefficient ranged between 0.24 to 0.49, with Slovenia the lowest and Chile the highest. The countries in Africa had the highest pre-tax Gini coefficients in 2008–2009, with South Africa the world's highest at 0.7. The global income inequality Gini coefficient in 2005, for all human beings taken together, has been estimated to be between 0.61 and 0.68 by various sources.</p> <p>There are some issues in interpreting a Gini coefficient. The same value may result from many different distribution curves. The demographic structure should be taken into account. Countries with an aging population, or with a baby boom, experience an increasing pre-tax Gini coefficient even if real income distribution for working adults remain constant. Scholars have devised over a dozen variants of the Gini coefficient.</p>	<p>Income distribution</p>
<p>World Institute for Development Economics Research World Income Inequality Database http://www.wider.unu.edu/research/Database/en_GB/database/</p>	<p>The UNU-WIDER World Income Inequality Database (WIID) collects and stores information on income inequality for developed, developing, and transition countries. The database and its documentation are available on this website.</p> <p>WIID2 consists of a checked and corrected WIID1, a new update of the Deininger & Squire database from the World Bank, new estimates from the Luxembourg Income Study and Transmonee, and other new sources as they have become available. WIID2a contains fewer points of data than WIID1 as some overlaps between the old Deininger & Squire data and estimates included by WIDER have been eliminated along with some low quality estimates adding no information. In addition to the Gini coefficient and quintile and decile shares, survey means and medians along with the income shares of the richest 5% and the poorest 5% have been included in the update. In addition to the</p>	<p>Income inequality</p>

	<p>Gini coefficient reported by the source, a Gini coefficient calculated using a new method developed by Tony Shorrocks and Guang Hua Wan is reported. The method estimates the Gini coefficient from decile data almost as accurately as if unit record data were used.</p>	
<p>The World Bank – Measuring Poverty http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXT/POVERTY/EXTPA/0,,contentMDK:22397595~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:430367,00.html</p>	<p>A common method used to measure poverty is based on incomes or consumption levels. A person is considered poor if his or her consumption or income level falls below some minimum level necessary to meet basic needs. This minimum level is usually called the "poverty line". What is necessary to satisfy basic needs varies across time and societies. Therefore, poverty lines vary in time and place, and each country uses lines which are appropriate to its level of development, societal norms and values. Information on consumption and income is obtained through sample surveys, with which households are asked to answer detailed questions on their spending habits and sources of income. Such surveys are conducted more or less regularly in most countries. These sample survey data collection methods are increasingly being complemented by participatory methods, where people are asked what their basic needs are and what poverty means for them. Interestingly, new research shows a high degree of concordance between poverty lines based on objective and subjective assessments of needs.</p> <p>When estimating poverty worldwide, the same reference poverty line has to be used, and expressed in a common unit across countries. Therefore, for the purpose of global aggregation and comparison, the World Bank uses reference lines set at \$1.25 and \$2 per day (2005 Purchasing Power Parity terms). Using improved price data from the latest (2005) round of the International Comparison Program, new poverty estimates released in August 2008 show that about 1.4 billion people in the developing world (one in four) were living on less than \$1.25 a day in 2005, down from 1.9 billion (one in two) in 1981. The new international poverty line of \$1.25 a day at 2005 prices is the mean of the national poverty lines for the 10-20 poorest countries of the world. While the revised estimate is significantly higher than earlier estimates of less than a billion people living under \$1 a day in 1993 prices, the developing world as a whole remains on track to meet the first Millennium Development Goal to halve extreme poverty from its 1990 levels by 2015. However, poverty is more pervasive than earlier estimated, and efforts to fight it will have to be redoubled, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. Also, lags in survey data availability mean that the new estimates do not yet reflect the potentially large impact on poor people of rising food and fuel prices since 2005.</p> <p>While much progress has been made in measuring and analyzing income poverty, efforts are needed to measure and study the many other dimensions of poverty. Work on non-income dimensions of poverty -- defining indicators where needed, gathering data, assessing trends -- is presented in the World Development Report (WDR) 2000/01: Attacking Poverty. This work includes assembling comparable and high-quality social indicators for education, health, access to services and infrastructure. It also includes developing new indicators</p>	<p>Poverty</p>

	<p>to track other dimensions -- for example risk, vulnerability, social exclusion, access to social capital -- as well as ways to compare a multi-dimensional conception of poverty, when it may not make sense to aggregate the various dimensions into one index.</p> <p>In addition to expanding the range of indicators of poverty, work is needed to integrate data coming from sample surveys with information obtained through more participatory techniques, which usually offer rich insights into why programs work or do not. Participatory approaches illustrate the nature of risk and vulnerability, how cultural factors and ethnicity interact and affect poverty, how social exclusion sets limits to people's participation in development, and how barriers to such participation can be removed. Work on integrating analyses of poverty based on sample surveys and on participatory techniques is presented in the WDR. An example of participatory work is given by the Voices of the Poor studies. See an extract of these studies at "What the Poor Say" (150Kb PDF).</p>	
<p>Cross-national Data Center in Luxembourg http://www.lisdatacenter.org/</p>	<p>LIS is a cross-national data center which serves a global community of researchers, educators, and policy makers. LIS acquires datasets with income, wealth, employment, and demographic data from a large number of countries, harmonises them to enable cross-national comparisons, and makes them available for public use by providing registered users with remote access. LIS, located in Luxembourg, is home to the <i>Luxembourg Income Study Database</i> and the <i>Luxembourg Wealth Study Database</i>. These databases contain harmonised microdata from high- and middle-income countries around the world.</p> <p>Our mission is to enable, facilitate, promote, and conduct cross-national comparative research on socio-economic outcomes and on the institutional factors that shape those outcomes.</p>	<p>Wealth, income, & employment</p>
<p>The Living Planet Index (LPI) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Living_Planet_Index</p>	<p>The Living Planet Index (LPI) is an indicator of the state of global biological diversity, based on trends in vertebrate populations of species from around the world. The LPI provides the general public, scientists and policy-makers with information on trends in the abundance of the world's vertebrates and offers insights into which habitats or ecosystems have species that are declining most rapidly. This information can be used to define the impact humans are having on the planet and for guiding actions to address biodiversity loss. The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) is working in collaboration with the Institute of Zoology (IoZ), the research division of the Zoological Society of London (ZSL), to further develop the project which began in 1997. The Living Planet Index was originally developed by WWF in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, the biodiversity assessment and policy implementation arm of the United Nations Environment Programme. UNEP-WCMC collected much of the data for the index in the first few years of the project. Results are presented biennially in the WWF Living Planet Report, on the World Wide Web, and in publications such as the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the UN Global Environment Outlook. National and regional reports are now</p>	<p>Biological diversity</p>

	<p>being produced to focus on relevant issues at a smaller scale. Between 1970 and 2007, the index fell by 28%. This global trend suggests that we are degrading natural ecosystems at a rate unprecedented in human history.</p> <p>The current <i>Living Planet Database (LPD)</i> maintained by ZSL, contains over 10,000 population trends for more than 2,500 species of fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals. The global LPI is calculated using over 7000 of these population time-series which are gathered from a variety of sources such as journals, online databases and government reports. A generalised additive modelling framework is used to determine the underlying trend in each population time-series. Average rates of change are calculated and aggregated to the species level. Each species trend is aggregated to produce an index for the terrestrial, marine and freshwater systems. The three system indices are weighted equally within tropical and temperate regions which are then aggregated to produce the global LPI.</p>	
<p>OpenNet Initiative https://opennet.net/</p>	<p>The OpenNet Initiative is a collaborative partnership of three institutions: the Citizen Lab at the Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto; the Berkman Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University; and the SecDev Group (Ottawa).</p> <p>Our aim is to investigate, expose and analyze Internet filtering and surveillance practices in a credible and non-partisan fashion. We intend to uncover the potential pitfalls and unintended consequences of these practices, and thus help to inform better public policy and advocacy work in this area. To achieve these aims, the ONI employs a unique multi-disciplinary approach that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Development and deployment of a suite of technical enumeration tools and core methodologies for the study of Internet filtering and surveillance; B. Capacity-building among networks of local advocates and researchers; C. Advanced studies exploring the consequences of current and future trends and trajectories in filtering and surveillance practices, and their implications for domestic and international law and governance regimes. 	<p>Internet access</p>
<p>Freedom indices http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_freedom_indices</p>	<p>A list of freedom indices produced by several non-governmental organizations that publish and maintain assessments of the state of freedom in the world, according to their own various definitions of the term, and rank countries as being free, partly free, or unfree using various measures of freedom, including political rights, economic rights, and civil liberties.</p> <p>Canada based</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Economic Freedom of the World Index is a report published by the Fraser Institute in conjunction with the Economic Freedom Network, a group of independent research and educational institutes in 90 nations and territories worldwide. It is a numeric index and its results are not currently included in the table below. • The Index of Freedom in the World (also <i>Freedom Index</i>, <i>Worldwide Index of Human Freedom</i>) is an index measuring classical civil liberties published by Canada's Fraser Institute, Germany's Liberales 	<p>Freedom</p>

Institute, and the U.S. [Cato Institute](#).^[1] It is not currently included in the table below.

France based

- [Worldwide Press Freedom Index](#) is published by [Reporters Without Borders](#). Countries are assessed as having a *good situation*, a *satisfactory situation*, *noticeable problems*, a *difficult situation*, or a *very serious situation*.

United Kingdom based

- The [Democracy Index](#), published by the [Economist Intelligence Unit](#), is an assessment of countries' democracy. Countries are rated to be either *Full Democracies*, *Flawed Democracies*, *Hybrid Regimes*, or *Authoritarian regimes*. Full democracies, flawed democracies, and hybrid regimes are considered to be democracies, and the authoritarian nations are considered to be dictatorial. The Economist bases its ratings based on: civil liberties, conduct of elections, media freedom, participation, public opinion, functioning government, corruption, and stability.

United States based

- [Freedom in the World](#) published by [Freedom House](#) (which receives about 66% of its budget from the [U.S. government](#)) ranks countries by political rights and [civil liberties](#) that are derived in large measure from the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#). Countries are assessed as *free*, *partly free*, or *unfree*.
- The [Index of Economic Freedom](#) is an annual report published by [The Wall Street Journal](#) and the [Heritage Foundation](#). Countries are assessed as *free*, *mostly free*, *moderately free*, *mostly unfree*, and *repressed*.
- The [Polity data series](#) is a widely used data series in political science research. It contains coded annual information on regime authority characteristics and transitions for all independent states with greater than 500,000 total population and covers the years 1800–2006. Polity's conclusions about a state's level of democracy are based on an evaluation of that state's elections for competitiveness, openness and level of participation. Data from this series is not currently included in the table below. The Polity work is sponsored by the [Political Instability Task Force](#) (PITF) which is funded by the U.S. [Central Intelligence Agency](#). However, the views expressed in the reports are the authors' alone and do not represent the views of the US Government.

The Free Existence

The data from the Free Existence indices are not currently included in the table below.

- The Free Existence [Drug Freedom Index](#) is a quantitative index which rates the legality of drug usage, possession, and sales in most countries across the world. As it is the first attempt to quantify worldwide drug laws of its kind, there is at present some reliance on anecdotal evidence in lieu of direct legal analysis due to lack of access to primary sources (i.e., the actual

	<p>written laws of some nations).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Free Existence Gun Rights Index is a quantitative index which rates the legality of gun ownership and use in most countries across the world. As it is the first attempt to quantify worldwide gun laws of its kind, there is presently some reliance on anecdotal evidence and news reports in lieu of direct legal analysis due to lack of access to primary sources (i.e., the actual written laws of some nations). • The Free Existence Freedom Meta-Index is a meta-index which incorporates several other freedom indices (e.g., Index of Economic Freedom, Freedom in the World, Corruption Perceptions Index, etc.) into a single ranking web interface. Users can weight the liberties they value most, and these preferences are used to prioritize or exclude individual freedom index values and produce a final score reflecting the most free country given the user's set of values. This weight-value multiplication approach can be used to selectively rank only values from a specific subset of freedom indices, or to enable a user to identify the country or countries that best match his or her philosophical preferences. 	
<p>Reporters Without Borders http://en.rsf.org/</p>	<p>Freedom of expression and of information will always be the world's most important freedom. If journalists were not free to report the facts, denounce abuses and alert the public, how would we resist the problem of children-soldiers, defend women's rights, or preserve our environment? In some countries, torturers stop their atrocious deeds as soon as they are mentioned in the media. In others, corrupt politicians abandon their illegal habits when investigative journalists publish compromising details about their activities. Still elsewhere, massacres are prevented when the international media focuses its attention and cameras on events. Freedom of information is the foundation of any democracy. Yet almost half of the world's population is still denied it.</p> <p>Reporters Without Borders was founded in Montpellier (France) in 1985 by four journalists: Robert Ménard, Rémy Loury, Jacques Molénat and Émilien Jubineau. This association, registered as a non-profit organisation in France since 1995, soon took on an international dimension. Under the direction of Christophe Deloire, Reporters Without Borders organised its team of researchers by geographical area. The organization also gradually developed two essential and highly specialised spheres of activity: one focused on Internet Censorship and the New Media, and the other devoted to providing material, financial and psychological assistance to journalists assigned to dangerous areas. Reporters Without Borders is registered in France as a non-profit organisation and has consultant status at the United Nations and UNESCO.</p>	<p>Media & journalism</p>
<p>Corruption Perceptions Index http://www.transparency.org/research/cpi/overview</p>	<p>FIRST LAUNCHED IN 1995, THE CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX HAS BEEN WIDELY CREDITED WITH PUTTING THE ISSUE OF CORRUPTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY AGENDA. What does a number mean to you? Each year we score countries on how corrupt their public sectors are seen to be. Our Corruption Perceptions Index sends a powerful message and governments have been forced to take notice and act.</p>	<p>Corruption</p>

	<p>Behind these numbers is the daily reality for people living in these countries. The index cannot capture the individual frustration of this reality, but it does capture the informed views of analysts, businesspeople and experts in countries around the world. How does your country score?</p>	
<p>Global Peace Index http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Peace_Index</p>	<p>The Global Peace Index (GPI) is an attempt to measure the relative position of nations' and regions' peacefulness. It is the product of Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) and developed in consultation with an international panel of peace experts from peace institutes and think tanks with data collected and collated by the Economist Intelligence Unit. The list was launched first in May 2007, then continued yearly. It is claimed to be the first study to rank countries around the world according to their peacefulness. It ranks 158 countries (up from 121 in 2007). The study is the brainchild of Australian entrepreneur Steve Killelea and is endorsed by individuals such as Kofi Annan, the Dalai Lama, archbishop Desmond Tutu, former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari, Nobel laureate Muhammad Yunus, economist Jeffrey Sachs, former president of Ireland Mary Robinson, Jan Eliasson and former US president Jimmy Carter. Factors examined by the authors include internal factors such as levels of violence and crime within the country and factors in a country's external relations such as military expenditure and wars. The index is launched each year at events in London, Washington DC, the United Nations in New York and in Brussels.</p>	<p>Peace</p>
<p>Human Development Reports (UNDP) (United Nations Development Programme) http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/</p>	<p>Human Development Index (HDI) The first Human Development Report introduced a new way of measuring development by combining indicators of life expectancy, educational attainment and income into a composite human development index, the HDI. The breakthrough for the HDI was the creation of a single statistic which was to serve as a frame of reference for both social and economic development. The HDI sets a minimum and a maximum for each dimension, called goalposts, and then shows where each country stands in relation to these goalposts, expressed as a value between 0 and 1.</p> <p>Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) Like development, poverty is multidimensional — but this is traditionally ignored by headline figures. The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), published for the first time in the 2010 Report, complements money-based measures by considering multiple deprivations and their overlap. The index identifies deprivations across the same three dimensions as the HDI and shows the number of people who are multidimensionally poor (suffering deprivations in 33% of weighted indicators) and the number of deprivations with which poor households typically contend. It can be deconstructed by region, ethnicity and other groupings as well as by dimension, making it an apt tool for policymakers.</p> <p>Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI) Reflecting inequality in each dimension of the HDI addresses an objective first stated in the Human Development Report 1990. The 2010</p>	<p>Human development, poverty, & inequality</p>

	<p>Report introduced the Inequality-adjusted HDI (IHDI), a measure of the level of human development of people in a society that accounts for inequality. Under perfect equality the IHDI is equal to the HDI, but falls below the HDI when inequality rises. In this sense, the IHDI is the actual level of human development (taking into account inequality), while the HDI can be viewed as an index of the potential human development that could be achieved if there is no inequality. The IHDI accounts for inequality in HDI dimensions by “discounting” each dimension’s average value according to its level of inequality measured by the Atkinson index. We apply this index to 132 countries.</p> <p>Countries with less human development tend to have greater inequality in more dimensions—and thus larger losses in human development.</p>	
<p>Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) http://www.ophi.org.uk/about</p>	<p>The Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) is an economic research centre within the Oxford Department of International Development at the University of Oxford. Established in 2007, the centre is led by Sabina Alkire. OPHI aims to build and advance a more systematic methodological and economic framework for reducing multidimensional poverty, grounded in people’s experiences and values. OPHI works towards this by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadening poverty measurement. OPHI develops and implements multi-dimensional measures of poverty, wellbeing and inequality. These measures go beyond traditional one-dimensional approaches to incorporate dimensions such as health, education, living standards, quality of work and more innovative dimensions. • Improving data on poverty. OPHI has developed tools to measure five missing dimensions of poverty data that poor people value but which have been largely overlooked in international studies of poverty to date: Quality of Work, Empowerment, Physical Safety, The Ability to go About Without Shame and Psychological Wellbeing. • Building capacity. OPHI runs academic courses and technical training programmes on multidimensional poverty and human development, and collaborates with universities, development agencies, governments and other research institutions and policy makers using our work. • Impacting policy. OPHI’s methodologies have been adopted by policy makers, including national governments and the United Nations Development Programme Human Development Report. <p>OPHI’s work is grounded in Amartya Sen’s capability approach. OPHI works to implement this approach by creating real tools that inform policies to reduce poverty. OPHI’s team members are involved in a wide range of activities and collaborations around the world, including survey design and testing, quantitative and qualitative data collection, training and mentoring, and advising policy makers.</p>	<p>Human development & poverty</p>
<p>FREEDOM HOUSE http://www.freedomhouse.org/a</p>	<p>Freedom House is an independent watchdog organization dedicated to the expansion of freedom around the world.</p>	<p>Freedom, rights</p>

bout-us	<p>Today, as more than two billion people live under oppressive rule, Freedom House speaks out against the main threats to democracy and empowers citizens to exercise their fundamental rights. We analyze the challenges to freedom; advocate for greater political and civil liberties; and support frontline activists to defend human rights and promote democratic change. Founded in 1941, Freedom House was the first American organization to champion the advancement of freedom globally.</p> <p>Freedom is possible only in democratic political environments where governments are accountable to their own people; the rule of law prevails; and freedoms of expression, association, and belief, as well as respect for the rights of minorities and women, are guaranteed. Freedom ultimately depends on the actions of committed and courageous men and women. We support non-violent civic initiatives in societies where freedom is denied or under threat and promote the right of all people to be free.</p> <p>Freedom House acts as a catalyst for freedom through a combination of analysis, advocacy, and action. Our research and analysis frames the policy debate in the United States and abroad on the progress and decline of freedom. Leading experts on democracy have called our flagship publication, <i>Freedom in the World</i>, an “essential source” and “indispensable guide” to democracy’s development.</p> <p>We advocate for U.S. leadership and collaboration with like-minded governments to vigorously oppose dictators and oppression. We amplify the voices of those struggling for freedom in repressive societies and counter authoritarian efforts to weaken international scrutiny of their regimes. We also empower frontline human rights defenders and civic activists to uphold fundamental rights and to advance democratic change. With Freedom House’s support, these activists expand the boundaries of freedom in repressive societies and hold their governments to account.</p>	
<p>Bhutan Gross National Happiness http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/ & http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gross_national_happiness</p>	<p>Like many psychological and social indicators, GNH is somewhat easier to state than to define with mathematical precision. Nonetheless, it serves as a unifying vision for Bhutan's five-year planning process and all the derived planning documents that guide the economic and development plans of the country. Proposed policies in Bhutan must pass a GNH review based on a GNH impact statement that is similar in nature to the Environmental Impact Statement required for development in the U.S.</p> <p>The Bhutanese grounding in Buddhist ideals suggests that beneficial development of human society takes place when material and spiritual development occur side by side to complement and reinforce each other. The four pillars of GNH are the promotion of sustainable development, preservation and promotion of cultural values, conservation of the natural environment, and establishment of good governance. At this level of generality, the concept of GNH is transcultural—a nation need not be Buddhist to value sustainable development, cultural integrity, ecosystem conservation, and good governance. Through collaboration with an international group of</p>	<p>Sustainable development & happiness</p>

scholars and empirical researchers the Centre for Bhutan Studies further defined these four pillars with greater specificity into eight general contributors to happiness—physical, mental and spiritual health; time-balance; social and community vitality; cultural vitality; education; living standards; good governance; and ecological vitality. Although the GNH framework reflects its Buddhist origins, it is solidly based upon the empirical research literature of happiness, positive psychology and well-being.

A second-generation GNH concept, treating happiness as a socioeconomic development metric, was proposed in 2006. The metric measures socioeconomic development by tracking seven development areas including the nation's mental and emotional health. GNH value is proposed to be an index function of the total average per capita of the following measures:

1. Economic Wellness: Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of economic metrics such as consumer debt, average income to consumer price index ratio and income distribution
2. Environmental Wellness: Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of environmental metrics such as pollution, noise and traffic
3. Physical Wellness: Indicated via statistical measurement of physical health metrics such as severe illnesses
4. Mental Wellness: Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of mental health metrics such as usage of antidepressants and rise or decline of psychotherapy patients
5. Workplace Wellness: Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of labor metrics such as [jobless claims](#), job change, workplace complaints and lawsuits
6. Social Wellness: Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of social metrics such as discrimination, safety, divorce rates, complaints of domestic conflicts and family lawsuits, public lawsuits, crime rates
7. Political Wellness: Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of political metrics such as the quality of local democracy, individual freedom, and foreign conflicts.

The above seven metrics were incorporated into the first Global GNH Survey.