



# THE SOCIAL INCLUSION INDEX

**In a new regular feature, *Americas Quarterly* unveils a way to measure, track and compare social inclusion in the Americas.**

**W**hat really is social inclusion? From scholars to multilateral banks to President Ollanta Humala of Peru, social inclusion has become the term *du jour*. Implicitly, most of us understand it as more than development; it includes elements of political participation, social rights, civil liberties, and equal access—across race, ethnicity and gender—to social services and labor markets.

If we can define it, presumably we can also measure it, or at least some components of it. There are a number of evolving and sophisticated efforts currently under way to measure elements of social inclusion. One of these is the World Bank's excellent Human Opportunity Index that measures circumstances affecting access to goods and services (education and housing). (See [www.worldbank.org/](http://www.worldbank.org/)

*lacportunity*.) Yet social inclusion also contains an element of political voice and freedom that is often lacking in more economic measures.

Here we present the results of measuring multiple dimensions of social inclusion from a series of private and public meetings held with economists, sociologists, representatives of multilateral banks, and political scientists. Does it include everything? Does it strive for consensus? No and no. For this, the first cut, the point is to begin a debate on the concrete dimensions of social inclusion, how to measure it and where countries rank.

Every two years, we will revisit this index to track changes in social inclusion. We will also refine it over time, adjusting, combining and perhaps adding new variables and countries as relevant data become available.

**INTRODUCTION** Social inclusion is the concept that a citizen has the ability to participate in the basic political, economic and social functioning of his or her society. It includes not just economic empowerment, but also access to basic social services, access to infrastructure (physical and institutional), access to the formal labor market, civil and political participation and voice, and the absence of legally sanctioned discrimination based on race, ethnicity or gender.

States have the capacity (and responsibility) to directly or indirectly affect these conditions. For this reason we have organized the index into: **INPUTS TO SOCIAL INCLUSION** (the political environment, economic conditions, state policies, and access to services that promote social inclusion) and **OUTPUTS OF SOCIAL INCLUSION** (the economic, political and policy outcomes that result from policies, rights and economic conditions that lead to social inclusion over the long term).

For each of the 15 variables below, we scored all 11 countries on a relative scale that we then combined and converted to 0–100 (with 100 representing the highest a country could score if it were to outperform its hemispheric neighbors in all 15 variables). We also developed a scale that included the U.S., based on 7 of the variables for which we have data. With the exception of the U.S., the 15-variable relative score is noted for each country card in the lower right corner. (The U.S. score is based only on its performance regionally in the 7 indicators.) The lower a country’s overall score, the lower its ranking.

On page 122 we rank the 11 countries for which we have data in our Social Inclusion Index, overall and by variable. For more on the methodology we used to calculate the scores and rank the countries, and the data sources we consulted, please visit [www.americasquarterly.org/social-inclusion-index](http://www.americasquarterly.org/social-inclusion-index).

**INPUTS**

**GDP GROWTH** A country can only reduce poverty and inequality if it is growing economically. The first measure of the index takes the average of the country’s growth from 2001–2010.

**PERCENT GDP SPENT ON SOCIAL PROGRAMS** There are no measures of the effectiveness of state spending on social programs, so we used this simpler, imperfect measure of percent GDP spent. Countries were scored on a relative basis, since there is no optimal level—though up to a certain point, more, of course, is better.

**ENROLLMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOL** Since there is near-universal enrollment in primary schools in the region, we chose secondary school to measure access. We used household data disaggregated by gender and race/ethnicity and analyzed by the World Bank (WB). For sake of ease, non-minority refers to respondents who did not self-identify as Indigenous, Afro-descendant or other similar terms in specific countries.

**OUTPUTS**

**PERCENT LIVING ON MORE THAN \$4 PER DAY**  
Based on household data disaggregated by gender and race/ethnicity (non-minority/minority). According to the WB, over \$4 per day is defined as above moderate poverty—for our purposes a better measure than being out of absolute poverty (\$2.50/day).

**PERSONAL EMPOWERMENT**  
This is the standard measure of what is called internal efficacy in political science. Drawn from 2010 *AmericasBarometer* survey data, it is based on the statement, “You feel that you understand the most important political issues of the country,” asking respondents to disagree or agree on scale of 1 to 7. The survey has a margin of error of +/- 2.9%.

INPUTS	OUTPUTS																								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GDP Growth 2001–2010 %</li> <li>• GDP Spent on Social Programs %</li> <li>• Enrollment Secondary School               <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>by gender</td> <td>male %</td> <td>female %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>by race</td> <td>non-minority %</td> <td>minority %</td> </tr> </table> </li> </ul>	by gender	male %	female %	by race	non-minority %	minority %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent Living on More than \$4 per day               <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>by gender</td> <td>male %</td> <td>female %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>by race</td> <td>non-minority %</td> <td>minority %</td> </tr> </table> </li> <li>• Personal Empowerment 1 2 3 4 5</li> <li>• Government Responsiveness (Efficacy) 1 2 3 4</li> <li>• Access to Adequate Housing               <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>by gender</td> <td>male %</td> <td>female %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>by race</td> <td>non-minority %</td> <td>minority %</td> </tr> </table> </li> <li>• Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25–65)               <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>by gender</td> <td>male %</td> <td>female %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>by race</td> <td>non-minority %</td> <td>minority %</td> </tr> </table> </li> </ul>	by gender	male %	female %	by race	non-minority %	minority %	by gender	male %	female %	by race	non-minority %	minority %	by gender	male %	female %	by race	non-minority %	minority %
by gender	male %	female %																							
by race	non-minority %	minority %																							
by gender	male %	female %																							
by race	non-minority %	minority %																							
by gender	male %	female %																							
by race	non-minority %	minority %																							
by gender	male %	female %																							
by race	non-minority %	minority %																							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political Rights 0 10 20 30 40</li> <li>• Civil Rights 0 10 20 30 40 50</li> <li>• Civil Society Participation 1 2 3 4 5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OVERALL SCORE</li> </ul>																								

**POLITICAL RIGHTS**  
These scores, from 0–40—with 40 being the greatest degree of rights—are from Freedom House’s survey of *Freedom in the World 2011*. They evaluate a country’s respect for 10 political rights grouped into 3 categories: the electoral process (3 questions); political pluralism and participation (4); and functioning of government (3).

**CIVIL RIGHTS** These scores, from 0–60—with 60 representing the greatest degree of rights—are from Freedom House’s survey of *Freedom in the World 2011*. They evaluate a country’s respect for 15 civil liberties grouped into 4 categories: freedom of expression and belief (4 questions); associational and organizational rights (3); rule of law (4); and personal autonomy and individual rights (4).

**CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION**  
Based on 2010 survey data from *AmericasBarometer*, this measures the average number of associations respondents said they participated in, out of a possible 6. The survey has a margin of error of +/- 2.9%.

**PERCENT ACCESS TO A FORMAL JOB**  
Based on household data disaggregated by gender and race/ethnicity. An individual between 25 and 65 is considered to have a formal job if he/ she will receive a pension.

**ACCESS TO ADEQUATE HOUSING**  
Based on household data disaggregated by gender and race/ethnicity. It includes 3 indicators of adequate housing: access to water; access to electricity; and lack of severe overcrowding.

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSIVENESS (EFFICACY)** This is the standard measure of what is called external efficacy in political science. Drawn from 2010 *AmericasBarometer* survey data, it is based on the statement, “Those who govern are interested in what people like you think,” asking respondents to disagree or agree on a scale of 1 to 7. The survey has a margin of error of +/- 2.9%.



Name of Country

*Bolivia*

## SOCIAL INCLUSION INDEX 2012

INPUTS		OUTPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	3.85 %	Percent Living on More than \$4 per day	
GDP Spent on Social Programs	16.24 %	by gender	male 54.5 % female 53.6 %
Enrollment Secondary School		by race	non-minority 62.2 % minority 45.7 %
by gender	male 83.4 % female 76.8 %	Personal Empowerment	
by race	non-minority 85.7 % minority 71.5 %	Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)	
Political Rights		Access to Adequate Housing	
Civil Rights		by gender	male 62.5 % female 63.5 %
Civil Society Participation		by race	non-minority 72.4 % minority 53.6 %
<b>COMMENTS</b> Generally high levels of secondary school enrollment are undercut by differences by gender and race. Inequality of access for Indigenous and Afro-Bolivians occurs across education, percent earning more than \$4 per day, access to adequate housing, and access to a formal job.		Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)	
		by gender	male 39.3 % female 42.0 %
		by race	non-minority 42.7 % minority 37.5 %
		<b>BOLIVIA</b> <b>OVERALL SCORE</b> <b>39.0</b>	

Name of Country

*Brazil*

## SOCIAL INCLUSION INDEX 2012

INPUTS		OUTPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	3.60 %	Percent Living on More than \$4 per day	
GDP Spent on Social Programs	26.05 %	by gender	male 72.3 % female 71.4 %
Enrollment Secondary School		by race	non-minority 72.1 % minority 67.8 %
by gender	male 72.0 % female 79.1 %	Personal Empowerment	
by race	non-minority 76.0 % minority 71.4 %	Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)	
Political Rights		Access to Adequate Housing	
Civil Rights		by gender	male 91.3 % female 92.4 %
Civil Society Participation		by race	non-minority 91.9 % minority 92.1 %
<b>COMMENTS</b> Recent years of economic growth have significantly reduced poverty, as the percent living on more than \$4 per day and percent with access to formal jobs show. Brazil is also a leader in percent GDP spent on social programs—and the results can be seen in access to education and adequate housing, though disparity by race and ethnicity remains.		Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)	
		by gender	male 78.2 % female 72.8 %
		by race	non-minority 76.1 % minority 72.0 %
		<b>BRAZIL</b> <b>OVERALL SCORE</b> <b>51.4</b>	



Name of Country

*Chile*

## SOCIAL INCLUSION INDEX 2012

INPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	3.76 %
GDP Spent on Social Programs	14.22 %
Enrollment Secondary School	
by gender	male 90.5% female 90.9%
by race	non-minority 90.8% minority 89.4%
Political Rights	0 10 20 30 39 40
Civil Rights	0 10 20 30 40 50 58
Civil Society Participation	1 1.30 2 3 4 5

## COMMENTS

Consistently high rankings across almost all indicators demonstrate that Chile has harnessed its economic strength and democracy to ensure better quality of life for most citizens. While a small minority in Chile, the difference by race in access to adequate housing stands out—as does the low level of civil society participation.

OUTPUTS	
Percent Living on More than \$4 per day	
by gender	male 88.3% female 87.2%
by race	non-minority 88.2% minority 81.4%
Personal Empowerment	1 2 3 4.12 5
Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)	1 2 3 3.66 4
Access to Adequate Housing	
by gender	male 95.9% female 96.4%
by race	non-minority 97.0% minority 84.3%
Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)	
by gender	male 83.5% female 75.1%
by race	non-minority 80.4% minority 74.4%

## OVERALL SCORE

**CHILE 71.9**

Name of Country

*Colombia*

## SOCIAL INCLUSION INDEX 2012

INPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	4.10 %
GDP Spent on Social Programs	12.59 %
Enrollment Secondary School	
by gender	male 74.9% female 77.7%
by race	non-minority 76.5% minority 73.3%
Political Rights	0 10 20 27 30 40
Civil Rights	0 10 20 30 34 40 50
Civil Society Participation	1 1.92 2 3 4 5

## COMMENTS

Colombia's GDP growth since 2000 marks it as one of the strongest performers. Some, though, have questioned the validity of the WB household data. The low rates of enrollment in secondary school, those living on more than \$4 per day and percent with access to a formal job are unexpectedly low.

OUTPUTS	
Percent Living on More than \$4 per day	
by gender	male 63.8% female 62.9%
by race	non-minority 64.8% minority 48.2%
Personal Empowerment	1 2 3 3.85 4 5
Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)	1 2 3 3.61 4
Access to Adequate Housing	
by gender	male 81.4% female 83.6%
by race	non-minority 84.1% minority 66.4%
Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)	
by gender	male 53.3% female 56.9%
by race	non-minority 55.3% minority 47.6%

## OVERALL SCORE

**COLOMBIA 41.8**

INPUTS		OUTPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	44.0 %	<b>Percent Living on More than \$4 per day</b>	
GDP Spent on Social Programs	6.39 %	by gender	male 68.3% female 66.8%
<b>Enrollment Secondary School</b>		by race	non-minority 70.1% minority 47.1%
by gender	male 82.3% female 83.6%	<b>Personal Empowerment</b>	
by race	non-minority 83.9% minority 75.9%	1	2
<b>Political Rights</b>		3	4
0	10	20	30
		28	40
<b>Civil Rights</b>		1	2
0	10	20	30
		39	40
<b>Civil Society Participation</b>		3	4
1	2	3	4
	1.79		5
<b>COMMENTS</b>			
Some have also questioned the validity of the household data for Ecuador. What's striking is that despite the country's level of polarization, the country's rate of economic growth remains high, as does the sense of personal empowerment.			
		<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	
		Ecuador 43.8	

INPUTS		OUTPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	3.35 %	<b>Percent Living on More than \$4 per day</b>	
GDP Spent on Social Programs	7.03 %	by gender	male 49.1% female 49.0%
<b>Enrollment Secondary School</b>		by race	non-minority 62.5% minority 27.5%
by gender	male 52.9% female 46.0%	<b>Personal Empowerment</b>	
by race	non-minority 57.9% minority 35.0%	1	2
<b>Political Rights</b>		3	4
0	10	20	30
		23	40
<b>Civil Rights</b>		1	2
0	10	20	30
		34	40
<b>Civil Society Participation</b>		3	4
1	2	3	4
	2.35		5
<b>COMMENTS</b>			
Severe inequalities by race and ethnicity remain stark in the outputs and the inputs. Percent of GDP spent on social programs remains among the region's lowest. Indigenous and Afro-Guatemalans lag far behind in enrollment in secondary school, income per capita, access to housing and to formal jobs.			
		<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	
		Guatemala 7.5	

INPUTS		OUTPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	1.66 %	<b>Percent Living on More than \$4 per day</b>	
GDP Spent on Social Programs	12.52 %	by gender	male 72.7% female 71.6%
<b>Enrollment Secondary School</b>		by race	non-minority 75.4% minority 61.3%
by gender	male 73.7% female 76.3%	<b>Personal Empowerment</b> 1 2 3 4 5	
by race	non-minority 76.4% minority 69.9%	<b>Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)</b> 1 2 3 4	
Political Rights	0 10 20 29 30 40	<b>Access to Adequate Housing</b>	
Civil Rights	0 10 20 37 30 40 50	by gender	male 90.0% female 90.4%
Civil Society Participation	1 1.92 2 3 4 5	by race	non-minority 92.0% minority 84.1%
<b>COMMENTS</b> The recession in the U.S. has contributed to Mexico's low rate of GDP growth. Still, poverty levels remain relatively low—though ethnic/race-based differences remain. Greatest challenge: moving more people to formal employment. Good news: high levels of GDP spent on social programs and access to education.		<b>Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)</b>	
		by gender	male 41.1% female 43.6%
		by race	non-minority 44.3% minority 33.1%
		<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	
		<b>MEXICO 39.0</b>	

INPUTS		OUTPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	2.94 %	<b>Percent Living on More than \$4 per day</b>	
GDP Spent on Social Programs	12.30 %	by gender	male 36.6% female 37.5%
<b>Enrollment Secondary School</b>		by race	non-minority 37.5% minority 27.1%
by gender	male 47.6% female 59.6%	<b>Personal Empowerment</b> 1 2 3 4 5	
by race	non-minority 54.2% minority 44.9%	<b>Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)</b> 1 2 3 4	
Political Rights	0 10 20 20 30 40	<b>Access to Adequate Housing</b>	
Civil Rights	0 10 20 34 30 40 50	by gender	male 23.9% female 27.0%
Civil Society Participation	1 2.03 2 3 4 5	by race	non-minority 26.4% minority 8.2%
<b>COMMENTS</b> Levels of poverty remain some of the highest in the region, and the country's input scores indicate why. GDP growth remains low, as do the country's levels of school enrollment and political and civil rights.		<b>Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)</b>	
		by gender	male 34.9% female 50.4%
		by race	non-minority 40.4% minority 50.2%
		<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	
		<b>NICARAGUA 10.3</b>	



INPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	4.10 %
GDP Spent on Social Programs	8.87 %
Enrollment Secondary School	
by gender	male 74.6 % female 73.4 %
by race	non-minority 84.5 % minority 57.8 %
Political Rights	0 10 20 28 30 40
Civil Rights	0 10 20 36 40 50
Civil Society Participation	1 2.40 3 4 5

**COMMENTS**

High general rates of enrollment in secondary school are undermined by the disparity by ethnicity. This disparity holds across poverty levels, access to adequate housing and access to a formal job. Can Paraguay convert its level of economic growth, civil society participation and sense of empowerment into more expansive, effective social programs?

OUTPUTS	
Percent Living on More than \$4 per day	
by gender	male 62.8 % female 62.6 %
by race	non-minority 75.6 % minority 44.3 %
Personal Empowerment	1 2 3 3.18 4 5
Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)	1 2 2.92 3 4
Access to Adequate Housing	
by gender	male 66.9 % female 68.2 %
by race	non-minority 78.8 % minority 51.5 %
Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)	
by gender	male 37.8 % female 40.6 %
by race	non-minority 44.9 % minority 22.3 %

<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>
<b>PARAGUAY 21.2</b>



INPUTS	
GDP Growth 2001-2010	5.72 %
GDP Spent on Social Programs	7.82 %
Enrollment Secondary School	
by gender	male 81.5 % female 80.8 %
by race	non-minority 79.7 % minority 83.0 %
Political Rights	0 10 20 30 31 40
Civil Rights	0 10 20 30 40 41 50
Civil Society Participation	1 2.24 3 4 5

**COMMENTS**

The contrast between the country's rate of economic growth and investment in social programs could not be starker. Despite this, Peru remains strong in all the inputs—educational access, political and civil rights and civil society participation, as well as in income per capita—increasing the chance that the other indicators will improve over time.

OUTPUTS	
Percent Living on More than \$4 per day	
by gender	male 65.5 % female 64.2 %
by race	non-minority 71.8 % minority 55.4 %
Personal Empowerment	1 2 3 3.73 4 5
Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)	1 2 3 3.02 4
Access to Adequate Housing	
by gender	male 58.1 % female 58.8 %
by race	non-minority 64.4 % minority 50.4 %
Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)	
by gender	male 62.5 % female 48.9 %
by race	non-minority 61.2 % minority 49.1 %

<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>
<b>PERU 43.8</b>



Name of Country

*United States*

## SOCIAL INCLUSION INDEX 2012

INPUTS		OUTPUTS				
GDP Growth 2001-2010	1.58 %	Percent Living on More than \$4 per day				
GDP Spent on Social Programs	16.20 %	by gender	male	— %	female	— %
Enrollment Secondary School		by race	non-minority	— %	minority	— %
by gender	male — % female — %	Personal Empowerment				
by race	non-minority — % minority — %	1	2	3	4	5
Political Rights	0 10 20 30 40	38	Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)			
Civil Rights	0 10 20 30 40 50	56	1	2	3	4
Civil Society Participation	1 1.46 2 3 4 5	Access to Adequate Housing				
<b>COMMENTS</b> GDP growth in a developed economy such as the U.S. will not reach the rates of its developing neighbors, though the economic recession certainly hurt levels of social inclusion overall. And while political and civil rights remain high, the extremely low popular sense of government responsiveness is noteworthy.		by gender	male	— %	female	— %
		by race	non-minority	— %	minority	— %
		Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)				
		by gender	male	— %	female	— %
		by race	non-minority	— %	minority	— %
		<b>UNITED STATES</b>		<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>		
				<b>43.3</b>		

Name of Country

*Uruguay*

## SOCIAL INCLUSION INDEX 2012

INPUTS		OUTPUTS				
GDP Growth 2001-2010	3.46 %	Percent Living on More than \$4 per day				
GDP Spent on Social Programs	21.65 %	by gender	male	88.9 %	female	89.0 %
Enrollment Secondary School		by race	non-minority	89.5 %	minority	78.9 %
by gender	male 78.2 % female 85.8 %	Personal Empowerment				
by race	non-minority 82.5 % minority 69.3 %	1	2	3	4	5
Political Rights	0 10 20 30 40	39	Government Responsiveness (Efficacy)			
Civil Rights	0 10 20 30 40 50	58	1	2	3	4
Civil Society Participation	1 1.14 2 3 4 5	Access to Adequate Housing				
<b>COMMENTS</b> The country's deep commitment to social justice is reflected in its social spending, but the sustainability of its efforts lies in its rates of economic growth, poverty levels and high levels of political and civil rights. The one outlier? As in Chile, civil society participation—a sign of contentment or disengagement?		by gender	male	95.8 %	female	96.7 %
		by race	non-minority	96.5 %	minority	92.1 %
		Percent Access to a Formal Job (age 25-65)				
		by gender	male	88.1 %	female	82.5 %
		by race	non-minority	85.9 %	minority	77.6 %
		<b>URUGUAY</b>		<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>		
				<b>71.2</b>		



**HOW THE COUNTRIES RANK**

We scored each of the 11 countries relatively for all 15 indicators (Inputs and Outputs), giving each country a score of 1-11 and then converting the totals into a 0-100 scale. All variables were weighted equally. Below is how each country ranks relative to the others in those totals. To the right below we show how the countries ranked in each of the 15 variables (or, in the case of the U.S., in the 7 variables for which we had data). It is within the individual variables that some real surprises occur: Chile lands at 10 in civil society participation, and Bolivia scores well in the areas in which Chile scored poorly—civil society participation and government responsiveness. The latter should give hope for the future, the former perhaps some concern about the need for political renovation in Chile. (For how we calculated the variables and the rankings visit [www.americasquarterly.org/social-inclusion-index](http://www.americasquarterly.org/social-inclusion-index).)

**RELATIVE RANKING ON 15 VARIABLES**

That **Chile** and **Uruguay** rank the highest in social inclusion is no surprise. The ranking, however, obscures the differences among the countries. Despite coming in third, **Brazil's** aggregate score of 51.4 is far below **Chile's** (71.9) and **Uruguay's** (71.2). **Ecuador**, in fourth place, was boosted by above-average scores in GDP growth and secondary-school enrollment, though, as mentioned earlier, the latter numbers have been questioned. **Mexico's** appearance in the middle of the pack is consistent with its performance across the variables, with one important exception—living on more than \$4 per day, which is high even taking into account gender and race.

- 1 **Chile**
- 2 **Uruguay**
- 3 **Brazil**
- 4 **Ecuador**  
**Peru**
- 5 **Colombia**
- 6 **Bolivia**  
**Mexico**
- 7 **Paraguay**
- 8 **Nicaragua**
- 9 **Guatemala**

**RANKING BY OTHER VARIABLES**

Variable by variable, this is how the countries stacked up. One methodological note: for the indicators secondary-school enrollment, daily income, access to adequate housing and access to a formal job, to take into account countrywide rates and differences by gender and race/ethnicity for each category, we calculated the differences between male/female and non-minority/minority and then subtracted those from the overall national percent. The idea was to score countries by their overall performance with penalties for the differences in access by gender and race/ethnicity. The differences were not weighted by population size, based on the assumption that differences in the distribution of resources matter regardless of the size of the population.

**INPUTS**

% GDP GROWTH 2001-2010, CONSTANT PRICES	
Includes U.S.	
PERU	1
ECUADOR	2
COLOMBIA PARAGUAY	3
BOLIVIA	4
CHILE	5
BRAZIL	6
URUGUAY	7
GUATEMALA	8
NICARAGUA	9
MEXICO	10
UNITED STATES	11

% GDP SPENT ON SOCIAL PROGRAMS	
Includes U.S.	
BRAZIL	1
URUGUAY	2
BOLIVIA	3
UNITED STATES	4
CHILE	5
COLOMBIA	6
MEXICO	7
NICARAGUA	8
PARAGUAY	9
PERU	10
GUATEMALA	11
ECUADOR	12

% ENROLLMENT SECONDARY SCHOOL BY GENDER (MALE/FEMALE)	
Does not include U.S.	
CHILE	1
ECUADOR	2
PERU	3
URUGUAY	4
BOLIVIA	5
COLOMBIA	6
PARAGUAY	7
MEXICO	8
BRAZIL	9
GUATEMALA	10
NICARAGUA	11

% ENROLLMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOL BY RACE (NON-MINORITY/MINORITY)	
Does not include U.S.	
CHILE	1
PERU	2
ECUADOR	3
COLOMBIA	4
BRAZIL	5
URUGUAY	6
MEXICO	7
BOLIVIA	8
PARAGUAY	9
NICARAGUA	10
GUATEMALA	11

POLITICAL RIGHTS	
Includes U.S.	
CHILE URUGUAY	1
UNITED STATES	2
BRAZIL	3
PERU	4
MEXICO	5
ECUADOR PARAGUAY	6
BOLIVIA COLOMBIA	7
GUATEMALA	8
NICARAGUA	9

CIVIL RIGHTS	
Includes U.S.	
CHILE URUGUAY	1
UNITED STATES	2
BRAZIL	3
PERU	4
BOLIVIA ECUADOR	5
MEXICO	6
PARAGUAY	7
COLOMBIA GUATEMALA NICARAGUA	8

CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION	
Includes U.S.	
BOLIVIA	1
PARAGUAY	2
GUATEMALA	3
PERU	4
NICARAGUA	5
MEXICO COLOMBIA	6
ECUADOR	7
UNITED STATES	8
BRAZIL	9
CHILE	10
URUGUAY	11

**OUTPUTS**

% LIVING ON MORE THAN \$4 PER DAY BY GENDER (MALE/FEMALE)	
Does not include U.S.	
URUGUAY	1
CHILE	2
MEXICO	3
BRAZIL	4
ECUADOR	5
PERU	6
PARAGUAY	7
COLOMBIA	8
BOLIVIA	9
GUATEMALA	10
NICARAGUA	11

% LIVING ON MORE THAN \$4 PER DAY BY RACE (NON-MINORITY/MINORITY)	
Does not include U.S.	
CHILE	1
URUGUAY	2
BRAZIL	3
MEXICO	4
PERU	5
COLOMBIA	6
ECUADOR	7
BOLIVIA	8
PARAGUAY	9
NICARAGUA	10
GUATEMALA	11

PERSONAL EMPOWERMENT	
Includes U.S.	
UNITED STATES	1
URUGUAY	2
NICARAGUA	3
CHILE	4
ECUADOR	5
BOLIVIA	6
GUATEMALA MEXICO	7
COLOMBIA	8
PERU	9
BRAZIL	10
PARAGUAY	11

GOVERNMENT RESPONSIVENESS (EFFICACY)	
Includes U.S.	
URUGUAY	1
BOLIVIA	2
CHILE	3
COLOMBIA	4
MEXICO	5
ECUADOR	6
NICARAGUA	7
BRAZIL	8
PERU	9
PARAGUAY	10
UNITED STATES	11
GUATEMALA	12

% ACCESS TO ADEQUATE HOUSING BY GENDER (MALE/FEMALE)	
Does not include U.S.	
CHILE	1
URUGUAY	2
BRAZIL	3
MEXICO	4
ECUADOR	5
COLOMBIA	6
PARAGUAY	7
BOLIVIA	8
PERU	9
GUATEMALA	10
NICARAGUA	11

% ACCESS TO ADEQUATE HOUSING BY RACE (NON-MINORITY/MINORITY)	
Does not include U.S.	
URUGUAY	1
BRAZIL	2
CHILE	3
MEXICO	4
ECUADOR	5
COLOMBIA	6
PERU	7
BOLIVIA	8
PARAGUAY	9
GUATEMALA	10
NICARAGUA	11

% ACCESS TO A FORMAL JOB, AGES 25-65 BY GENDER (MALE/FEMALE)	
Does not include U.S.	
URUGUAY	1
CHILE	2
BRAZIL	3
COLOMBIA	4
PERU	5
MEXICO	6
ECUADOR	7
GUATEMALA	8
BOLIVIA	9
PARAGUAY	10
NICARAGUA	11

% ACCESS TO A FORMAL JOB, AGES 25-65 BY RACE (NON-MINORITY/MINORITY)	
Does not include U.S.	
URUGUAY	1
CHILE	2
BRAZIL	3
COLOMBIA	4
PERU	5
ECUADOR	6
BOLIVIA	7
MEXICO NICARAGUA	8
GUATEMALA	9
PARAGUAY	10