

The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 of the Quality of Democracy: Method and Ranking Outcome

David F. J. Campbell

Georg Pölzlbauer

February 23, 2009

David F. J. Campbell
Research Fellow
University of Klagenfurt
Faculty for Interdisciplinary Studies (IFF)
Institute of Science Communication and
Higher Education Research (WIHO)
A-1070 Vienna, Austria
david.campbell@uni-klu.ac.at
<http://www.uni-klu.ac.at/wiho>

Georg Pölzlbauer
Vienna University of Technology
Institute of Software Technology and Interactive Systems
Information and Software Engineering Group
A-1040 Vienna, Austria
poelzlbauer@ifs.tuwien.ac.at
<http://www.ifs.tuwien.ac.at/~poelzlbauer>

Recommended citation: Campbell, David F. J. / Georg Pölzlbauer (2009). The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 of the Quality of Democracy: Method and Ranking Outcome. Vienna: Democracy Ranking.

© Copyright by David F. J. Campbell & Georg Pölzlbauer, 2009.
All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

1. Method of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 of the Quality of Democracy	3
2. References	9
3. Ranking Outcome of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009: Scoreboards	10
4. Appendix: Overview and Definition of the Indicators Assigned per Dimension for the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009	20

1. Method of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 of the Quality of Democracy

The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 refers to a unique quantitative model. This model is governed by the following methodic principles:

1. *Conceptual and methodic source:* The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 is based on the originally developed “Feasibility Study” (Campbell and Sükösd, 2002) and early experiences gained from the “Pilot Ranking 2000” (Campbell and Sükösd, 2003). The feasibility study developed the general framework and conceptual architecture of the “dimensions” of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 and suggested furthermore a specific assignment of quantitative indicators to the different dimensions. In the “Pilot Ranking 2000” this general framework was tested empirically for the first time. Emphasizing the need for a permanent learning process and in reflection of discussions and discourse, the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 moderately modified and adapted the set of assigned indicators and their weighting. Future Democracy Rankings might continue these procedures of indicator and weight adjustment.¹ However, the past ranking years then always will be recalculated, thus enabling a steady and continuous comparison across time, reaching back to the first ranking years as initial benchmark. The “Basic Concept for the Democracy Ranking” (Campbell 2008) provides further conceptual and theoretical evidence for the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 and the successively planned democracy rankings. The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009, furthermore, continues and updates the ranking data of the previous Democracy Ranking 2008 (Campbell and Pölzlbauer, 2008).
2. *Objectives:* The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 creates a comparative ranking of the quality of democracy for two two-year periods of all

¹) This also underscores the premise that a “perfect” model for democracy ranking does not exist. Or to phrase it differently: there never will be unanimous consensus about what such a perfect model would have to be. Modifications of indicator usage thus leverage the opportunity of creating alternative insights in democracy.

democracies (country-based democracies) world-wide. The scope and format of the ranking is global. As democracies all countries are classified that are “free” or at least “partly free”.² “Not free” countries are not considered as being democratic and thus are not included in the democracy ranking.³ The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 is interested in displaying the (average) ranking scores for each two-year period specifically as well as in demonstrating ranking score increases and decreases by contrasting these two two-year periods. This encourages that in addition to the actual ranking placement also changes over time are reflected and acknowledged. The results and scores of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 may be interpreted as a general orientation how the democracies compare and rank to each other in a global format with regard to the quality of democracy. The Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 wants to encourage discussion and discourse. More focused country case studies can reveal how plausible or implausible these ranking scores are for specific democracies.

3. *Country sample (covered democracies):* All countries are covered by the current ranking that fulfill the following criteria; (a) are classified by Freedom House as “free” or at least “partly free” during the whole years 2005-2007⁴; (b) have a population of at least one million; (c) and where a maximum number of indicators with missing values⁵ per dimension was not exceeded. Furthermore, not covered countries (because they are not systematically represented by the used sources)

²) This decision makes explicit that only free or partly free countries should be included in a democracy ranking. A democracy ranking is not the proper location for non-free countries.

³) For assessments of how free or not free countries (democracies) are, we refer to Freedom House as key source.

⁴) Freedom House released findings of the “Map of Freedom 2009”, referring to the year 2008, on January 12, 2009. At that time most of the data groundwork for the early release of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 already was completed. Of course the effect could occur that some of the countries that Freedom House listed as free or partly free during 2005-2007 may be re-categorized as “not free” in 2008 or 2009. For further details on the “Map of Freedom 2009”, see: <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=445>

⁵) Because of this “missing” rule it was decided not to cover the following countries by the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009: Afghanistan, Liberia, Lesotho, and Serbia.

are: Hong Kong, Puerto Rico, Taiwan, West Bank and Gaza. In total, this results in a sample of 103 countries for the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009.

4. *Covered years (2002-2003 and 2005-2006)*: The ranking consists of two rankings, focusing on average values of the two two-year periods 2002-2003 and 2005-2006. This adds in a dynamic component, allowing for a comparison and tracking of changes and shifts of ranking positions over time.⁶
5. *The individual dimensions as a basis for the final comprehensive (aggregated) ranking*: In conceptual terms, the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 is based on the following six individual dimensions (one political dimension, five non-political dimensions); (a) politics (political system); (b) gender (socioeconomic gender equality); (c) economy (economic system); (d) knowledge (knowledge-based information society, education and research); (e) health (health status and health system); and (f) environment (environmental sustainability).
6. *Assignment of indicators per dimension and the ranking aggregation procedure*: The following procedures are applied; (a) per dimension, a specific set of quantitative indicators has been assigned; (b) for 2002-2003 as well as 2005-2006 average indicator values are being calculated; (c) for the whole two two-year period 2002-2006 (2002-2003 and 2005-2006) all assigned indicators are “numerically proportionally” transformed into a value range of “1-100”. “1” represents the weakest (poorest) value⁷, and “100” the strongest (best) value, with regard to the quality of democracy; (d) per dimension, specific ranking scores are calculated for all the covered democracies for 2002-2003 and 2005-2006; (e) finally, on the basis of the ranking

⁶) The previous Democracy Ranking 2008 covered the years 2001-2002 and 2004-2005 (Campbell and Pözlbauer, 2008).

⁷) The decision to use “1”, and not “0”, as the lowest value should deliver the symbolic message that in context of a democracy ranking every democracy ranks above zero and thus falls in a “positive” value range.

scores (indicator values) of the individual dimensions and in accordance with a specific weighting of those dimensions, the six dimensions are being aggregated to the comprehensive Democracy Ranking 2008/2009.

7. *Documentation of the indicators assigned per dimension:* In the Appendix, the indicators are being exactly documented that have been used and assigned per dimension. In total, the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 is based on 45 indicators.
8. *Weighting of the individual dimensions:* The following weight measures are assigned to the dimensions for the procedure of the comprehensive ranking aggregation for the periods 2002-2003 and 2005-2006; (a) politics 50%; (b) gender 10%; (c) economy 10%; (d) knowledge 10%; (e) health 10%; and (f) environment 10%.
9. *Weighting of indicators in context of the dimensions:* Possible weight measures of the indicators for the ranking of democracies in the context of individual dimensions are revealed in the Appendix. Weights should indicate the potential influence of different indicators on the concept of the quality of democracy.
10. *Treatment of missing values for the indicators:* In case of missing values for indicators of the five non-political dimensions, the year 2001 was leveraged as an estimator for 2002-2003 and the year 2004 as an estimator for 2005-2006. For the political dimension the years 2001 and 2004 were not used as estimators, because normally there were no values for 2001 and 2004, when also no values were available for 2002-2003 and 2005-2006. Further specifications for the political dimension and five non-political dimensions are, with regard to the treatment of missing values for the individual country-based democracies; (a) in case of missing values for the whole period 2002-2003 (and 2001), the transformed (1-100) average value of 2005-2006 was taken; (b) in case of missing values for the whole period 2005-2006 (and 2004), the transformed (1-100) average value of 2002-2003 was taken; (c) in case of missing values for the total period 2001-

2006, the transformed (1-100) average score of that country (democracy) for that specific dimension (2002-2003 and 2005-2006) was taken.

11. *Comprehensive gender dimension:* Gender indicators with a political orientation are assigned to the political dimension, thus the political dimension already contains gender information. The gender dimension of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 falls more in line with socioeconomic gender equality, where the socioeconomic status of women is being compared across different democracies. To know what a possible ranking pattern of a broader gender dimension might be, the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 calculates a “comprehensive gender dimension” (a so-called seventh dimension). The ranking scores of that comprehensive gender dimension are also documented; however, they do not impact the aggregated ranking of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 (only the socioeconomic gender dimension does). The comprehensive gender dimension results from the dimension of socioeconomic gender equality and the political indicators P1-P4 (see the Appendix for an exact definition), where the following weight measures are being assigned: “socioeconomic gender equality” 50%, P1 15%, P2 15%, P3 15%, and P4 5%.

12. *Empirical source of the indicators for the Democracy Ranking 2008:* All indicators for the five non-political dimensions (gender [socioeconomic gender equality], economy, knowledge, health, and environment) are taken from the World Bank CD-ROM publication “World Development Indicators ’08” (World Bank, 2008). In that context it should be mentioned that these World Development Indicators frequently are pooled by the World Bank from other renowned sources. For each indicator, the World Bank always cites precisely the original data source. Concerning the political dimension, reference is being made to Freedom House (most prominently the “Freedom in the World”⁸ country ranking database) as key source for the political indicators. Additional sources for the political dimension are the United Nations Development Program (e.g., “Human

⁸) See: http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/AggregateScores_2003-2008.xls

Development Report 2007/2008”⁹⁾, Transparency International (such as the “TI 2006 Corruption Perceptions Index”¹⁰⁾) and subsequent editions of the “Political Handbook of the World” (for example, Banks et al., 2007). In the Appendix, the source for every indicator is always acknowledged.

13. *The ranking scores of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009 of the Quality of Democracy:* In Chapter 3, the ranking scores for the comprehensive Democracy Ranking and for the individual dimensions are documented in a series of scoreboards.

⁹⁾ See:

http://hdr.undp.org/xmlsearch/reportSearch?y=* &c=* &t=* &k=&orderby=year

¹⁰⁾ See: http://www.transparency.org/publications/annual_report

2. References

Banks, Arthur S. / Thomas C. Muller / William R. Overstreet (eds.) (2007). Political Handbook of the World 2007. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press (CQ Press).

Campbell, David F. J. (2008). The Basic Concept for the Democracy Ranking of the Quality of Democracy. Vienna: Democracy Ranking. http://www.democracyranking.org/downloads/basic_concept_democracy_ranking_2008_A4.pdf and http://www.democracyranking.org/downloads/basic_concept_democracy_ranking_2008_letter.pdf

Campbell, David F. J. / Georg Pözlbauer (2008). The Democracy Ranking 2008 of the Quality of Democracy: Method and Ranking Outcome. Vienna: Democracy Ranking.

Campbell, David F. J. / Miklós Sükösd (eds.) (2002). Feasibility Study for a Quality Ranking of Democracies. Vienna: Global Democracy Award. http://www.democracyranking.org/downloads/feasibility_study-a4-e-01.pdf and http://www.democracyranking.org/downloads/feasibility_study-letter-e-01.pdf

Campbell, David F. J. / Miklós Sükösd (eds.) (2003). Global Quality Ranking of Democracies: Pilot Ranking 2000. Vienna: Global Democracy Award. http://www.democracyranking.org/downloads/folder_a4-e-03.pdf and http://www.democracyranking.org/downloads/folder_letter-e-03.pdf

World Bank (2008). World Development Indicators '08 (CD-ROM). Washington DC: World Bank.

3. Ranking Outcome of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009: Scoreboards

	Total Score	Rank	Total Score	Rank	Democracy Loss/Gain	Democracy Loss/Gain
	2002-2003	2002-2003	2005-2006	2005-2006	Rating	Score
Sweden	88.69	1	89.54	1	84	0.8
Norway	86.77	2	87.72	2	80	1.0
Denmark	86.08	3	87.13	3	79	1.0
Finland	83.78	4	85.82	4	50	2.0
Switzerland	82.59	6	85.39	5	34	2.8
Netherlands	83.42	5	84.90	6	64	1.5
New Zealand	81.47	7	82.78	7	69	1.3
Austria	80.89	9	82.75	8	53	1.9
Australia	80.92	8	82.00	9	76	1.1
Belgium	79.82	11	81.89	10	49	2.1
Germany	80.25	10	81.38	11	75	1.1
United Kingdom	78.82	12	80.50	12	56	1.7
Canada	78.57	13	80.21	13	59	1.6
Ireland	76.82	15	79.54	14	36	2.7
Spain	75.57	17	78.72	15	30	3.2
United States	77.01	14	78.22	16	70	1.2
France	75.87	16	76.94	17	77	1.1
Portugal	75.09	18	75.74	18	85	0.7
Japan	73.05	19	74.41	19	68	1.4
Slovenia	71.10	20	72.51	20	67	1.4
Israel	70.68	22	72.44	21	54	1.8
Italy	70.71	21	72.35	22	58	1.6
Estonia	66.47	24	71.69	23	9	5.2
Costa Rica	69.16	23	71.54	24	43	2.4
Greece	66.19	27	70.69	25	17	4.5
Lithuania	66.35	25	70.63	26	19	4.3
Latvia	65.69	28	69.29	27	25	3.6
Uruguay	64.37	32	69.17	28	12	4.8
Czech Republic	64.69	31	68.96	29	20	4.3
Chile	65.52	29	68.92	30	28	3.4
Hungary	66.26	26	68.65	31	42	2.4
Korea, Rep.	63.54	34	68.31	32	14	4.8
Poland	65.45	30	67.08	33	60	1.6
Slovak Republic	62.44	36	66.66	34	21	4.2
Mauritius	63.74	33	65.68	35	52	1.9
Argentina	59.76	39	64.59	36	11	4.8
Croatia	60.88	37	64.44	37	27	3.6
Bulgaria	62.74	35	63.88	38	72	1.1
Panama	60.05	38	62.70	39	37	2.7
Mexico	58.74	41	60.38	40	57	1.6
Peru	59.09	40	60.22	41	74	1.1

Singapore	54.48	47	59.15	42	15	4.7
Brazil	56.84	42	58.27	43	65	1.4
Romania	55.80	43	57.29	44	63	1.5
El Salvador	54.30	48	56.71	45	40	2.4
Dominican Republic	53.86	50	56.43	46	38	2.6
Trinidad and Tobago	53.19	52	56.28	47	32	3.1
Ecuador	52.68	54	56.28	48	26	3.6
Jamaica	55.02	45	56.16	49	73	1.1
South Africa	53.78	51	55.52	50	55	1.7
Bolivia	55.17	44	54.74	51	94	-0.4
Mongolia	54.02	49	54.61	52	87	0.6
Philippines	54.55	46	54.10	53	95	-0.4
Ghana	47.06	66	52.11	54	10	5.0
Colombia	48.52	63	51.73	55	29	3.2
Albania	52.39	55	51.72	56	98	-0.7
Namibia	50.18	57	51.59	57	66	1.4
India	48.52	62	51.48	58	33	3.0
Botswana	52.82	53	51.39	59	100	-1.4
Ukraine	42.51	75	51.26	60	4	8.8
Honduras	48.67	60	51.14	61	39	2.5
Senegal	48.56	61	50.84	62	46	2.3
Nicaragua	50.53	56	50.82	63	91	0.3
Mali	49.41	58	49.85	64	88	0.4
Macedonia, FYR	48.50	64	49.37	65	83	0.9
Turkey	43.29	74	48.75	66	7	5.5
Georgia	44.69	71	48.45	67	22	3.8
Moldova	47.31	65	48.20	68	81	0.9
Bosnia and Herzegovina	41.64	79	47.41	69	6	5.8
Paraguay	46.33	68	47.39	70	78	1.1
Indonesia	42.48	76	46.93	71	18	4.4
Papua New Guinea	49.31	59	46.42	72	101	-2.9
Guatemala	44.63	72	46.17	73	62	1.5
Benin	43.86	73	46.10	74	47	2.2
Sri Lanka	46.58	67	46.04	75	96	-0.5
Malaysia	42.07	77	45.79	76	24	3.7
Venezuela, RB	45.18	70	45.09	77	93	-0.1
Madagascar	45.61	69	44.93	78	99	-0.7
Tanzania	41.30	80	42.46	79	71	1.2
Kuwait	39.99	82	42.38	80	41	2.4
Niger	35.92	90	41.23	81	8	5.3
Lebanon	30.62	96	40.39	82	2	9.8
Bangladesh	38.16	83	40.39	83	48	2.2
Jordan	34.60	92	39.37	84	13	4.8
Malawi	36.90	88	39.23	85	45	2.3
Kenya	31.89	94	39.21	86	5	7.3

Morocco	37.42	86	39.01	87	61	1.6
Uganda	36.05	89	38.82	88	35	2.8
Guinea-Bissau	29.53	98	38.67	89	3	9.1
Kyrgyz Republic	34.62	91	38.35	90	23	3.7
Burkina Faso	37.99	84	38.33	91	89	0.3
Armenia	41.94	78	38.08	92	102	-3.9
Mozambique	37.17	87	37.77	93	86	0.6
Gambia, The	37.94	85	37.37	94	97	-0.6
Gabon	40.26	81	35.93	95	103	-4.3
Burundi	25.02	102	35.75	96	1	10.7
Sierra Leone	34.58	93	35.45	97	82	0.9
Mauritania	30.66	95	32.68	98	51	2.0
Ethiopia	28.78	99	31.12	99	44	2.3
Central African Republic	26.27	101	30.91	100	16	4.6
Zambia	30.57	97	30.87	101	90	0.3
Nigeria	26.46	100	29.59	102	31	3.1
Yemen, Rep.	24.50	103	24.49	103	92	0.0
	Green: Within the highest third of all countries	Green: Country is among the 10 best	Green: Within the highest third of all countries	Green: Country is among the 10 best	Green: Country is among the 10 best	Green: Gain of democracy score
	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		Blue: Within the medium third of all countries			
	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries	Red: Country is among the 10 worst	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries	Red: Country is among the 10 worst	Red: Country is among the 10 worst	Red: Loss of democracy score

	Political System Scores							
	2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006
Sweden	97.87	99.02	Panama	61.57	63.87	Guatemala	37.24	38.71
Finland	94.87	97.13	Namibia	61.59	63.55	Sri Lanka	40.29	38.06
Norway	96.20	96.62	Mexico	60.69	62.89	Venezuela, RB	41.14	37.54
Denmark	95.90	95.36	Peru	59.72	61.29	Malaysia	29.75	35.79
Netherlands	92.63	93.82	Dominican Republic	59.00	60.81	Burundi	14.50	35.24
Belgium	88.16	91.62	Botswana	65.09	59.77	Uganda	30.51	34.81
New Zealand	91.11	91.00	Senegal	56.56	59.45	Zambia	36.27	34.56
Austria	87.84	90.18	Jamaica	58.56	59.09	Bangladesh	29.96	33.92
Germany	88.41	89.53	Benin	56.35	59.06	Nigeria	26.52	32.35
Australia	89.07	89.19	Mongolia	59.95	59.00	Gambia, The	34.17	30.60
Canada	88.47	89.05	India	54.06	58.20	Lebanon	12.51	29.91
Switzerland	85.03	88.68	Mali	57.51	57.00	Central African Republic	20.65	29.26
Spain	82.45	86.01	Romania	57.49	56.84	Jordan	21.00	28.44
United Kingdom	84.62	85.91	Brazil	56.00	56.84	Kuwait	25.07	28.26
Portugal	82.66	83.47	El Salvador	52.92	55.56	Morocco	26.14	27.75
Ireland	81.49	82.89	Philippines	57.85	55.35	Ethiopia	22.47	25.60
United States	80.83	81.00	Bolivia	56.02	54.94	Kyrgyz Republic	17.61	24.41
Costa Rica	77.76	80.77	Ecuador	49.59	53.70	Mauritania	20.95	24.13
Estonia	73.82	80.45	Nicaragua	52.13	51.66	Armenia	32.57	23.47
France	79.57	79.84	Ukraine	33.79	49.44	Gabon	32.11	22.39
Chile	71.93	77.15	Mozambique	48.31	49.18	Yemen, Rep.	14.43	13.86
South Africa	77.14	76.83	Macedonia, FYR	48.24	48.95			
Lithuania	71.28	76.21	Honduras	45.28	48.89			
Uruguay	70.08	75.53	Tanzania	45.55	47.45	Green: Within the highest third of all countries		
Slovenia	74.95	75.09	Indonesia	39.00	46.49			
Slovak Republic	69.01	74.18	Singapore	39.85	46.22			
Latvia	70.66	74.16	Papua New Guinea	53.24	45.97			
Czech Republic	67.92	74.14	Niger	36.05	45.80	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		
Poland	73.02	74.13	Guinea-Bissau	27.66	45.76			
Italy	72.21	73.51	Albania	47.79	44.80			
Japan	72.42	72.99	Colombia	41.54	44.79			
Hungary	69.40	72.84	Turkey	36.69	44.34	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries		
Bulgaria	71.42	70.54	Bosnia and Herzegovina	36.05	44.18			
Israel	70.33	70.53	Kenya	29.93	44.02			
Greece	64.88	70.49	Moldova	43.42	43.82			
Mauritius	68.16	70.43	Madagascar	44.54	43.08			
Argentina	62.53	67.69	Malawi	38.61	42.28			
Korea, Rep.	61.10	67.68	Sierra Leone	38.67	41.43			
Croatia	63.05	67.44	Paraguay	40.21	41.07			
Ghana	58.91	66.63	Georgia	33.74	41.01			
Trinidad and Tobago	63.29	66.36	Burkina Faso	39.75	39.44			

Gender Equality (Socioeconomic) Scores								
	2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006
Norway	87.00	87.77	Chile	69.52	71.02	Uganda	45.19	47.60
New Zealand	84.84	87.60	Slovak Republic	68.71	70.51	Mali	43.94	47.11
Finland	86.39	86.63	Kyrgyz Republic	68.55	69.97	Gambia, The	43.16	45.84
Sweden	90.07	86.49	Brazil	67.95	69.31	Mauritania	42.46	44.49
Australia	85.72	86.34	Colombia	63.17	69.11	Ethiopia	38.41	43.17
Denmark	84.16	85.56	Malaysia	67.43	69.09	Kenya	38.55	41.72
United States	82.91	84.11	Georgia	71.51	69.01	Burundi	35.85	39.36
Slovenia	82.63	84.10	Costa Rica	66.21	68.60	Botswana	38.84	39.22
United Kingdom	82.86	83.78	Mexico	66.98	68.40	South Africa	31.04	38.04
Canada	82.07	83.61	Bolivia	67.83	68.06	Malawi	34.94	37.59
France	81.08	82.67	Panama	63.46	67.72	Namibia	36.88	36.66
Lithuania	79.59	82.31	Philippines	64.22	67.16	Burkina Faso	30.32	33.38
Ireland	79.92	82.31	Sri Lanka	65.54	67.14	Benin	28.51	31.57
Bosnia and Herzegovina	78.37	82.05	El Salvador	64.10	66.63	Yemen, Rep.	27.33	31.11
Estonia	79.09	82.00	Albania	65.05	66.63	Mozambique	29.89	30.02
Netherlands	81.27	81.58	Peru	65.83	66.63	Zambia	26.51	29.92
Japan	80.18	81.49	Honduras	63.75	66.42	Niger	26.35	28.97
Belgium	83.32	81.40	Venezuela, RB	62.87	66.19	Central African Republic	27.09	28.19
Israel	79.35	81.11	Jamaica	64.09	65.61	Nigeria	24.22	24.59
Switzerland	79.96	81.00	Paraguay	64.54	65.61	Guinea-Bissau	20.83	21.11
Austria	79.60	80.34	Mongolia	62.61	65.49	Sierra Leone	18.70	19.52
Spain	76.44	80.06	Mauritius	62.85	63.52			
Latvia	77.43	80.05	Trinidad and Tobago	60.70	61.53			
Germany	80.08	80.02	Kuwait	58.74	60.58	Green: Within the highest third of all countries		
Portugal	80.02	79.82	Lebanon	57.57	60.10			
Korea, Rep.	77.84	79.79	Nicaragua	57.39	58.88			
Italy	75.97	79.15	Jordan	54.44	57.53			
Hungary	77.46	78.29	Indonesia	56.10	56.87	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		
Ukraine	76.86	77.85	Madagascar	55.53	56.82			
Greece	74.17	77.77	Guatemala	54.32	56.41			
Singapore	74.80	76.06	Turkey	56.11	56.17			
Poland	73.89	75.54	Papua New Guinea	55.86	56.00	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries		
Czech Republic	73.40	75.51	Tanzania	53.66	55.54			
Argentina	71.80	75.39	Dominican Republic	55.56	55.43			
Romania	72.71	74.88	Macedonia, FYR	57.13	55.37			
Bulgaria	71.56	74.43	Bangladesh	54.10	54.11			
Uruguay	69.85	73.92	Gabon	53.46	52.88			
Croatia	71.22	73.16	India	47.34	49.93			
Armenia	70.89	72.21	Morocco	46.41	49.12			
Moldova	71.89	71.95	Senegal	45.56	48.89			
Ecuador	66.86	71.45	Ghana	45.64	47.69			

	Economy Scores							
	2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006
Norway	89.49	93.35	Romania	38.26	45.35	Armenia	23.26	26.36
Kuwait	83.44	91.16	Ecuador	38.47	44.74	Namibia	23.28	25.40
United States	82.40	86.35	Bangladesh	45.39	44.72	Macedonia, FYR	22.87	22.77
Ireland	79.75	84.97	Brazil	40.85	44.59	Lebanon	18.03	20.04
Singapore	74.75	83.96	Colombia	41.02	44.38	Gambia, The	14.47	20.01
Switzerland	80.84	82.73	Morocco	41.91	44.27	Central African Republic	19.26	19.46
Australia	76.69	80.69	Panama	40.27	44.24	Benin	20.79	19.45
Denmark	75.57	80.68	Bulgaria	38.11	44.11	Burkina Faso	20.36	19.32
Netherlands	77.02	79.39	Guatemala	43.90	43.82	Guinea-Bissau	20.76	19.26
Canada	74.22	78.64	Argentina	31.98	43.76	Niger	20.64	18.79
Austria	75.66	77.44	India	42.97	43.36	Mauritania	19.98	17.79
Japan	72.95	77.00	Turkey	32.64	43.06	Burundi	18.67	15.97
United Kingdom	72.43	75.40	Uruguay	30.11	42.90	Mozambique	12.53	15.46
Sweden	70.88	73.56	Bolivia	43.37	42.72	Kenya	18.77	15.42
Finland	68.47	73.20	Honduras	41.56	42.33	Nigeria	14.65	15.28
Germany	72.56	72.53	Peru	42.05	42.13	Sierra Leone	19.62	14.97
Belgium	67.00	69.79	Gabon	41.04	41.72	Ghana	10.16	14.70
New Zealand	67.16	69.17	Moldova	39.82	40.86	Yemen, Rep.	16.96	14.54
France	67.44	68.98	Ukraine	41.22	40.47	Zambia	9.58	14.36
Spain	63.79	68.27	Philippines	39.57	39.80	Bosnia and Herzegovina	10.85	13.04
Korea, Rep.	61.77	65.42	Georgia	38.00	39.49	Malawi	14.20	12.91
Slovenia	59.17	65.34	Indonesia	39.71	39.18			
Czech Republic	61.92	64.03	Venezuela, RB	30.06	38.11	Green: Within the highest third of all countries		
Greece	58.68	63.71	Paraguay	36.02	38.08			
Israel	58.07	63.22	Kyrgyz Republic	35.75	37.11			
Italy	60.19	62.60	Nicaragua	38.52	36.98			
Estonia	56.19	61.97	Ethiopia	37.28	36.26	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		
Portugal	60.16	59.47	Madagascar	38.44	36.01			
Lithuania	51.67	58.15	Albania	33.73	35.86			
Latvia	52.43	57.41	Botswana	34.44	35.80			
Hungary	55.23	55.97	Sri Lanka	34.04	34.75			
Mexico	52.77	53.79	Jordan	32.66	34.41	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries		
Trinidad and Tobago	47.78	52.52	Mongolia	35.44	34.01			
Slovak Republic	46.05	52.52	Jamaica	32.84	33.14			
Chile	48.26	51.06	Dominican Republic	25.32	30.49			
Costa Rica	48.04	48.16	Uganda	31.71	30.12			
Poland	43.77	47.60	Mali	30.26	29.40			
El Salvador	47.25	47.49	Tanzania	31.60	29.35			
Mauritius	46.42	47.46	South Africa	24.03	28.41			
Malaysia	45.66	47.21	Papua New Guinea	21.99	27.33			
Croatia	42.91	46.65	Senegal	27.30	27.17			

	Knowledge Scores							
	2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006
Sweden	83.41	84.18	Dominican Republic	30.86	36.91	Ghana	13.88	15.73
Israel	71.85	78.37	Malaysia	33.66	36.74	Nigeria	14.55	15.36
Switzerland	71.81	75.25	Panama	34.71	36.11	Senegal	11.50	14.41
Finland	74.79	74.68	Brazil	33.06	36.11	Yemen, Rep.	13.14	14.20
Denmark	71.46	74.01	Moldova	31.36	35.49	Mauritania	12.11	13.83
United States	67.47	70.69	Romania	30.61	35.29	Sierra Leone	13.51	13.52
Australia	63.72	67.48	Jordan	32.24	34.93	Bangladesh	12.56	13.29
Norway	62.37	67.39	Trinidad and Tobago	29.33	34.86	Benin	7.54	12.31
Netherlands	60.27	66.86	Kuwait	31.15	34.50	Zambia	10.52	10.98
United Kingdom	63.48	66.56	Uruguay	30.35	34.05	Uganda	9.01	10.63
New Zealand	61.40	66.16	Chile	30.56	33.76	Guinea-Bissau	8.39	9.00
Japan	60.91	64.71	Mongolia	28.28	32.75	Niger	7.56	8.42
Korea, Rep.	57.53	63.46	Bolivia	32.01	32.66	Mali	6.20	8.20
Canada	56.77	62.90	Kyrgyz Republic	30.50	31.40	Burkina Faso	7.47	7.65
Singapore	58.12	61.67	Turkey	27.95	31.20	Madagascar	7.79	7.26
Belgium	61.51	61.28	Venezuela, RB	26.90	30.95	Malawi	7.47	6.95
Germany	57.39	61.20	El Salvador	24.33	30.39	Burundi	6.69	6.80
France	57.67	60.87	Costa Rica	26.49	30.20	Ethiopia	4.57	5.99
Austria	56.26	59.06	South Africa	26.24	29.57	Tanzania	4.47	5.55
Slovenia	53.54	56.21	Georgia	27.96	29.32	Mozambique	3.58	4.88
Italy	52.08	55.66	Peru	26.86	29.26	Central African Republic	1.87	2.11
Ireland	50.88	55.33	Colombia	25.59	29.20			
Estonia	46.97	54.46	Ecuador	24.59	29.04			
Spain	50.24	53.87	Mexico	25.76	28.86			
Greece	46.39	51.02	Armenia	26.42	28.29	Green: Within the highest third of all countries		
Hungary	45.53	48.81	Botswana	25.26	26.93			
Lithuania	40.38	47.58	Guatemala	21.59	26.33			
Czech Republic	42.72	47.38	Gabon	20.18	25.61	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		
Portugal	45.16	47.09	Bosnia and Herzegovina	15.10	25.51			
Poland	41.35	44.95	Philippines	23.09	25.21			
Jamaica	37.64	43.16	Namibia	22.75	24.44	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries		
Croatia	38.16	43.03	Morocco	19.28	22.88			
Ukraine	36.96	42.41	Honduras	19.60	22.80			
Latvia	34.14	41.51	Paraguay	21.22	22.49			
Bulgaria	36.09	39.74	Sri Lanka	19.69	21.51			
Argentina	35.58	39.12	Indonesia	19.13	21.41			
Slovak Republic	34.15	38.65	Nicaragua	18.37	20.91			
Macedonia, FYR	33.90	38.47	Gambia, The	17.97	19.80			
Albania	33.81	38.16	India	14.66	17.05			
Mauritius	33.07	37.58	Kenya	15.15	16.16			
Lebanon	34.06	36.99	Papua New Guinea	14.90	15.94			

	Health Scores							
	2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006
Switzerland	86.99	89.62	Estonia	65.91	68.28	Gabon	37.99	37.55
Japan	86.74	88.11	Lithuania	69.32	68.00	Madagascar	35.14	37.32
Sweden	85.48	87.07	Jordan	65.14	67.48	Benin	30.26	33.11
France	83.68	86.37	Brazil	65.55	67.33	Namibia	31.73	32.38
Norway	83.01	85.72	Mexico	67.05	67.30	Niger	27.46	30.00
Austria	82.91	85.08	Latvia	65.97	67.27	South Africa	24.43	29.86
United States	82.98	84.93	Georgia	66.09	67.11	Kenya	26.56	29.82
Germany	82.87	84.38	Venezuela, RB	66.08	66.96	Mali	26.25	28.78
Greece	82.20	84.25	Sri Lanka	65.48	66.96	Tanzania	24.92	28.62
Belgium	81.98	84.11	Lebanon	66.47	66.44	Ethiopia	25.88	27.86
Italy	82.28	83.97	Armenia	65.54	66.01	Burkina Faso	23.99	26.57
Netherlands	84.49	83.47	Romania	64.52	65.79	Uganda	22.90	26.56
Australia	81.31	83.45	Malaysia	64.20	65.61	Botswana	20.41	25.78
Spain	79.64	82.51	Dominican Republic	63.79	65.15	Malawi	21.54	25.61
Canada	81.03	82.41	Mauritius	63.09	65.00	Burundi	17.80	20.24
Ireland	77.67	82.38	Colombia	63.70	64.84	Nigeria	18.82	18.48
Israel	81.92	82.22	El Salvador	62.24	63.86	Guinea-Bissau	16.08	17.21
New Zealand	79.35	81.53	Turkey	62.83	63.85	Central African Republic	12.62	14.14
Finland	78.95	81.48	Paraguay	63.11	63.64	Mozambique	15.19	12.85
Denmark	78.33	80.93	Nicaragua	61.23	63.59	Zambia	8.18	11.00
Portugal	77.38	79.98	Peru	61.27	62.64	Sierra Leone	5.41	6.88
United Kingdom	77.25	79.64	Ukraine	62.49	62.49			
Slovenia	75.31	77.34	Honduras	60.66	62.46			
Costa Rica	76.30	76.95	Moldova	60.87	62.25			
Argentina	74.46	76.87	Trinidad and Tobago	59.87	60.95	Green: Within the highest third of all countries		
Korea, Rep.	74.06	76.74	Jamaica	60.49	60.71			
Czech Republic	74.81	76.23	Guatemala	59.22	60.64			
Singapore	74.10	76.07	Philippines	58.82	60.32			
Chile	73.22	73.78	Morocco	57.54	59.33	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		
Uruguay	73.54	73.66	Kyrgyz Republic	59.51	58.72			
Croatia	71.91	73.20	Mongolia	55.93	57.50			
Panama	71.31	71.91	Indonesia	53.63	56.00			
Slovak Republic	70.32	71.75	Bolivia	49.61	51.56	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries		
Kuwait	71.13	71.33	India	46.83	48.57			
Poland	70.76	71.14	Senegal	45.28	46.89			
Albania	70.21	70.99	Bangladesh	43.64	45.68			
Hungary	70.22	70.94	Mauritania	41.91	43.78			
Macedonia, FYR	69.05	70.00	Yemen, Rep.	41.09	43.62			
Bosnia and Herzegovina	68.46	69.92	Papua New Guinea	39.84	40.48			
Bulgaria	68.59	69.81	Ghana	38.60	40.27			
Ecuador	68.29	69.45	Gambia, The	36.69	38.38			

	Environmental Sustainability Scores							
	2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006		2002-2003	2005-2006
Mali	99.85	99.98	Portugal	74.87	73.73	Macedonia, FYR	60.81	62.32
Uganda	99.18	99.17	Denmark	71.79	73.31	Mongolia	58.17	61.30
Burkina Faso	99.02	99.16	Honduras	74.73	72.97	Venezuela, RB	60.13	60.97
Burundi	98.69	98.96	Spain	73.33	72.47	Poland	59.63	60.92
Central African Republic	98.66	98.92	Argentina	71.13	72.32	Nigeria	59.81	60.46
Malawi	97.86	97.86	Dominican Republic	68.09	72.29	Malaysia	61.01	60.26
Niger	96.93	97.07	Yemen, Rep.	74.30	72.11	Norway	64.79	59.85
Gambia, The	96.30	96.70	Philippines	70.54	71.79	Korea, Rep.	58.70	59.28
Madagascar	96.49	96.47	Turkey	69.90	71.47	Bulgaria	55.93	58.00
Peru	96.27	95.10	France	70.95	71.33	Jordan	56.51	57.15
Papua New Guinea	94.31	94.60	Croatia	69.33	71.20	Finland	54.88	56.60
Sierra Leone	95.21	92.54	Mexico	71.38	70.99	Australia	56.46	56.11
Guinea-Bissau	90.98	91.25	Lebanon	67.48	70.74	Czech Republic	54.47	55.77
Mauritius	91.10	91.14	Armenia	70.40	70.54	Moldova	52.05	52.35
Gabon	89.40	89.57	United Kingdom	69.11	70.08	United States	50.15	51.13
Uruguay	89.44	89.52	Ethiopia	69.25	69.90	Canada	49.29	49.29
Panama	82.86	87.69	Zambia	69.55	69.68	Estonia	47.48	47.99
Costa Rica	85.82	87.67	Nicaragua	69.19	69.59	South Africa	46.35	45.16
Botswana	83.80	87.30	Ghana	67.79	69.55	Ukraine	38.65	42.19
Mauritania	85.42	86.21	Benin	69.71	69.23	Kuwait	30.10	24.95
Colombia	84.00	85.82	Lithuania	66.17	69.23	Trinidad and Tobago	17.77	21.16
Switzerland	81.18	81.91	Sweden	67.74	68.99			
Albania	82.16	81.56	Kenya	70.18	68.91			
Brazil	80.98	81.15	Mozambique	68.95	68.64			
Guatemala	81.13	81.01	Netherlands	67.98	68.59	Green: Within the highest third of all countries		
El Salvador	80.46	80.94	New Zealand	66.45	68.37			
Sri Lanka	79.62	79.81	Hungary	67.18	68.34			
Ecuador	80.61	79.63	Tanzania	70.56	68.30			
Namibia	79.19	79.33	Germany	67.53	68.01	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		
Paraguay	77.42	78.70	Japan	67.65	67.84			
Bolivia	78.78	77.73	Romania	64.44	67.41			
Greece	76.06	77.66	Israel	63.98	66.85			
Bangladesh	76.08	76.49	Slovenia	65.61	66.65	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries		
Ireland	72.53	75.96	India	63.15	64.86			
Latvia	73.59	75.86	Belgium	63.63	64.26			
Morocco	78.34	75.75	Kyrgyz Republic	63.82	64.25			
Austria	75.30	74.74	Jamaica	62.36	63.58			
Italy	75.55	74.62	Indonesia	61.23	63.33			
Georgia	74.65	74.54	Bosnia and Herzegovina	63.36	62.73			
Chile	74.03	73.89	Singapore	63.80	62.62			
Senegal	73.22	73.77	Slovak Republic	60.09	62.32			

	Gender Comprehensive Scores							
	2001-2002	2004-2005		2001-2002	2004-2005		2001-2002	2004-2005
Sweden	93.50	93.02	Peru	62.65	65.72	Kenya	39.03	45.29
Norway	92.53	92.94	Ukraine	55.95	65.44	Bangladesh	41.51	44.96
Finland	89.91	91.88	Trinidad and Tobago	62.13	65.28	Kuwait	42.18	44.48
Denmark	89.73	90.36	Ecuador	58.49	64.18	Jordan	38.51	43.75
New Zealand	86.68	88.67	Jamaica	62.83	64.08	Uganda	37.67	41.72
Australia	87.42	88.50	Brazil	61.93	63.75	Malawi	37.63	40.28
Netherlands	87.04	88.12	El Salvador	59.67	63.03	Gambia, The	40.55	39.90
Belgium	86.47	87.46	Philippines	61.65	62.90	Mozambique	39.32	39.16
Canada	85.63	87.29	Mongolia	61.34	62.70	Niger	30.78	38.48
Germany	85.41	86.00	Bosnia and Herzegovina	54.77	62.63	Burundi	24.22	38.06
Austria	84.91	85.84	Singapore	56.59	61.81	Morocco	34.91	37.66
United Kingdom	83.32	85.32	Bolivia	62.21	61.59	Zambia	32.81	36.37
Spain	79.57	84.40	Dominican Republic	57.59	59.75	Gabon	40.94	35.32
United States	82.58	83.16	Moldova	59.23	59.73	Ethiopia	30.67	35.05
Switzerland	81.81	83.09	Honduras	53.90	59.56	Burkina Faso	33.54	34.96
Ireland	81.12	82.75	Ghana	52.75	59.03	Mauritania	31.42	34.61
Portugal	81.42	81.95	Albania	59.75	58.92	Sierra Leone	30.58	32.40
France	81.21	81.72	Colombia	53.20	57.97	Guinea-Bissau	21.27	31.19
Estonia	76.02	81.02	Senegal	53.27	57.22	Nigeria	25.14	28.43
Lithuania	75.49	80.12	South Africa	53.20	57.07	Central African Republic	21.41	27.58
Slovenia	78.67	79.48	Nicaragua	55.64	56.88	Yemen, Rep.	16.39	18.82
Italy	74.92	78.94	Georgia	53.43	56.36			
Latvia	74.51	77.49	India	52.49	55.71			
Czech Republic	72.24	76.64	Paraguay	53.53	55.12	Green: Within the highest third of all countries		
Israel	74.29	76.35	Indonesia	50.83	54.84			
Argentina	69.10	76.34	Venezuela, RB	52.77	54.42			
Poland	74.20	76.17	Macedonia, FYR	54.31	54.21	Blue: Within the medium third of all countries		
Costa Rica	73.03	76.10	Malaysia	50.99	53.64			
Hungary	73.39	75.86	Tanzania	50.73	53.21			
Greece	70.26	75.60	Mali	51.28	52.94	Red: Within the lowest third of all countries		
Japan	74.24	75.44	Namibia	50.60	51.91			
Uruguay	69.72	74.75	Madagascar	50.67	51.24			
Bulgaria	72.59	74.01	Sri Lanka	50.90	50.86			
Korea, Rep.	68.69	73.53	Papua New Guinea	56.05	50.38			
Slovak Republic	69.78	73.47	Botswana	52.33	49.93			
Chile	68.34	73.13	Guatemala	47.22	49.75			
Croatia	68.16	72.43	Armenia	54.46	49.23			
Panama	63.52	68.02	Turkey	45.12	48.76			
Mauritius	65.91	67.69	Kyrgyz Republic	42.95	47.74			
Mexico	65.19	67.56	Benin	43.75	47.29			
Romania	66.00	67.33	Lebanon	35.04	46.21			

4. Appendix: Overview and Definition of the Indicators Assigned per Dimension for the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009¹¹

4.1 Dimension of Politics (Political System): Definition of Assigned Indicators¹²

P1: Political rights (aggregated scores): Freedom House (minimum = 1, maximum = 100), source: Freedom House (http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/AggregateScores_2003-2008.xls).

P2: Civil liberties (aggregated scores): Freedom House (minimum = 1, maximum = 100), source: Freedom House (http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/AggregateScores_2003-2008.xls).

P3: Gender Empowerment Measure/GEM (UNDP HDI) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100), source: United Nations Development Program (Human Development Report Office) (http://hdr.undp.org/xmlsearch/reportSearch?y=*&c=*&t=*&k=&orderby=year). Comment: For the year 2002 was taken the “Human Development Report 2004”, for 2003 the “Human Development Report 2005”, and for 2005 the “Human Development Report 2007/2008”. The reason for this is that there exists at least a two-year time lag of the most recently available data for 3 of the 4 key indicators of GEM when compared with the release date of the report.

¹¹) We want to acknowledge all organizations that provided the sources, from which indicators were taken to input the quantitative model of the Democracy Ranking 2008/2009. Without these fine sources, the computation of this democracy ranking would not have been possible. That these organizations make their data sources public and transparent, and thus globally available to all communities, demonstrates mature responsibility and leadership.

¹²) In case of missing values, for the political dimension, the year 2001 did not serve as an estimator for 2002-2003 and 2004 was not used as an estimator for 2005-2006. Missing values thus were treated differently for the political and the five non-political dimensions. Reasoning for this was pragmatic; because of the data structure of the used sources, missing values for politics for 2002-2003 and 2005-2006 mostly implied that data for 2001 and 2004 also were not available. There is a tendency for political indicators to cover more countries with every new year.

P4: Seats in parliament held by women (UNDP HDI) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100), source: United Nations Development Program (Human Development Report Office) (http://hdr.undp.org/xmlsearch/reportSearch?y=*&c=*&t=*&k=&orderby=year). Comment: For the year 2002 was taken the “Human Development Report 2002”, for 2003 the “Human Development Report 2003”, for 2005 the “Human Development Report 2005”, and for 2006 the “Human Development Report 2006”.

P5: Press Freedom: Freedom House (minimum = 100, maximum = 1), source: Freedom House (<http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/fop/historical/SSGlobal.xls>).

P6: Corruption Perceptions Index: Transparency International (minimum = 1, maximum = 100), source: Transparency International (http://www.transparency.org/publications/annual_report). Comment: For the year 2002 was taken the “TI 2002 Corruption Perceptions Index”, for 2003 the “TI 2003 Corruption Perceptions Index”, for 2005 the “TI 2005 Corruption Perceptions Index”, and for 2006 the “TI 2006 Corruption Perceptions Index”.

P7: Change of the head of government (last 13 years) (minimum = no = 1, maximum = yes = 100), source: successive volumes of “Political Handbook of the World” (for example: Banks, Arthur S. / Thomas C. Muller / William R. Overstreet [eds.] [2007]. Political Handbook of the World 2007. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press). Comment: As benchmarks served the years 2002 and 2006, thus reference was made to the two periods 1990-2002 and 1994-2006. In case of no change (“no”), the value “1” was assigned; in case of change (“yes”) the value “100”. Because of interpretation ambiguities, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia and Montenegro were omitted.

P8: Party change of the head of government (last 13 years) (last 13 years) (minimum = no = 1, maximum = yes = 100), source: successive volumes of “Political Handbook of the World” (for example: Banks, Arthur S. / Thomas C. Muller / William R. Overstreet [eds.] [2007]. Political

Handbook of the World 2007. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press). Comment: As benchmarks served the years 2002 and 2006, thus reference was made to the two periods 1990-2002 and 1994-2006. In case of no change (“no”), the value “1” was assigned; in case of change (“yes”) the value “100”. Changes to or from “non-party heads or independents” to or from “party-based heads of government” were interpreted with the value “50”. Because of interpretation ambiguities were omitted: Afghanistan, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kyrgyz Republic, Lebanon, and Serbia and Montenegro.

Weighting of the indicators in context of the dimension of politics (political system): The following weight measures are assigned; P1 = 25%, P2 = 25%, P3 = 12.5%, P4 = 12.5%, P5 = 10%, P6 = 10%, P7 = 2.5%, and P8 = 2.5%.

4.2 Dimension of Gender (Socioeconomic Gender Equality): Definition of Assigned Indicators

SEGE1: Labor force, female (% of total labor force) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

SEGE2: Unemployment, female (% of female labor force) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

SEGE3: Primary education, pupils (% female) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

SEGE4: School enrollment, secondary, female (% gross) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

SEGE5: School enrollment, secondary, female (% net) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

SEGE6: School enrollment, tertiary, female (% gross) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

SEGE7: Life expectancy at birth, female (years) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

Source for all indicators of the dimension of gender (socioeconomic gender equality): World Bank (2008). World Development Indicators '08 (CD-ROM). Washington DC: World Bank.

Weighting of the indicators in context of the dimension of gender (socioeconomic gender equality): The following weight measures are assigned to three clusters of indicators; “labor force” (SEGE1-SEGE2) = 33.33%, “education” (SEGE3-SEGE6) = 33.33%, and “life expectancy” (SEGE7) = 33.33%. Within these three clusters, no indicator-specific weighting is being applied to the indicators.

4.3 Dimension of the Economy (Economic System): Definition of Assigned Indicators

E1: GDP per capita, PPP (constant 2005 international \$) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

E2: GDP per capita, PPP (current international \$) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

E3: Central government debt, total (% of GDP) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

E4: Inflation, consumer prices (annual %) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

E5: Unemployment, total (% of total labor force) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

E6: Unemployment, youth total (% of total labor force ages 15-24) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

Source for all indicators of the dimension of the economy (economic system): World Bank (2008). World Development Indicators '08 (CD-ROM). Washington DC: World Bank.

Weighting of the indicators in context of the dimension of the economy (economic system): The following weight measures are assigned; E1 = 25%, E2 = 25%, and all the other indicators (E3-E6) are weighted equally with 12.5%.

4.4 Dimension of Knowledge (Knowledge-Based Information Society, Education and Research): Definition of Assigned Indicators

K1: School enrollment, secondary (% gross) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K2: School enrollment, secondary (% net) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K3: School enrollment, tertiary (% gross) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K4: Pupil-teacher ratio, primary (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

K5: Telephone mainlines (per 100 people) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K6: Personal computers (per 100 people) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K7: Internet users (per 100 people) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K8: Mobile phone subscribers (per 100 people) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K9: Information and communication technology expenditure (% of GDP) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K10: Research and development expenditure (% of GDP) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

K11: Scientific and technical journal articles (per 1,000 people) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

Source for all indicators of the dimension of knowledge (knowledge-based information society, education and research): World Bank (2008). World Development Indicators '08 (CD-ROM). Washington DC: World Bank.

Weighting of the indicators in context of the dimension of knowledge (knowledge-based information society, education and research): The following weight measures are assigned to three clusters of indicators; “education” (K1-K4) = 33.33%, “technology” (K5-K9) = 33.33%, and “research” (K10-K11) = 33.33%. Within these three clusters, no indicator-specific weighting is being applied to the indicators.

4.5 Dimension of Health (Health Status and Health System): Definition of Assigned Indicators

H1: Life expectancy at birth, total (years) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

H2: Health expenditure per capita (current US\$) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

H3: Health expenditure, public (% of GDP) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

H4: Health expenditure, private (% of GDP) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

H5: Hospital beds (per 1,000 people) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

H6: Physicians (per 1,000 people) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

H7: Mortality rate, infant (per 1,000 live births) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

H8: Mortality rate, under-5 (per 1,000) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

Source for all indicators of the dimension of health (health status and health system): World Bank (2008). World Development Indicators '08 (CD-ROM). Washington DC: World Bank.

Weighting of the indicators in context of the dimension of health (health status and health system): The following weight measures are assigned; H1 = 65%, and all the other indicators (H2-H8) are weighted equally with 5%.

4.6 Dimension of the Environment (Environmental Sustainability): Definition of Assigned Indicators

EN1: CO2 emissions (kg per 2005 PPP \$ of GDP) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

EN2: CO2 emissions (metric tons per capita) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

EN3: GDP per unit of energy use (constant 2005 PPP \$ per kg of oil equivalent) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

EN4: Electric power consumption (kWh per capita) (minimum = 100, maximum = 1).

EN5: Electricity production from hydroelectric sources (% of total) (minimum = 1, maximum = 100).

Source for all indicators of the dimension of the environment (environmental sustainability): World Bank (2008). World Development Indicators '08 (CD-ROM). Washington DC: World Bank.

Weighting of the indicators in context of the environment (environmental sustainability): The following weight measures are assigned; EN1 = 30%, EN2 = 30%, EN3 = 30%, EN4 = 5%, and EN5 = 5%.

4.7 Dimension of Gender “Comprehensive”: Definition of Assigned Indicators

For the conceptual and methodic design of a comprehensive gender dimension, see again paragraph 11 in Chapter 1.