

Institute for Advance Development Studies



06/2015

**SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND GENDER INEQUALITY
IN FRAGILE STATES:
ARE THEY RELEVANT FOR THE POST-MDG DEBATE?**

by:

Boris Branisa
Carolina Cardona

Development Research Working Paper Series
06/2015

June 2015

The views expressed in the Development Research Working Paper Series are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute for Advanced Development Studies. Copyrights belong to the authors. Papers may be downloaded for personal use only.

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND GENDER INEQUALITY IN FRAGILE STATES: ARE THEY RELEVANT FOR THE POST-MDG DEBATE?

Boris Branisa¹ and Carolina Cardona²

Fundación INESAD (Instituto de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo)
Av. Héctor Ormachea 6115, Obrajés
La Paz, Bolivia

This version: January, 2015

Abstract

We focus on an issue that appears particularly relevant for fragile states and which has received little attention: social institutions related to gender inequality, defined as societal practices and legal norms that frame gender roles and the distribution of power between men and women in the family, market, and social and political life. We show empirically that fragile states perform worse than other non-fragile developing countries when considering these social institutions. We suggest that a special set of indicators reflecting social institutions related to gender inequality in both fragile states and non-fragile states should be considered in the post-MDG agenda.

JEL classification: D63, I39, J16, O1

Keywords: Social institutions, Gender inequality, Developing countries, Fragile States, Millennium Development Goals, Post 2015 Development Agenda

The views in this paper are entirely those of the authors and do not represent the views of the institutions they are affiliated with.

Acknowledgement

This paper has been prepared under a research grant provided by the Southern Voice on Post-MDG International Development Goals (<http://southernvoice-postmdg.org/>) – a network of 48 think tanks drawn from Africa, Latin America and South Asia. We would like to thank an anonymous referee for helpful comments on earlier versions of the paper.

¹ Corresponding author: Boris Branisa, Senior Researcher at Fundación INESAD (Instituto de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo).

Email: bbranisa@inesad.edu.bo; boris.branisa@gmail.com

² Carolina Cardona, Junior Researcher at Fundación INESAD. Email: ccardona@inesad.edu.bo.

Executive summary

One of the proposals for the post-Millennium Development Goal (MDG) development agenda focuses on *leaving no one behind*, meaning that the international community should ensure no person is denied universal human rights and basic economic opportunities (UN High Level Panel, 2013). If one takes this idea seriously, it is evident that there are countries in the world that deserve special attention: so-called fragile states. The OECD (2013a), for example, argues that we must guarantee that fragile states are not left behind and warns that fragility remains one of the biggest obstacles to global peace and development.

Following the reasoning of Baranyi and Powell (2005, p. 1), who claim that gender inequality is "a central feature of state fragility", we focus on an issue that appears particularly relevant for fragile states and which has not received enough attention: social institutions related to gender inequality, defined as societal practices and legal norms that frame gender roles and the distribution of power between men and women in the family, market, and social and political life (e.g., Branisa et al., 2014). We show empirically that fragile states perform worse than other non-fragile developing countries when considering social institutions related to gender inequality.

Attempting to address gendered institutional constraints in fragile states should be high on the agenda when trying to promote development outcomes in general. On the one hand, from an intrinsic point of view, it should be clear that in fragile states policies focusing on changing gendered development outcomes should take into account inequalities in social institutions as relevant constraints. This should be addressed explicitly as it reflects the deprivation of women, and removing this deprivation is essential. On the other hand, we should contemplate that different kinds of freedom interrelate with one another, and freedom of one type may to a great extent help in advancing freedoms of other types (Sen, 1999). From this instrumental point of view, we should consider the studies at the cross-country level which show that social institutions related to gender inequality are associated with, and appear to be relevant for, several development outcomes such as female education, child mortality, fertility, and governance in developing countries (e.g. Branisa et al., 2013). Reducing gender inequality can be useful for society in general and benefits not only women.

Therefore, including a special set of indicators reflecting social institutions related to gender inequality in both fragile states and non-fragile states should be considered as part of the post-MDG agenda. Additionally, specific measures to help fragile states improve the situation and reduce gender inequality are needed, which could be part of the new global partnership towards a spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability for the post-2015 period.

1. Introduction

The UN High-level Panel, set to advise on the global development framework beyond 2015, established the need for a new development paradigm. It also concluded that the post-Millennium Development Goal (MDG) agenda is universal and that five big transformative shifts are needed (UN High Level Panel, 2013). The fifth required shift (to forge a new global partnership) articulates the need to build a new global partnership towards a new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability that must underpin the post-2015 agenda. The first required shift (to leave no one behind) asserts that the international community should ensure that no person – regardless of ethnicity, gender, geography, disability, race or other status – is denied universal human rights and basic economic opportunities. Likewise, the United Nations Association-UK (UNA-UK) proposes a transformative agenda for 2015-2030, recognising the need for a profound change in lifestyles and mindsets to ensure that no one is left behind. Above all, it argues that across the world discrimination and inequality are stifling progress (UNA-UK, 2013).

If the idea of leaving no one behind is taken seriously, it is evident that there are countries in the world that deserve special attention: the so-called fragile states. The OECD (2013a), for example, argues that we must ensure that fragile states are not left behind and warns that fragility remains one of the biggest obstacles to global peace and development.

It has been estimated that one billion of the world's population in 2006, including the 340 million of the world's extreme poor, were living in fragile states and that seventy percent were located in Africa (Collier, 2008). Fragile states have consistently grown slower than other low-income countries with a rise in the rate of extreme poverty. Over the period 1990 - 2006 fragile states performed worse than other stable developing countries in terms of MDG targets (Harttgen and Klasen, 2010). It is believed that many fragile states will not achieve the MDGs by 2015, as they have 50 percent higher levels of malnutrition; 20 percent higher levels of child mortality; and 18 percent lower primary education completion rates than other low-income countries (World Bank, 2007). Hence, it is assumed that these countries are caught in one of four traps that have received less attention: i) the conflict trap; ii) the natural resources trap; iii) the trap of being landlocked with bad neighbors; and iv) the trap of bad governance in a small country (Collier, 2008).

Following the reasoning of Baranyi and Powell (2005. p. 1), who claim that gender inequality is "a central feature of state fragility", this paper focusses on an issue that appears particularly relevant for fragile states and which has not received enough attention in the literature: social institutions related to gender inequality. These are defined as societal practices and legal norms that frame gender roles and the distribution of power between men and women in the family, the market, and social and political life (e.g., De Soysa and Jütting, 2007; Branisa et al., 2014). We show that fragile states perform worse than other non-fragile developing countries when considering social institutions related to gender inequality.

We take into account the empirical results from Branisa et al. (2013) who, using a sample of more than 100 developing countries, suggest that apart from geography, the political system, the level of economic development and religion, one should consider social institutions related to gender inequality to better account for differences in important development outcomes. In this paper, we argue that this is important for the Post 2015 Development Agenda, following the view championed by Amartya Sen (e.g., Sen, 1999) who reasons that freedom is intrinsic and instrumental to development.

Trying to address gendered institutional constraints in fragile states should be high on the agenda when trying to promote development outcomes in general. On the one hand, from an *intrinsic* point of view, it should be clear that in fragile states policies focusing on changing gendered development outcomes should take into account inequalities in social institutions as relevant constraints. This is an issue that should be addressed explicitly, as it reflects the deprivation of women, and eliminating this deprivation is crucial.

On the other hand, we should keep in mind that different kinds of freedom interrelate with one another, and freedom of one type may to a great extent help in advancing freedom of other types (Sen, 1999). From this *instrumental* point of view, we should consider the studies at the cross-country level that show that social institutions related to gender inequality are associated with, and appear to be relevant for, several development outcomes such as female education, child mortality, fertility, and governance in developing countries (e.g. Branisa et al., 2013). Reducing gender inequality can be useful for society in general and benefits not only women.

Therefore, one could think of including a special set of indicators reflecting social institutions related to gender inequality in both fragile states and non-fragile states as part of the Post-MDG agenda. It is also important to think of special measures to help fragile states improve the situation and reduce gender inequality, as part of the new global partnership towards a new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 examines possible definitions of fragile states as well as their importance. Section 3 discusses the situation of the MDGs in fragile states and non-fragile developing states. Section 4 argues that social institutions related to gender inequality are particularly relevant for fragile states. Section 5 discusses the need to collect more and better data about social institutions related to gender inequality in fragile and non-fragile states. Section 6 concludes.

2. The importance of fragile states, and the discussion about fragility

Before trying to explore the link between fragility and MDG achievements, one should address the difficult question of how to define and classify fragile states. In recent years there have been some attempts to define fragile states. We briefly describe here some of the most important reflections on the topic.

Some institutions tend to classify the type of fragility according to the degree or nature of failure within relevant states, to identify appropriate strategies for donor engagement. For

example, the OECD identifies five types of state fragility that reflect have different vulnerabilities to violent conflict or humanitarian crisis: i) weak states; ii) divided states; iii) post-war states; iv) semi-authoritarian states; and v) collapsed states (Jones et al., 2008). The 2009 UNDP guide on measuring fragility (Mata and Ziaja, 2009) presents a comparative analysis of cross-country fragility indices, choosing 11 fragility and conflict indices based on relevancy, quantification, accessibility, transparency, multi-country coverage, and updated information. **Table 2-1** below provides an overview of the indices.

Table 2-1: Cross-country fragility indices from the UNDP users guide on measuring fragility.

Index	Producer	Publication and website
Bertelsmann Transformation Index State Weakness Index (BTI).	Bertelsmann Stiftung	<i>Publication:</i> Bertelsmann Stiftung. (2008). Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2008. <i>Politische Gestaltung im internationalen Vergleich. Gütersloh, Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung.</i> <i>Website:</i> http://www.bti-project.de/bti-home/
Country Indicators for Foreign Policy Fragility Index (CIFP).	Carleton University	<i>Publication:</i> Carment, D., Prest, S., Gazo, J. J., el-Achkar, S., Samy, Y., and Bell, T. (2006). Failed and Fragile States 2006. <i>A Briefing Note for the Canadian Government. Country Indicators for Foreign Policy, Carleton University.</i> <i>Website:</i> http://www.carleton.ca/cifp/
Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) / International Development Association (IDA) Resource Allocation Index (IRAI)	The World Bank	<i>Publication:</i> World Bank (2008). Country Policy and Institutional Assessment: 2008 Assessment Questionnaire. <i>Operations Policy and Country Services.</i> Washington, DC: The World Bank. <i>Website:</i> http://www.worldbank.org/ida/IRAI-2011.html
Failed states index	Fund for Peace	<i>Publication:</i> Foreign Policy and Fund for Peace (2009). The Failed States Index 2009. <i>Foreign Policy</i> , Vol. 173, p. 80-127. <i>Website:</i> http://global.fundforpeace.org/index.php
Global Peace Index	Institute for Economics and Peace	<i>Publication:</i> Global Peace Index. (2008). Methodology, Results and Findings. <i>Institute for Economics and Peace.</i> <i>Website:</i> http://www.visionofhumanity.org/
Harvard Kennedy School Index of African Governance	Harvard University	<i>Publication:</i> Rotberg, R. I., and Gisselquist, R. M. (2008). Strengthening African governance: Results and rankings 2008. <i>the News, Harvard University, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.</i> <i>Website:</i> http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/project/52/intrastate_conflict_program.html
Index of State Weakness in the Developing World	Brookings Institution	<i>Publication:</i> Rice, S. E., and Patrick, S. (2008). <i>Index of state weakness in the developing world.</i> Global Economy and Development, Brookings Institution. <i>Website:</i> http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2008/02/weak-states-index
Peace and Conflict Instability Ledger	University of Maryland	<i>Publication:</i> Hewitt, J. J., Wilkenfeld, J. and Gurr, T. R. (2010). Peace and Conflict 2010. <i>Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland.</i> <i>Website:</i> http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/
Political Instability Index	Economist Intelligence Unit	<i>Publication:</i> Economist Intelligence Unit (2009). Manning the barricades: Who's at risk as deepening economic distress foments social distress. London: Economist Intelligence Unit. <i>Website:</i> http://viewswire.eiu.com/site_info.asp?info_name=instability_map
State Fragility Index	George Mason University	<i>Publication:</i> Marshall, M. G., and Cole, B. R. (2008). Global report on conflict, governance and state fragility 2008. <i>Foreign Policy Bulletin: The Documentary Record of United States Foreign Policy</i> , Vol. 18, No. 01, p.3-21. <i>Website:</i> http://www.systemicpeace.org/
World Governance Indicators Political Stability and Absence of Violence (WGI)	The World Bank	<i>Publication:</i> Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., and Mastruzzi, M. (2011). The worldwide governance indicators: methodology and analytical issues. <i>World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430.</i> Washington, DC: The World Bank. <i>Website:</i> http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home

Source: Based on Mata and Ziaja (2009), own elaboration.

Interest in fragile states has emerged from several considerations, such as the belief that underdevelopment and insecurity are related, and that state effectiveness and development are related (Mcloughlin, 2012). However, a consensus does not exist for classifying “fragile states” due to a lack of information and a common framework. It is also important to note that the term “fragile state” has empirical and normative shortcomings; hence, some agencies use the terms “fragility” or “situations of fragility” (OECD, 2012). As there are different indices for classifying countries as fragile states, different definitions of fragile states exist between agencies, as described in **Box 2-1**.

This paper follows the classification proposed by the OECD (2013a), which establishes 47 “fragile states” that can be used for quantitative analyses. The 47 countries are from the World Bank - African Development Bank - Asian Development Bank harmonised list of fragile and post-conflict countries for 2012 and the 2011 Failed State Index (FSI). The list includes all countries rated “alert” (FSI above 90) or “critical” (FSI between 80 and 90) on the FSI index (OECD, 2013a¹). These countries are all defined as “fragile”, but are not an entirely homogenous group. As shown in **Table 2-2**, in 2012 26 of the 47 fragile states were Low-Income Fragile States (LIFS), and 21 were Middle-Income Fragile States (MIFS). A decade before, all 47 were considered LIFS.

¹ For more detail on the harmonized list, see <http://go.worldbank.org/BNFOS8V3SQ> ; on the FSI, see <http://global.fundforpeace.org/index.php>.

Box 2-1: Donor agencies' different definitions of "fragile states"

In the last decade, there has been a broad agreement over the relevance of fragile states and their complex development situation. Nevertheless, there remains debate about precise definitions, causes, characteristics, measurement, and implications of fragility (OECD, 2013a).

It is recognised that delivering international assistance to these countries cannot be understood as 'business as usual'. This explains why donor agencies have different approaches, concepts and names to define them (McCloughlin, 2012). Denominations such as "weak and failing states", "poor performers", "low-income countries under stress", "countries at risk of instability", "collapsed countries", "countries in crisis" or "fragile states" are used (Nay, 2014; Harttgen and Klasen, 2010). Likewise, there are different situations of fragility: they can be chronic or transitory; their causes can be local, national or global; and their manifestations can be economic, social or political (OECD, 2013a).

The OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC), the UK Department of International Development (DfID) and the World Bank have been very active on this field and are considered among the developers of the concept (Nay, 2014; Harttgen and Klasen, 2010). Each of these agencies has its own approach and concept of "fragile states", which are summarised below.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - DAC (OECD-DAC)

The OECD identifies eight global factors of fragility classified in three dimensions i) *growth and wealth*; ii) *meaning and movement*; and iii) *violence and security*. These factors are defined as licit and illicit processes operating at the international, regional or cross-border level that influence a state's risk of fragility and conflict. The OECD defines a fragile state as a region or state that "*[...] has weak capacity to carry out basic governance functions, and lacks the ability to develop mutually constructive relations with society [...] vulnerable to internal or external shocks such as economic crises or natural disasters [...] and low capacity and legitimacy of governing a population and its territory.*" (OECD, 2013a).

UK Department for International Development (DfID)

DfID defines fragile states as "*countries where the government cannot or will not deliver core functions to the majority of its people, including the poor. The most important functions of the state for poverty reduction are territorial control, safety and security, capacity to manage public resources, delivery of basic services, and the ability to protect and support the ways in which the poorest people sustain themselves [...]*" (DfID, 2005).

The World Bank

The World Bank classifies fragile states as those that register weak performance on the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) index. The characteristics of fragile states are "*weak policies and institutions, making them vulnerable in their capacity to deliver services to their citizens, to control corruption, or to provide for sufficient voice and accountability. Furthermore, they face risk conflict and political instability*". Some of the countries considered "fragile" between 1992 and 2002 were also Low Income Countries Under Stress (LICUS) during this period (World Bank, 2005).

Table 2-2: “Fragile states” as defined by the OECD (2013a), by region and income level

Region and Income Level	Low-income fragile states (LIFS)	Middle-income fragile states (MIFS) or economies	
		Lower-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)	Upper-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)
East Asia and Pacific	Korea, Dem. Rep. Myanmar	Kiribati Marshall Islands Micronesia, Fed. Sts. Solomon Islands Timor-Leste	
Europe and Central Asia	Kyrgyz Republic	Georgia Kosovo	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Latin America and Caribbean	Haiti		
Middle East and North Africa		Iraq West Bank and Gaza Yemen, Rep.	Iran, Islamic Rep.
South Asia	Afghanistan Bangladesh Nepal	Pakistan Sri Lanka	
Sub-Saharan Africa	Burundi Central African Republic Chad Comoros Congo, Dem. Rep. Eritrea Ethiopia Guinea Guinea-Bissau Kenya Liberia Malawi Niger Rwanda Sierra Leone Somalia Togo Uganda Zimbabwe	Cameroon Congo, Republic Cote d'Ivoire Nigeria South Sudan Sudan	Angola

Source: OECD (2013a) and World Bank Data, own elaboration.

We consider that the classification proposed by the OECD (2013a) is practical and based on a reasonable framework. Nevertheless, and as a robustness check for the empirical part of this paper, we use additional classifications of fragile states. These are: (i) the FSI 2013 definition (FFP, 2014); (ii) the CPIA 2008 definition (Klasen, 2013); and (iii) the DFID definition (Klasen, 2013). **Tables 8-1, 8-2, and 8-3** in the Appendix present the list of fragile countries according to these three alternatives, and their classification by region and income level, i.e. low-income or middle-income.

For example, following the FSI definition we identify 66 fragile states, of which 40 also appear in the OECD list. Like the OECD classification, the FSI, CPIA, and DfID classifications present a group of diverse fragile countries. Around two thirds of the countries classified as fragile by these three agencies are low-income economies, and one third are lower-middle-income economies.

3. Fragile states and the MDGs

In the last decade many countries have experienced major economic and social progress towards the MDGs, allowing households and individuals to move out of poverty (Harttgen and Klasen, 2010). However, this achievement has been uneven among countries, and fragile states have been lagging behind. Wracked by conflict and weak governance, fragile states present hard governance challenges for effective development (World Bank, 2009). Thus, fragility is associated with poor MDG levels and trends, characterised by performance of policies, institutions and governments (Harttgen and Klasen, 2010). It is estimated that by 2015 half of the population living on less than USD\$1.25 per day will reside in fragile states (OECD, 2013a). The UN highlights that MDG progress at the global level is driven by large and middle-income countries (UN, 2012). Sapkota and Shiratori (2013) suggest that while achievement of the MDGs at the global level has been a success, poor progress in the most disadvantaged regions and countries indicates the urgency of a general change of policy, oriented towards more *inclusive development*. They also emphasise the risks associated with armed conflicts, natural disasters, and financial or other types of crises for poor and vulnerable people, and propose developing *social resilience* through the establishment of a local, regional and global framework for social protection.

The MDGs are designed to alleviate poverty in its many dimensions, among them halving world income poverty and hunger; reaching universal education; reducing child and maternal mortality by two thirds; halving the number of people who lack access to safe drinking water and sanitation; and achieving gender equality (Bourguignon et al., 2008).

This section compares selected MDG indicators in developing countries between the years 1990 and 2010. The main comparison uses available data corresponding to the group of 47 “fragile states”² as defined by the OECD (2013a), and a group of 85 other developing, non-fragile states.

It has been argued that the indicators that best describe the achievement of MDGs are poverty; childhood malnutrition; primary completion rates; and under-five mortality rate (Bourguignon et al., 2008; Harttgen and Klasen, 2013). **Table 3-1** compares fragile and non-fragile states according to *levels* of primary and secondary completion rates, under-five mortality rate and some indicators related to the third MDG (Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women) for the year 2010. Results from a two-group mean comparison test (t-test) using as the two groups fragile and non-fragile states suggest that fragility is associated with poorer levels of several outcomes: lower levels of primary completion rates; higher levels of under-five mortality rates; lower ratios of female to male enrollment (primary, secondary, and tertiary); and a lower share of women employed in the non-agricultural sector. **Tables 8-4, 8-5** and **8-6** in the Appendix show the same comparison using the three alternative definitions of fragile countries. The results are similar.

² The list of the countries is presented in Section 2. For details on the selection of the 47 fragile states, see OECD (2013a).

Table 3-1: Comparison of levels of selected MDG indicators in 2010 by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)

Indicator	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
Primary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	54	27	90.3104 (15.1553)	68.4219 (21.7288)	5.2788 (0.0000)
Primary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	52	26	89.7645 (16.0357)	64.1904 (24.0914)	5.5847 (0.0000)
Primary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	52	26	89.7843 (14.8565)	71.3066 (20.4934)	4.5468 (0.0000)
Secondary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	48	31	74.0078 (35.3169)	66.4819 (36.1416)	0.9164 (0.3623)
Secondary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	47	30	74.1480 (37.2004)	67.1300 (38.3443)	0.7977 (0.4276)
Secondary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	47	30	72.2560 (33.7921)	65.5087 (35.4594)	0.8382 (0.4046)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) year 2010	81	46	36.5395 (31.5423)	84.7326 (47.6493)	-6.8455 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live female births) year 2010	81	46	33.5346 (29.8985)	79.3391 (45.7479)	-6.8145 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live male births) year 2010	81	46	39.3877 (33.1639)	89.8109 (49.4496)	-6.8619 (0.0000)
Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments (%) year 2010	78	42	17.3436 (9.7345)	15.3691 (12.1944)	0.9684 (0.3348)
Ratio of female to male primary enrollment (%) year 2010	62	29	97.6070 (3.9282)	91.7890 (10.6105)	3.8132 (0.0003)
Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment (%) year 2010	58	21	100.5163 (11.0798)	83.4552 (20.1937)	4.7754 (0.0000)
Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment (%) year 2010	50	22	114.8809 (37.9804)	75.9352 (42.7546)	3.8564 (0.0003)
Share of women employed in the nonagricultural sector (% of total nonagricultural employment) year 2010	44	13	40.1900 (10.2623)	28.5231 (12.2034)	3.4490 (0.0011)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.

Note: The T-statistic corresponds to a two-group mean comparison test (t-test) using as the two groups the non-fragile states and fragile states.

In terms of MDG achievement, it is often observed that fragile states are off track and will probably not achieve the Goals by 2015 (Vandemoortele, 2012). According to the Global Monitoring Report (World Bank, 2009), thirty percent of fragile states are off track and seriously off track to achieve the poverty reduction target. With regard to promoting gender


equality and empower women, some progress in achieving gender equality in education has been made but fragile states still have work to do at all education levels.

Figure 3-1 presents MDG achievements in terms of percentage point *changes* for selected indicators: primary education completion rate; under-five mortality rate; and the ratio of female to male primary and secondary education enrollment between 1990 and 2010 for fragile and non-fragile states. It is important to note however that this information can only be computed for a low number of countries in both groups, especially for the education indicators, and so caution is needed when interpreting these results. The information is presented using box plots. As discussed by Cox (2009), box plots summarise helpful information corresponding to a variable related to location or levels (median); spread (interquartile range and range); asymmetry about the median; and possible outliers. We observe that with regard to male primary completion rates, both fragile and non-fragile states have made similar progress. However, with regard to female primary completion rates some fragile states have performed better in relative terms, probably as they started from lower levels in 1990. A similar pattern is observed for the ratios of female to male primary and secondary enrollment. Regarding the reduction of male and female under five mortality rates, it seems that fragile states have lagged behind. **Figures 8-1, 8-2, and 8-3** in the Appendix show the same comparison using the three alternative definitions of fragile countries.

In order to achieve the MDGs and eliminate poverty it is necessary to ensure that all poor people benefit from poverty reduction interventions. Currently, being female remains a disadvantage in every area of progress in international development, making women poorer and adversely affecting their dependents and the next generation (Beall and Piron, 2005). Women and girls constitute at least 50 percent of the world's population and are disproportionately represented among the poorest and most excluded groups.

Although there has been progress among fragile states in terms of income levels, they are still home to one third of the world's poor population, being more vulnerable to internal or external shocks than stable countries (OECD, 2013a). Therefore, donor interventions and aid effectiveness should adopt a new approach for these countries. As an example, and as explained before, Sapkota and Shiratori (2013) suggest including for the post 2015 agenda inclusive development and resilient society, in order not to leave behind low-income countries and fragile states.

Figure 3-1: Change of selected MDG indicators (growth rate as a percentage) between 1990 and 2010 in Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)



Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.

4. The relevance of social institutions related to gender inequality in fragile states

When thinking about the post MDG agenda, the case has been made that a new framework for fragile states is required that involves building security, legitimacy, governance and economy to bring security and development together (Zoellick, 2008). A country's situation

of fragility may have varying causes. Collier (2014), for example, identifies as possible causes: i) problems with the economy; ii) with the society; or iii) with the government.

We argue in this paper that gender considerations seem to be even more important in fragile states than in non-fragile states. Baranyi and Powell (2005, p. 1) claim that gender inequality is "a central feature of state fragility". There seems to be an emerging consensus that the post-MDG framework should apply a gender inequality and a conflict-sensitive approach, and include measures to build and develop capacity for data collection and analysis on gender-related issues, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected contexts (Cordaid, 2013). The relevance of gender considerations in fragile states can be more easily understood if one recalls that: i) men and women are affected differently by state fragility; and ii) gender roles and relations are crucial to understanding opportunities and obstacles to state building (Baranyi and Powell, 2005).

Nevertheless, even if gender issues are clearly relevant for fragile countries, the topic of 'gender and fragility' remains relatively under-researched. Harcourt (2009, p. 1) identifies gender and fragility as "an emerging new theme in [the] gender and development literature and as an important component of the current policy debate around peace and security and aid effectiveness in fragile states". Among existing studies, few deal with the empowerment of women in fragile states (e.g., Armendáriz and Roome, 2008), and only a couple relate to gender inequality and conflict. For instance, Caprioli (2005) finds that gender inequality increases the chances of intra-state conflict even when controlling for economic factors. Similarly, Melander's (2005) study suggests a significant relationship between women's educational attainment ratio and female representation in parliament, and lower levels of conflict within a country. Concerning women's attitudes towards peace, Yablon (2009) reports that women are more positively consistent in their attitudes towards peace than men.

4.1. The measurement at the country level of social institutions related to gender inequality

In this paper, we follow a relatively new strand of the literature on gender inequality that appears particularly pertinent for fragile states. We focus on the measurement at the country level of *social institutions related to gender inequality*, defined as societal practices and legal norms that frame gender roles and the distribution of power between men and women in the family, the market, and in social and political life (e.g., De Soysa and Jütting, 2007; Branisa et al., 2014). Branisa et al. (2014) use 12 variables from the OECD Centre's Gender, Institutions and Development (GID) Database (Morrison and Jütting, 2005; Jütting et al. 2008) to construct several composite measures of social institutions related to gender inequality. All the variables in the database, as well as the proposed composite measures, are coded between 0 and 1, where 0 means no or very low inequality, and 1 indicates high inequality. Some of the variables are continuous, but most measure social institutions on an ordinal scale.

It is useful to briefly describe the five subindices proposed by Branisa et al. (2014). Each subindex is designed to provide a summary measure of one dimension of social institutions related to gender inequality. The aggregation of variables corresponding to each subindex is performed using polychoric principal component analysis.³ Only countries with non-missing values for all the variables corresponding to a subindex get assigned a value for the subindex. The subindex **Family Code** measures the decision-making power of women in the household and includes the variables 'Parental authority;' 'Inheritance;' 'Early marriage;' and 'Polygamy.' The subindex **Civil Liberties** captures the freedom of social participation for women and includes the variables 'Freedom of movement' and 'Freedom of dress.' The subindex **Physical Integrity** comprises the indicators 'Violence against women' and 'Female genital mutilation.' The subindex **Son Preference** reflects an extreme manifestation of son preference under scarce resources using the variable 'missing women' that measures gender bias in mortality (Klasen and Wink, 2003; Sen, 1992). Finally, the subindex **Ownership Rights** proxies access of women to several types of property and include 'Women's access to land;' 'Women's access to bank loans;' and 'Women's access to property other than land.' For a full description of these variables and the coding scheme used, please refer to Branisa et al. (2014) and the supplemental content on the publisher's website.

Using the five subindices described before as inputs, Branisa et al. (2014) propose a multidimensional composite index named **Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI)** which reflects the deprivation of women caused by social institutions related to gender inequality. Only countries with non-missing values for all the subindices get a value for SIGI. The objective of SIGI is to capture the institutional basis of gender inequality. As it was the case for all variables and subindices, the index value is between 0 and 1, where 0 reflects no or very low inequality and 1 denotes high inequality.

Issues around social institutions related to gender inequality in fragile states have received little attention to date. As far as we are aware, no systematic study has been conducted on the topic, i.e. the measurement of social institutions related to gender inequality in fragile states, and the relevance of these institutions to the MDGs, and for the post-MDG development agenda.

4.2. Social institutions related to gender inequality in fragile states

The question remains of whether gender inequality is a cause or an outcome of fragility in states. This certainly goes beyond the scope of this paper, and a complete answer probably needs to be based on multiple case studies. Nevertheless, following Branisa et al. (2013) we conceive social institutions related to gender inequality as long-lasting norms, values, and codes of conduct that find expression in traditions; customs and cultural practices; and informal and formal laws. They shape gender roles and the distribution of power between men and women in the family, in the market, and in social and political life. Gender inequalities seem to be rooted in gender roles that evolve from these institutions. It is possible that these same institutions are also related to some of the problems stressed by

³ Please refer to the original paper for details.

Collier (2014), who identifies that fragile situations may be caused by problems i) with the economy; ii) with the society; or iii) with the government. The idea presented by Jones et al. (2008) when reflecting on state building appears relevant here. They suggest that a focus on formal and informal governance structures which address inequality and promote accountability is likely to promote stability over time. All this, of course, remains highly speculative for the time being.


Another aspect that deserves attention for policy implications is that fragile states will experience difficulties implementing policies to change social institutions related to gender inequality. As clearly stated by the (OECD, 2013a, p. 15), a fragile state is one that "[...] has weak capacity to carryout basic governance functions, and lacks the ability to develop mutually constructive relations with society [...] vulnerable to internal or external shocks such as economic crises or natural disasters [...] and low capacity and legitimacy of governing a population and its territory". These countries require support to improve their situation.

This being said, the main question we seek to address in this section is whether measures of social institutions related to gender inequality are, on average, different between fragile states and other non-fragile developing countries. As already noted, we follow the OECD (2013a) by classifying countries as fragile or non-fragile.

We start inspecting the data visually using box plots for fragile and for non-fragile states for the SIGI and the five subindices in **Figure 4-1**. Box plots are particularly useful for comparing distributions across groups (Wickham and Stryjewski, 2012). Fragile and non-fragile countries appear to have different distributions concerning the SIGI, and the subindices Family Code, Physical Integrity, and Ownership Rights.

We replicate these box plots using alternative classifications of fragile countries: the FSI 2014 definition (FFP, 2014); the CPIA 2008 definition (Klasen, 2013); and the DFID definition (Klasen, 2013) in **Figures 9-1, 9-2 and 9-3** in the Appendix. The visual inspection yields similar results as with **Figure 4-1**.

Figure 4-1: Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights by fragility according to the OECD (2013a) definition, year 2009



Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and OECD (2013a).

We then divide all countries with available data in quintiles according to the values for the SIGI, and for each of the five subindices described before. The first quintile consists of countries with lowest inequality, and the fifth quintile includes countries with highest inequality. We then split the countries in each quintile according to whether the country is considered a non-fragile state or fragile state, according to the OECD (2013a). Results are shown in **Table 4-1**. A pattern is noticeable for the SIGI and three of the subindices (Family

Code, Physical Integrity, and Ownership Rights). With regard to non-fragile states, more than 50 percent belong to the quintiles reflecting low inequality. For fragile states, more than 50 percent appear in the quintiles with high inequality. Such a pattern is not found in the case of the subindices Civil Liberties and Son Preference.

Table 4-1: Pattern according to fragility [according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)] of the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009

	Non Fragile States		Fragile States		Total Observations
	Observations	%	Observations	%	
SIGI 2009					
Quintile 1	21	30%	0	0%	21
Quintile 2	17	24%	3	10%	20
Quintile 3	15	21%	6	19%	21
Quintile 4	11	15%	9	29%	20
Quintile 5	7	10%	13	42%	20
Total	71	100%	31	100%	102
Subindex: Family Code 2009					
Quintile 1	22	28%	1	3%	23
Quintile 2	20	26%	2	6%	22
Quintile 3	13	17%	10	29%	23
Quintile 4	14	18%	8	24%	22
Quintile 5	9	12%	13	38%	22
Total	78	100%	34	100%	112
Subindex: Civil Liberties 2009					
Quintile 1, 2, 3	62	73%	21	55%	83
Quintile 4	11	13%	8	21%	19
Quintile 5	12	14%	9	24%	21
Total	85	100%	38	100%	123
Subindex: Physical Integrity 2009					
Quintile 1	30	39%	2	5%	32
Quintile 2	12	16%	2	5%	14
Quintile 3	23	30%	9	24%	32
Quintile 4	6	8%	13	35%	19
Quintile 5	6	8%	11	30%	17
Total	77	100%	37	100%	114
Subindex: Son Preference 2009					
Quintile 1, 2, 3	62	74%	26	67%	88
Quintile 4	6	7%	6	15%	12
Quintile 5	16	19%	7	18%	23
Total	84	100%	39	100%	123
Subindex: Ownership Rights 2009					
Quintile 1	37	44%	5	13%	42
Quintile 2	10	12%	0	0%	10
Quintile 3	20	24%	3	8%	23
Quintile 4	15	18%	17	45%	32
Quintile 5	2	2%	13	34%	15
Total	84	100%	38	100%	122

Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and OECD (2013a).

We additionally perform two formal tests to check whether there are differences between fragile and non-fragile countries concerning social institutions related to gender inequality. Results are presented in **Table 4-2**. The first test is a two-group mean comparison test (t-test) using as the two groups the fragile and non-fragile states. As the data might be

interpreted as being ordinal rather than cardinal, we also perform a Wilcoxon rank-sum test⁴, which is based exclusively on the order in which the observations from the two groups fall (Wilcoxon, 1945; Mann and Whitney, 1947) and is a nonparametric alternative to the two-sample t-test. Results from both tests point in the same direction, and reject at the 1 percent level that fragile and non-fragile states have both been drawn from the same population when considering the SIGI, and the subindices Family Code, Physical Integrity, and Ownership Rights.

The results of the formal tests are fairly robust to alternative classifications of fragile countries. We replicate the tests using the other three definitions, and present the results in **Tables 9-1** (FSI 2014 definition), **9-2** (CPIA 2008 definition) and **9-3** (DFID definition) in the Appendix.

Table 4-2: Mean-comparison test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test between fragile and non-fragile states [according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)] for the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)	Rank sum		Expected		Wilcoxon test Z-statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States		Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
SIGI_2009	71	31	0.0852 (.0890)	0.2189 (.1380)	-5.8547 (0.0000)	2952	2301	3657	1597	-5.1260 (0.0000)
subindex_family_2009	78	34	0.2630 (.2136)	0.4719 (.1710)	-5.0372 (0.0000)	3682	2647	4407	1921	-4.5910 (0.0000)
subindex_civil_2009	85	38	0.1279 (.2323)	0.2306 (.3019)	-2.0584 (0.0417)	4966	2660	5270	2356	-2.0050 (0.0450)
subindex_physical_2009	77	37	0.3002 (.1663)	0.4772 (.1860)	-5.1179 (0.0000)	3600	2956	4428	2128	-5.0290 (0.0000)
subindex_son_2009	84	39	0.1280 (.2376)	0.1474 (.2481)	-0.4168 (0.6776)	5115	2511	5208	2418	-0.6370 (0.5243)
subindex_ownership_2009	84	38	0.2022 (.2132)	0.5107 (.2496)	-7.0100 (0.0000)	4146	3357	5166	2337	-5.8030 (0.0000)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and OECD (2013a).

Note: SIGI_2009 refers to Social Institutions and Gender Index; subindex_family_2009 refers to Family Code; subindex_civil_2009 refers to Civil Liberties; subindex_physical_2009 refers to Physical Integrity; subindex_son_2009 refers to Son Preference; and subindex_ownership_2009 refers to Ownership Right; all for the year 2009.

Until now we have dealt mainly with composite measures. We would also like to know which of the underlying variables are the ones driving the results. We inspect graphically using box plots and histograms the 12 variables used in the construction of the subindices of the SIGI to check whether fragile and non-fragile states seems to have different distributions (**Figures 9-4 – 9-7** in the Appendix). As a next step we repeat both statistical tests (the t-test and the Wilcoxon rank-sum test) for the 12 variables used in the construction of the subindices of the SIGI (**Table 4-3**). This is interesting because we have more observations for the variables than for the subindices and for the SIGI, and having more observations increases the statistical power of the tests. As stressed before, only countries with no missing values for

⁴ The Wilcoxon rank-sum test is also known in the literature as Mann–Whitney U test, Mann–Whitney–Wilcoxon test, and Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney test.

each of the variables are assigned a value for the corresponding subindex, and only countries with no missing values for all the subindices are assigned a value for the SIGI. The results confirm that there are differences in all nine variables corresponding to the subindices Family Code, Physical Integrity, and Ownership Rights, but not for the variables corresponding to the subindices Civil Liberties and Son Preference.

We conclude that fragile states perform worse than other non-fragile developing countries when considering social institutions related to gender inequality, and in particular in the dimensions (1) **Family Code**, which measures the decision-making power of women in the household and includes the variables 'Parental authority,' 'Inheritance,' 'Early marriage,' and 'Polygamy', (2) **Physical Integrity, which** comprises the indicators on 'Violence against women' and 'Female genital mutilation.', and (3) **Ownership rights**, which proxies access of women to several types of property and include 'Women's access to land,' 'Women's access to bank loans,' and 'Women's access to property other than land.'

Table 4-3: Mean-comparison test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test between fragile and non-fragile states [according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)] for the variables used in the subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, and Ownership Rights 2009.

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)	Rank sum		Expected		Wilcoxon test Z-statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States		Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
par_auth	83	39	0.3313 (.4152)	0.5641 (.3835)	-2.9572 (0.0037)	4595	2909	5105	2399	-3.0130 (0.0026)
inher	82	39	0.2927 (.3234)	0.5256 (.2797)	-3.8610 (0.0002)	4383	2998	5002	2379	-3.8020 (0.0001)
ear_marr	82	34	0.1599 (.1068)	0.3132 (.1685)	-5.8803 (0.0000)	4028	2759	4797	1989	-4.6690 (0.0000)
polyg	85	39	0.3588 (.3827)	0.6026 (.4003)	-3.2455 (0.0015)	4773	2978	5313	2438	-3.0970 (0.0020)
fem_mut	78	37	0.0682 (.2036)	0.2354 (.3215)	-3.3857 (0.0010)	3911	2759	4524	2146	-4.5070 (0.0000)
vio	84	39	0.5163 (.2356)	0.7008 (.2252)	-4.0956 (0.0001)	4483	3144	5208	2418	-4.0090 (0.0001)
free_mov	85	38	0.1235 (.2302)	0.2237 (.3008)	-2.0213 (0.0455)	5000	2626	5270	2356	-1.8830 (0.0597)
obli_veil	85	39	0.0941 (.2112)	0.1795 (.3138)	-1.7814 (0.0773)	5121	2630	5313	2438	-1.4600 (0.1443)
son_2009	84	39	0.1280 (.2376)	0.1474 (.2481)	-0.4168 (0.6776)	5115	2511	5208	2418	-0.6370 (0.5243)
wom_land	84	38	0.2619 (.2741)	0.5263 (.3277)	-4.6363 (0.0000)	4504	2999	5166	2337	-4.0830 (0.0000)
wom_loans	84	39	0.1548 (.2325)	0.4744 (.2797)	-6.6416 (0.0000)	4306	3320	5208	2418	-5.5780 (0.0000)
wom_prop	84	39	0.1667 (.2494)	0.4744 (.2797)	-6.1219 (0.0000)	4339	3287	5208	2418	-5.3510 (0.0000)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and OECD (2013a).

Note: par_auth refers to Parental Authority/Legal guardian of a child during marriage; inher refers to Inheritance rights of spouses; ear_marr refers to Percentage of women married between 15-19 years old; polyg refers to Poligamy acceptance or legality if acceptance is missing; fem_mut refers to Female Genital Mutilation; vio refers to Violence against women/Legal indicator; free_mov refers to Freedom of movement; obli_veil refers to Dress Code in Public; son_2009 refers to Son preference; wom_land refers to Women's access to land; wom_loans refers to Women's access to bank loans; and wom_prop refers to Women's access to property other than land; all for the year 2009.

4.3. The importance of social institutions related to gender inequality for fragile states for fragile and non-fragile states

Why is all this pertinent for the Post 2015 Development Agenda? We think that this is related to the view championed by Amartya Sen (e.g., Sen, 1999), who reasons that freedom is both intrinsic and instrumental to development.

First, from the **intrinsic** perspective, it should be clear that in all developing countries but particularly in fragile states, policies focusing on changing gendered development outcomes should take into account inequalities in social institutions as relevant constraints. As already shown, fragile states perform worse than other developing countries in the dimensions **Family Code, Physical Integrity, and Ownership Rights**. This, of course, does not mean that

the issue is not relevant for *all* developing countries and it should be addressed explicitly as it reflects the deprivation of women. Attempting to remove this deprivation is essential.

Second, Sen (1999) argues that different kinds of freedom interrelate with one another, and freedom of one type may to a great extent help in advancing freedom of other types. From this **instrumental** perspective we should consider the studies at the cross-country level that show that social institutions related to gender inequality are associated with, and appear to be relevant for, several development outcomes such as female education, child mortality, fertility, and governance in developing countries. The empirical results from Branisa et al. (2013) for example suggest that apart from geography, the political system, the level of economic development, and religion, one should consider social institutions related to gender inequality to better account for differences in development outcomes among developing countries. This line of research indicates that trying to address these gendered institutional constraints in fragile states should be high on the agenda when trying to promote development outcomes in general. To illustrate the correlation between the measures of social institutions related to gender inequality and several outcomes, highlighting fragile states versus non-fragile states, we present several plots in the Appendix (**Figures 9-8 – 9-21**).

One could think of including a special set of indicators reflecting social institutions related to gender inequality in both fragile states and non-fragile states as part of the post-MDG agenda. Also, one could consider special measures to help fragile states improve the situation and reduce gender inequality as part of the new global partnership towards a new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability. We believe that Vandemoortele (2012) is right when he claims that the post-2015 agenda must be global and universal, and it should not include targets for particular regions or specific types of countries.

As a start point, one could use the 12 variables described in Branisa et al. (2014) which are used to build the five subindices or composite measures of different dimensions of social institutions related to gender inequality described already. **Family Code** measures the decision-making power of women in the household and includes the variables 'Parental authority,' 'Inheritance,' 'Early marriage,' and 'Polygamy.' **Civil Liberties** captures the freedom of social participation of women and includes the variables 'Freedom of movement' and 'Freedom of dress.' **Physical Integrity** comprises the indicators on 'Violence against women' and 'Female genital mutilation.' The subindex **Son Preference** reflects an extreme manifestation of son preference under scarce resources using the variable 'missing women' that measures gender bias in mortality (Klasen and Wink, 2003; Sen, 1992). Finally, the subindex **Ownership Rights** proxies access of women to several types of property and includes 'Women's access to land,' 'Women's access to bank loans,' and 'Women's access to property other than land.' For a complete description of all these variables and the coding scheme, please refer to Branisa et al. (2014) and the supplemental content on the publisher's website.

5. The need for collecting new and better data on social institutions related to gender inequality

Apart from the composite indices presented before from Branisa et al. (2014) which have been modified and updated by the OECD (www.genderindex.org), systematic information proxying social institutions related to gender inequality at the cross-country level is scarce.⁵ Some relevant data can be found under the gender-specific human rights measures of the CIRI Human Rights Data Project (<http://www.humanrightsdata.org>); the Women's Political Rights index (WOPOL) which focuses on the right of women to vote, petition, and be elected; the Women's Economic Rights index (WECON) which focuses on women's equal rights in the labour market; and the Women's Social Rights index (WOSOC) which focuses on rights in the social sphere (marriage, inheritance, travel, education, etc.). All these measures have their shortcomings, but can be useful in highlighting situations that are problematic in a given country, in bringing attention from stakeholders, and in initiating a fruitful discussion.

Understanding the institutional roots of gender inequality in developing countries is crucial. Concerning the availability of useful data for this task, the situation is even more difficult for fragile states. We argue that much effort is needed from donors to collect and evaluate information concerning social institutions related to gender inequality in both fragile and non-fragile states. This should be seen as part of a wider process to better understand the distribution of power in these countries. Institutions are by definition long-lasting, and if one wants to promote changes one should propose appropriate solutions and incentives for each society. As discussed by Branisa et al. (2013), this should include the identification of stakeholders in the countries who are willing to become reform drivers and initiate learning processes that should be complemented by deliberation and public discussion at all levels of society.

As already noted, fragile states are not a homogeneous group and so case studies are needed. This initiative should go beyond the indicators that have been used until now, and be understood as part of a broader process that builds the new global partnership towards a new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability as suggested by the UN High Level Panel (2013).

⁵ As a robustness check, we replicate in the Appendix many tables and figures from the paper with the variables and composite measures of the OECD (SIGI 2012 and subindices) from www.genderindex.org, instead of the ones from Branisa et al. (2014). The results are quite similar, but the number of observations is lower.

6. Conclusions

We have shown that social institutions related to gender inequality, defined as societal practices and legal norms that frame gender roles and the distribution of power between men and women in the family, market, and social and political life (e.g., De Soysa and Jütting, 2007; Branisa et al., 2014), appear even more important for fragile states than for non-fragile states. We argued that indicators related to this issue are relevant for both fragile and non-fragile states when reflecting upon the post-2015 agenda.

These indicators should be considered explicitly as part of the post-MDG discussion, because these social institutional constraints play both an intrinsic and an instrumental role in development (Sen, 1999). From an intrinsic point of view, social institutions related to gender inequality reveal the deprivation of women, which cannot be tolerated if we are to take seriously the first transformative shift of leaving no one behind, proposed by the UN High Level Panel (2013). In addition, and from an instrumental perspective, it has been argued that reducing gender inequality could benefit not only women but the whole society, as social institutions related to gender inequality are associated with, and appear to be relevant for, several development outcomes including female education, child mortality, fertility, and governance in developing countries (Branisa et al., 2013).

Special effort is required to collect more and better data in fragile and non-fragile states to understand how social institutions related to gender inequality shape the lives of men and women in various spheres. This should be part of a broader process to better understand the distribution of power in these countries, and to determine which special measures could help fragile states develop and reduce gender inequality. This is surely related to the spirit of the fifth transformative shift proposed by the UN High Level Panel (2013) of building a new global partnership towards a new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability that must underpin the post-2015 agenda.

7. References

- Abramo, L., and Valenzuela, M. E. (2005). Women's Labour Force Participation Rates in Latin America. *International Labour Review*. Vol. 144, No. 4, p. 369-400.
- Afridi, F., Iversen, V., and Sharan, M. R. (2013). Women Political Leaders, Corruption and Learning: Evidence from a Large Public Program in India. Discussion Paper Series No. 7212, Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit (IZA).
- Armendáriz, B. and Roome, N. (2008). Empowering Women via Microfinance in Fragile States. Working Papers CEB 08-001.RS. Université Libre de Bruxelles.
- Asal, V., Brown, M., and Figueroa, R. G. (2008). Structure, Empowerment and the Liberalization of Cross-National Abortion Rights. *Politics & Gender*, Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 265-284.
- Bandiera, O., and Natraj, A. (2013). Does Gender Inequality Hinder Development and Economic Growth? Evidence and Policy Implications. *The World Bank Research Observer*, Vol. 28, No. 1, p. 2-21.
- Baranyi, S., and Powell, K. (2005). Fragile States, Gender Equality and Aid Effectiveness: A Review of Donor Perspectives. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Gender Equality Division.
- Beall, J., and Piron, L. H. (2005). DFID Social Exclusion Review. London: Overseas Development Institute, 32-7.
- Beall, J., Gelb, S., and Hassim, S. (2005). Fragile Stability: State and Society in Democratic South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 4, p. 681-700.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung. (2008). Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2008. Politische Gestaltung im internationalen Vergleich. Gütersloh: Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Besley, T., and Persson, T. (2011). Fragile States and Development Policy. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 9, No. 3, p. 371-398.
- Boserup, E. (1971). Women's Role in Economic Development. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Bourguignon, F., Benassy-Quere, A., Dercon, S., Estache, A., Gunning, J.W., Kanbur, R., Klasen, S., Maxwell, S., Platteau, J.P. and Spadaro, A. (2008). Millennium Development Goals at Midpoint: Where Do We Stand and Where Do We Need to Go?. European Commission.
- Bouta, T., Frerks, G. and Bannon, I. (2005). Gender, Conflict and Development. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Branisa, B., Klasen, S., and Ziegler, M. (2013). Gender Inequality in Social Institutions and Gendered Development Outcomes. *World Development*, Vol. 45, p. 252-268.
- Branisa, B., Klasen, S., Ziegler, M., Drechsler, D., and Jütting, J. (2014). The Institutional Basis of Gender Inequality: The Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI). *Feminist Economics*, Vol. 20, Issue 2, p. 29-64.
- Branisa, B., and Ziegler, M. (2011). Reexamining the Link Between Gender and Corruption: The Role of Social Institutions. Proceedings of the German Development Economics Conference, Berlin 2011, Verein für Socialpolitik, Research Committee Development Economics.
- Browne, E. (2013). State Fragility and Social Cohesion. Governance and Social Development Resource Centre Helpdesk Research Report 1027.

- Brück T., and Schindler K. (2008). The Impact of Conflict and Fragility on Households: A Conceptual Framework with Reference to Widows. Research Paper/ UNU-WIDER No. 2008.83.
- Caprioli, M. (2003). Gender Equality and Civil Wars. Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit, Social Development Department, Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network, World Bank.
- Caprioli, M. (2005). The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 2, p. 161-178.
- Carment, D., Prest, S., Gazo, J. J., el-Achkar, S., Samy, Y., and Bell, T. (2006). Failed and Fragile States 2006. A Briefing Note for the Canadian Government. Country Indicators for Foreign Policy, Carleton University.
- Castillejo, C. (2011). Building a State that Works for Women: Integrating Gender into Post-Conflict State Building. Working Paper FRIDE No. 107.
- Cerise, S. and Francavilla, F. (2012). Tackling the Root Causes of Gender Inequalities in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. OECD Development Centre, Paris.
- Châtaignier, M and Magro, H. (2007). Etats et Sociétés Fragiles: Entre Conflits, Reconstruction et Développement. Karthala Editions.
- Cingranelli, D. L., and Richards, D. L. (2010). The Cingranelli–Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset. Electronic Publication. Available from <http://www.humanrightsdata.org>.
- Coffé, H. and Dilli, S. (2014). The Gender Gap in Political Participation in Muslim-Majority Countries. *International Political Science Review*. Published online before print May 12, 2014.
- Collier, P. (2014). Fragile African States: What Should Donors Do?. FERDI Document de travail No. 2014/P95.
- Collier, P. (2008). The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can be Done About It. Oxford University Press.
- Cordaid (2013). Gender Inequality and Fragility in the Post-MDG Framework. Cordaid Policy Paper 2013. Catholic Organization for Relief and Development Aid.
- Cox, N.J. (2009). Speaking Stata: Creating and varying box plots. *Stata Journal*. Vol. 9, p. 478–496.
- DFID (2005). Why We Need to Work More Effectively in Fragile States. Department for International Development, London.
- De Soysa, I., and Jütting, J. (2007). Informal Institutions and Development: How They Matter and What Makes Them Change. In J. Jütting, D. Drechsler, S. Bartsch, and I. de Soysa (Eds.), *Informal institutions. How Social Norms Help or Hinder Development* (p.29-43). Paris: OECD Development Centre.
- Dreher, A., Gehring, K., and Klasen, S. (2013). Gesture Politics or Real Commitment? Gender Inequality and the Allocation of Aid. No. 2013/079. WIDER Working Paper.
- Duflo, E. (2012). Women Empowerment and Economic Development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 50, No. 4, p. 1051-79.
- Dubois, J-L. and Huyghebaert, P. (2009). Relating Fragile States to Social and Human Fragilities. *Ethics and Economics*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 19.
- Easterly W. (2009). How the Millennium Development Goals are Unfair to Africa. *World Development*, Vol. 37, No. 1, p. 26–35.

- Economist Intelligence Unit (2009). *Manning the Barricades: Who's at Risk as Deepening Economic Distress Foments Social Distress*. London: Economist Intelligence Unit.
- Foreign Policy and Fund for Peace (2009). *The Failed States Index 2009*. Foreign Policy, Vol. 173, p. 80-127.
- FFP (2014). *The Failed State Index 2013*. Washington, D.C.: The Fund for Peace.
- García-Peñalosa, C., and Konte, M. (2014). Why Are Women Less Democratic Than Men? Evidence from Sub-Saharan African Countries. *World Development*, Vol. 59, p. 104-119.
- Global Peace Index. (2008). *Methodology, Results and Findings*. Institute for Economics and Peace.
- Harcourt, W. (2009). *Literature Review on Gender and Fragility*. European Report on Development. European Commission.
- Harper, C., Jones, N and Watson, C. (2012). *Gender Justice for Adolescent Girls: Tackling Social Institutions. Towards a Conceptual Framework*. Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- Harttgen, K., and Klasen, S. (2010). *Fragility and MDG Progress: How Useful is the Fragility Concept?* Courant Research Centre: Poverty, Equity and Growth - Discussion Papers 41, Courant Research Centre PEG.
- Harttgen, K., and Klasen, S. (2013). Do Fragile Countries Experience Worse MDG Progress? *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 1, p. 134-159.
- Hilker, L. (2012). *Empowerment in Fragile States and Situations of Fragility. Poverty Reduction and Pro-Poor Growth: The Role of Empowerment, 2012*, p. 137-76. Paris and Washington, D.C.: OECD.
- Hewitt, J. J., Wilkenfeld, J. and Gurr, T. R. (2010). *Peace and Conflict 2010*. Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland.
- Holvoet, N., and Inberg, L. (2013). *Multiple Pathways to Gender-Sensitive Budget Support in the Education Sector: Analyzing the Effectiveness of Sex-Disaggregated Indicators in Performance Assessment Frameworks and Gender Working Groups in (Education) Budget Support to Sub-Saharan Africa Countries*. No. 2013/105. WIDER Working Paper.
- Jones, B., Chandran, R., Cousens, E., Slotin, J., and Sherman, J. (2008). *From Fragility to Resilience: Concepts and Dilemmas of Statebuilding in Fragile States*. New York: Center on International Cooperation at New York University and International Peace Academy (A Research Paper for the OECD Fragile States Group).
- Jones, N., Harper, C., Watson, C., Espey, J., Wadugodapitiya, D., Page, E., and Clench, B. (2010). *Stemming Girls' Chronic Poverty: Catalysing Development Change by Building Just Social Institutions*. Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper.
- Jütting, J., Drechsler, D., Bartsch, S., and De Soysa, I. (2007). *Informal institutions: How social norms help or hinder development*. Development Centre of the OECD.
- Jütting, J., Morrisson, C., Dayton-Johnson, J., and Drechsler, D. (2008). *Measuring Gender (In)Equality: The OECD Gender, Institutions and Development Data Base*. *Journal of Human Development*, Vol 9, No. 1, p. 65–86.
- Kaplan, S. D. (2008). *Fixing Fragile States: A New Paradigm for Development*. CT/London: Praeger Security International.

- Kaplan, S. D. (2009). Identity in Fragile States: Social cohesion and state building. *Development*, Vol. 52, No. 4, p. 466–472.
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., and Mastruzzi, M. (2011). The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Kevane, M. (2004). *Women and Development in Africa: How Gender Works*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Kirk, J. (2007). Education and fragile states. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, Vol. 5, No. 2, p. 181-200.
- Klasen, S. (2013). Do Fragile Countries Experience Worse MDG Progress? *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 1, p. 134-159.
- Klasen, S., and Schüler, D. (2011). Reforming the Gender-Related Development Index and the Gender Empowerment Measure: Implementing Some Specific Proposals. *Feminist Economics*, Vol. 17, No. 1, p. 1-30.
- Klasen, S., and Wink, C. (2003). Missing Women: Revisiting the Debate. *Feminist Economics*, Vol. 9, p. 263–300.
- Klimis, E. (2009). State-Building in Central Africa: A Fragile Strategy for Fragile States. *Studia Diplomatica*, 2009, Vol. 62, No. 2, p. 41-52.
- Knowles, S., Lorgelly, P. K., and Owen, P. D. (2002). Are Educational Gender Gaps a Brake on Economic Development? Some Cross-Country Empirical Evidence. *Oxford economic papers*, Vol. 54, No. 1, p. 118-149.
- Koch, J. (2008). Does Gender Matter in Fragile States?. DIIS Policy Brief. Danish Institute for International Studies.
- Kolenikov, S. and Angeles, G.(2009). Socioeconomic Status Measurement with Discrete Proxy Variables: Is Principal Component Analysis a Reliable Answer? *Review of Income and Wealth*. Vol 55, No.1, p. 128–65.
- Konte, M. (2014). Gender Difference in Support for Democracy in Sub-Saharan Africa: Do Social Institutions Matter? Working Paper Series UNU-WIDER Research Paper, World Institute for Development Economic Research (UNU-WIDER).
- Luci, A., Jütting, J., and Morrisson, C. (2012). Why Do So Many Women End Up in ‘Bad Jobs’? A Cross-Country Assessment. *European Journal of Development Research*. Vol 24, No.4, p.530–49.
- Mann, H. B., and Whitney, D. R. (1947). On a Test of Whether One of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger Than the Other. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*. Vol 18, p.50–60.
- Marshall, M. G., and Cole, B. R. (2008). Global Report on Conflict, Governance and State Fragility 2008. *Foreign Policy Bulletin: The Documentary Record of United States Foreign Policy*, Vol. 18, No. 01, p.3-21.
- Mata, J. F., and Ziaja, S. (2009). Users' Guide on Measuring Fragility. German Development Institute.
- Mcloughlin, C. (2012). Topic Guide on Fragile States, Governance and Social Development Resource Centre, University of Birmingham.
- Melander, E. (2005). Gender Equality and Intrastate Armed Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 49, p. 695–714.

- Morrisson, C., and Jütting, J., (2005). Womens' Discrimination in Developing Countries: A New Data Set for Better Policies. *World Development*, Vol. 33, No. 7, p.1065–1081.
- Nay, O. (2014). International Organisations and the Production of Hegemonic Knowledge: How the World Bank and the OCCD helped invent the Fragile State Concept. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2, p. 210-231
- OECD (2010). Atlas of Gender and Development: How Social Norms Affect Gender Equality in Non-OECD Countries. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2012). The Missing Piece: Improving International Support to the Peace Process. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2013a). Fragile States 2013: Resource Flows and Trends in a Shifting World. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2013b). Gender and Statebuilding in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States, Conflict and Fragility, Paris: OECD.
- Osaghae, E. E. (2007). Fragile States. *Development in Practice*, Vol. 17, No. 4-5, p. 691-699.
- Puechguirbal, N. (2012). The Cost of Ignoring Gender in Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations: A Feminist Perspective. *Amsterdam Law Forum*, Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 4-19
- Rice, S. E., and Patrick, S. (2008). Index of State Weakness in the Developing World. Global Economy and Development, Brookings Institution.
- Rotberg, R. I., and Gisselquist, R. M. (2008). Strengthening African governance: Results and rankings 2008. The News, Harvard University, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.
- Sapkota, J. B., and Shiratori, S. (2013). Achieving the Millennium Development Goals: Lessons for Post-2015 New Development Strategies. No. 2013/62. JICAR-Research Institute Working Paper.
- Sekhar, C. S. C. (2010). Fragile States: The Role of Social, Political, and Economic Factors. *Journal of Developing Societies*, Vol. 26, No. 3, p. 263-293.
- Sen, A. (1992). Missing Women. *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 304, p. 586–587.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. New York: Alfred A. Knopf
- Sen, G. (2007). Informal Institutions and Gender Equality. In J. Jütting, D. Drechsler, S. Bartsch, and I. de Soysa (Eds.). Informal institutions: How Social Norms Help or Hinder Development (p. 49–72). Paris: OECD Development Centre.
- Torres, M. M., and Anderson, M. (2004). Fragile States: Defining Difficult Environments for Poverty Reduction. Poverty Reduction in Difficult Environments Team Policy Division, UK Department for International Development.
- United Nations (2012). The Millennium Development Goals report 2012. New York: The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- UN High Level Panel (2013). A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations Association-UK (UNA-UK) (2013). Global Development Goals: Leaving No One Behind. London: UNA-UK.
- UNDP (1995). Human Development Report 1995. Gender and Human Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP (2010). Thematic Paper on MDG 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women.

- UNDP (2012). *Powerful Synergies: Gender Equality, Economic Development and Environmental Sustainability*.
- Vandemoortele, J. (2012). *Advancing the Global Development Agenda Post-2015: Some Thoughts, Ideas and Practical Suggestions*. Background Paper prepared for the Experts Group Meeting to support the advancement of the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, New York (pp. 27-29).
- Van der Vleuten, A. (2013). *The Price of Gender Equality: Member States and Governance in the European Union*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Westoff, C. F., and Akinrinola, B. (2002). *Reproductive Preferences in Developing Countries at the Turn of the Century*. DHS Comparative Reports No. 2. Calverton, Maryland: ORC Macro.
- World Bank (2005). *Fragile States - Good Practice in Country Assistance Strategies*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (2007). *Global Monitoring Report 2007: Millenium Development Goals: Confronting the Challenges of Gender Equality and Fragile States*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (2008). *Country Policy and Institutional Assessment: 2008 Assessment Questionnaire*. Operations Policy and Country Services. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (2009). *Global Monitoring Report 2009*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (2011). *World Development Report 2012: Gender equality and development*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Wickham, H. and Stryjewski, L. (2012). *40 Years of Boxplots*. Manuscript submitted for publication. Available at: <http://vita.had.co.nz/papers/boxplots.html>
- Wilcoxon, F. 1945. Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods. *Biometrics* 1: 80–83.
- Yablon, Y.B. (2009). Gender Differences in the Consistency of Attitudes Towards Peace. *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 32, p. 305–310.
- Zoellick, R. B. (2008). Fragile States: Securing Development. *Survival*, Vol. 50, No. 6, p. 67-84.

APPENDIX

8. Information about fragile states and MDG indicators

Table 8-1: "Fragile states" as defined by the FSI (FFP, 2014), by region and income level

Region and Income Classification	Low-income fragile states (LIFS)	Lower-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)	Upper-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)	High-income fragile states (HIFS)
East Asia and Pacific	Cambodia Myanmar North Korea	Lao PDR Papua New Guinea Philippines Solomon Islands Timor-Leste		
Europe and Central Asia	Kyrgyzstan Tajikistan Uzbekistan	Georgia		
Latin America and Caribbean	Haiti	Guatemala	Colombia	
Middle East and North Africa	Syria	Djibouti Egypt Iraq Yemen	Iran, Islamic Rep. Lebanon Libya	
South Asia	Afghanistan Bangladesh Nepal	Bhutan Pakistan Sri Lanka		
Sub-Saharan Africa	Burkina Faso Burundi Central African Republic Chad Comoros Congo, Dem. Rep. Eritrea Ethiopia Gambia Guinea Guinea Bissau Kenya Liberia Madagascar Malawi Mali Mauritania Mozambique Niger Rwanda Senegal Sierra Leone Somalia Swaziland Tanzania Togo Uganda Zambia Zimbabwe	Cameroon Congo (Republic) Cote d'Ivoire South Sudan Sudan	Angola Equatorial Guinea	Equatorial Guinea

Source: FFP (2014) and World Bank Data

Table 8-2: “Fragile states” as defined by the CPIA (Klasen, 2013), by region and income level

Region and Income Classification	Low-income fragile states (LIFS)	Lower-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)	Upper-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)
East Asia and Pacific		Kiribati Solomon Islands Timor-Leste	
Europe and Central Asia			
Latin America and Caribbean	Haiti		
Middle East and North Africa		Djibouti	
South Asia	Afghanistan		
Sub-Saharan Africa	Burundi Central African Republic Chad Comoros Congo, Dem. Rep. Eritrea Guinea Guinea Bissau Sierra Leone Togo Zimbabwe	Congo (Republic) Cote d'Ivoire Sudan Angola	

Source: Klasen, (2013) and World Bank Data

Table 8-3: “Fragile states” as defined by the DFID (Klasen, 2013), by region and income level

Region and Income Classification	Low-income fragile states (LIFS)	Lower-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)	Upper-middle-income fragile states (MIFS)
East Asia and Pacific	Cambodia Vanuatu	Indonesia Kiribati Lao PDR Papua New Guinea Solomon Islands Timor-Leste	
Europe and Central Asia	Tajikistan Uzbekistan	Georgia	Azerbaijan
Latin America and Caribbean	Haiti	Guyana	Dominica
Middle East and North Africa		Djibouti Yemen	
South Asia	Afghanistan Nepal		
Sub-Saharan Africa	Burundi Central African Republic Comoros Eritrea Ethiopia Guinea Gambia Kenya Liberia Mali Niger Sierra Leone Somalia Chad Togo Congo (D. R.) Zimbabwe	Cote d'Ivoire Cameroon Congo (Republic) Nigeria South Sudan Sao Toma and P.	Angola

Source: Klasen (2013) and World Bank Data

Table 8-4: Comparison of levels of selected MDG indicators in 2010 by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the FSI (FFP, 2014), year 2010

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
Primary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	35	46	95.0414 (9.6858)	73.8631 (21.5861)	5.3994 (0.0000)
Primary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	33	45	94.6278 (10.0216)	71.4219 (24.0712)	5.2097 (0.0000)
Primary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	33	45	94.3472 (10.1399)	75.7622 (20.1178)	4.8670 (0.0000)
Secondary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	35	44	67.0347 (34.7179)	74.2522 (36.3697)	-0.8939 (0.3742)
Secondary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	35	42	68.2854 (36.8534)	74.0207 (38.3795)	-0.6648 (0.5082)
Secondary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	35	42	65.9716 (33.2375)	72.6735 (35.4093)	-0.8502 (0.3979)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) year 2010	63	64	26.3730 (21.9315)	81.1859 (44.4898)	-8.7842 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live female birhts) year 2010	63	64	23.9143 (20.6142)	75.9266 (42.7271)	-8.7148 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live male birhts) year 2010	63	64	28.6968 (23.2468)	86.1531 (46.1717)	-8.8357 (0.0000)
Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments (%) year 2010	60	60	17.4317 (10.3572)	15.8733 (10.9684)	0.8001 (0.4252)
Ratio of female to male primary enrollment (%) year 2010	42	49	98.0410 (3.1958)	93.7917 (9.0546)	2.8891 (0.0049)
Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment (%) year 2010	42	37	104.5125 (8.6551)	86.2968 (16.7022)	6.1906 (0.0000)
Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment (%) year 2010	38	34	131.6925 (27.3940)	70.8913 (33.9965)	8.3939 (0.0000)
Share of women employed in the nonagricultural sector (% of total nonagricultural employment) year 2010	40	17	40.9815 (9.8215)	29.4059 (12.0441)	3.8017 (0.0004)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.

Note: The T-statistic corresponds to a two-group mean comparison test (t-test) using as the two groups the non-fragile states and fragile states.

Table 8-5: Comparison of levels of selected MDG indicators in 2010 by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the CPIA (Klasen, 2013), year 2010

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
Primary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	69	12	87.5698 (17.4163)	56.8199 (15.8998)	5.7116 (0.0000)
Primary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	67	11	86.6750 (18.5712)	48.1345 (14.7081)	6.5416 (0.0000)
Primary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	67	11	87.4488 (16.8524)	60.3349 (14.0833)	5.0467 (0.0000)
Secondary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	68	11	71.2261 (35.5603)	69.9940 (37.5998)	0.1058 (0.9160)
Secondary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	67	10	71.5452 (37.1184)	70.5332 (42.4998)	0.0790 (0.9373)
Secondary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	67	10	69.7040 (34.2575)	69.1129 (37.0678)	0.0504 (0.9600)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) year 2010	107	20	43.1327 (35.4532)	112.1100 (43.8291)	-7.6839 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live female birhts) year 2010	107	20	39.8252 (33.8025)	105.2300 (42.3322)	-7.6203 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live male birhts) year 2010	107	20	46.2645 (37.0616)	118.5700 (45.2622)	-7.7251 (0.0000)
Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments (%) year 2010	101	19	16.9901 (10.6050)	14.8579 (11.0067)	0.7993 (0.4257)
Ratio of female to male primary enrollment (%) year 2010	78	13	97.4030 (5.1638)	85.8525 (10.0939)	6.3552 (0.0000)
Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment (%) year 2010	71	8	99.0504 (12.2378)	68.7410 (19.0956)	6.2461 (0.0000)
Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment (%) year 2010	63	9	110.5573 (40.0633)	49.9459 (21.7884)	4.4274 (0.0000)
Share of women employed in the nonagricultural sector (% of total nonagricultural employment) year 2010	56	1	37.8725 (11.5248)	18.3000	

Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.

Note: The T-statistic corresponds to a two-group mean comparison test (t-test) using as the two groups the non-fragile states and fragile states.


Table 8-6: Comparison of levels of selected MDG indicators in 2010 by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the DFID (Klasen, 2013), year 2010

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
Primary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	57	24	88.4967 (16.8336)	69.9935 (22.2846)	4.0912 (0.0001)
Primary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	56	22	88.2468 (17.4926)	63.4037 (24.2831)	5.0360 (0.0000)
Primary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	56	22	88.1319 (16.6736)	72.1533 (19.9413)	3.6005 (0.0006)
Secondary completion rate (% of relevant age group) year 2010	56	23	69.6846 (34.9971)	74.3900 (37.629)	-0.5312 (0.5968)
Secondary completion rate (% of female relevant age group) year 2010	55	22	70.0318 (36.8329)	74.8687 (39.9825)	-0.5080 (0.6129)
Secondary completion rate (% of male relevant age group) year 2010	55	22	67.8092 (33.3038)	74.1722 (37.3497)	-0.7315 (0.4668)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) year 2010	89	38	36.5124 (31.2726)	94.9421 (44.3962)	-8.4545 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live female birhts) year 2010	89	38	33.5169 (29.4954)	89.0237 (43.0718)	-8.4043 (0.0000)
Under 5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live male birhts) year 2010	89	38	39.3573 (33.0242)	100.4974 (45.6485)	-8.4791 (0.0000)
Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments (%) year 2010	85	35	17.5753 (10.7884)	14.4114 (10.1098)	1.4865 (0.1398)
Ratio of female to male primary enrollment (%) year 2010	65	26	97.9098 (4.0699)	90.3607 (10.2839)	5.0428 (0.0000)
Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment (%) year 2010	60	19	101.3952 (10.4361)	78.8840 (18.1086)	6.7582 (0.0000)
Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment (%) year 2010	51	21	120.5073 (36.153)	60.4166 (25.67000)	6.9193 (0.0000)
Share of women employed in the nonagricultural sector (% of total nonagricultural employment) year 2010	49	8	38.6073 (11.2588)	30.9250 (13.0446)	1.7516 (0.0854)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.


Note: The T-statistic corresponds to a two-group mean comparison test (t-test) using as the two groups the non-fragile states and fragile states.

Figure 8-1: Change of selected MDG indicators (growth rate as a percentage) between 1990 and 2010 in Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the FSI (FFP, 2014), year 2010




Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.

Figure 8-2: Change of selected MDG indicators (growth rate as a percentage) between 1990 and 2010 in Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the CPIA (Klasen, 2013), year 2010



Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.

Figure 8-3: Change of selected MDG indicators (growth rate as a percentage) between 1990 and 2010 in Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the DFID (Klasen, 2013), year 2010



Source: Own elaboration based on data from World Development Indicators.

9. Information about the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its subindices for the year 2009 (Branisa et al., 2014)

Figure 9-1: Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices by fragility according to the FSI 2014 definition (FFP, 2014), year 2009






Figure 9-2: Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices by fragility according to the CPIA 2008 definition (Klasen, 2013), year 2009



Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and Klasen (2013).

Figure 9-3: Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices by fragility according to the DFID definition (Klasen, 2013), year 2009



Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and Klasen (2013).

Table 9-1: Mean-comparison test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test between fragile and non-fragile states for the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, according to FSI 2014 definition(FFP, 2014)

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)	Rank sum		Expected		Wilcoxon test Z-statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States		Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
SIGI_2009	49	53	0.0621 (.0795)	0.1847 (.1260)	-5.8218 (0.0000)	1682	3571	2524	2730	-5.6360 (0.0000)
subindex_family_2009	56	56	0.2089 (.1888)	0.4439 (.1909)	-6.5478 (0.0000)	2202	4127	3164	3164	-5.6010 (0.0000)
subindex_civil_2009	63	60	0.1251 (.2438)	0.1960 (.2714)	-1.5253 (0.1298)	3586	4041	3906	3720	-1.9540 (0.0507)
subindex_physical_2009	55	59	0.2561 (.1216)	0.4523 (.1963)	-6.3575 (0.0000)	2169	4386	3163	3393	-5.6540 (0.0000)
subindex_son_2009	62	61	0.1250 (.2297)	0.1434 (.2519)	-0.4244 (0.6720)	3793	3834	3844	3782	-0.3280 (0.7428)
subindex_ownership_2009	62	60	0.1596 (.2068)	0.4415 (.2448)	-6.8776 (0.0000)	2713	4790	3813	3960	-5.7980 (0.0000)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and FFP (2014)

Note: SIGI_2009 refers to Social Institutions and Gender Index; subindex_family_2009 refers to Family Code; subindex_civil_2009 refers to Civil Liberties; subindex_physical_2009 refers to Physical Integrity; subindex_son_2009 refers to Son Preference; and subindex_ownership_2009 refers to Ownership Right; all for the year 2009.

Table 9-2: Mean-comparison test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test between fragile and non-fragile states for the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, according to CPIA 2008 definition(Klasen, 2013)

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)	Rank sum		Expected		Wilcoxon test Z-statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States		Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
SIGI_2009	90	12	0.1058 (.0975)	0.2760 (.1804)	-5.0434 (0.0000)	4302	951	4635	618	-3.4590 (0.0005)
subindex_family_2009	97	15	0.2911 (.2133)	0.5545 (.1322)	-4.6357 (0.0000)	4997	5481	1332	848	-4.1350 (0.0000)
subindex_civil_2009	107	16	0.1609 (.2514)	0.1510 (.3144)	0.1420 (0.8873)	6688	938	6634	992	0.4890 (0.6248)
subindex_physical_2009	99	15	0.3305 (.1804)	0.5373 (.1650)	-4.1781 (0.0001)	5217	1339	5693	863	-4.0040 (0.0001)
subindex_son_2009	106	17	0.1368 (.2368)	0.1176 (.2668)	0.3040 (0.7617)	6627	999	6572	1054	0.5080 (0.6117)
subindex_ownership_2009	106	16	0.2499 (.2374)	0.6186 (.2253)	-5.8269 (0.0000)	5912	1592	6519	984	-4.7420 (0.0000)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and Klasen (2013)

Note: SIGI_2009 refers to Social Institutions and Gender Index; subindex_family_2009 refers to Family Code; subindex_civil_2009 refers to Civil Liberties; subindex_physical_2009 refers to Physical Integrity; subindex_son_2009 refers to Son Preference; and subindex_ownership_2009 refers to Ownership Right; all for the year 2009.

Table 9-3: Mean-comparison test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test between fragile and non-fragile states for the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, according to DFID definition(Klasen, 2013)


Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)	Rank sum		Expected		Wilcoxon test Z-statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States		Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
SIGI_2009	74	28	0.1012 (.1146)	0.1910 (.1201)	-3.4853 (0.0007)	3301	1952	3811	1442	-3.8240 (0.0001)
subindex_family_2009	81	31	0.2729 (.2132)	0.4661 (.1861)	-4.4346 (0.0000)	3959	2369	4577	1752	-4.0160 (0.0001)
subindex_civil_2009	89	34	0.1691 (.2625)	0.1350 (.2517)	0.6507 (0.5165)	5633	1994	5518	2108	0.7800 (0.4353)
subindex_physical_2009	82	32	0.3072 (.1694)	0.4870 (.1850)	-4.9621 (0.0000)	3975	2581	4715	1840	-4.6860 (0.0000)
subindex_son_2009	89	34	0.1433 (.2409)	0.1103 (.2398)	0.6793 (0.4982)	5631	1995	5518	2108	0.8050 (0.4208)
subindex_ownership_2009	89	33	0.2412 (.2430)	0.4522 (.2680)	-4.1407 (0.0001)	4856	2648	5474	2030	-3.6660 (0.0002)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from Branisa et al. (2014) and Klasen (2013)


Note: SIGI_2009 refers to Social Institutions and Gender Index; subindex_family_2009 refers to Family Code; subindex_civil_2009 refers to Civil Liberties; subindex_physical_2009 refers to Physical Integrity; subindex_son_2009 refers to Son Preference; and subindex_ownership_2009 refers to Ownership Right; all for the year 2009.

Figure 9-4: Building the subindices for SIGI 2009, dimension Family Code 2009, by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Subindex Family Code: Parental authority 2009



Subindex Family Code: Inheritance 2009



Subindex Family Code: Early marriage 2009



Subindex Family Code: Polygamy 2009




Figure 9-5: Building the subindices for SIGI 2009, dimension Civil Liberties 2009 by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)




Figure 9-6: Building the subindices for SIGI 2009, dimension Physical Integrity 2009 by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)






Figure 9-7: Building the subindices for SIGI 2009, dimension Ownership Rights 2009 by Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)

Subindex Ownership Rights: Women's access to land 2009



Subindex Ownership Rights: Women's access to bank loans 2009



Subindex Ownership Rights: Women's access to property other than land 2009






Figure 9-8: Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – SIGI 2009




Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-9: Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – SIGI 2009




Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-10: Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – SIGI 2009




Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009




Figure 9-11: Female primary completion rate 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)




Figure 9-12: Adolescent fertility rate (births per 1,000 women ages 15-19) 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)






Figure 9-13: Total Fertility rate (births per woman) 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Fertility rate 2010 – SIGI 2009




Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-14: Maternal mortality ratio per 100,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – SIGI 2009




Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-15: Total infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Total infant mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2009




Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-16: Female infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Female infant mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2009




Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-17: Male infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Male infant mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2009




Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-18: Under-five mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2009




Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-19: Female Under-five mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2009




Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-20: Male Under-five mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2009




Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009



Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009






Figure 9-21: Malnutrition child prevalence, weight for age (% of children under five) 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Family Code, Civil Liberties, Physical Integrity, Son Preference and Ownership Rights, year 2009, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, classification by the OECD (2013a)


Malnutrition child prevalence 2010 – SIGI 2009




Malnutrition child prevalence 2010 – Subindex Family Code 2009




Malnutrition child prevalence 2010 – Subindex Civil Liberties 2009




Malnutrition child prevalence 2010 – Subindex Physical Integrity 2009



Malnutrition child prevalence 2010 – Subindex Son Preference 2009



Malnutrition child prevalence 2010 – Subindex Ownership Rights 2009



10. Information about the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its subindices for the year 2012 (www.genderindex.org)

Table 10-1: Country Fragility Pattern [according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)] of the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Discriminatory Family Code, Restricted Civil Liberties, Restricted Physical Integrity, Son Bias and Restricted Resources and Entitlements, year 2012

	Non-Fragile States		Fragile States		Total
	Observations	%	Observations	%	Observations
SIGI 2012					
Quintile 1	18	33%	0	0%	18
Quintile 2	13	24%	4	13%	17
Quintile 3	11	20%	6	19%	17
Quintile 4	6	11%	11	35%	17
Quintile 5	7	13%	10	32%	17
Total	55	100%	31	100%	86
Subindex: Discriminatory Family Code 2012					
Quintile 1	24	31%	0	0%	24
Quintile 2	17	22%	6	16%	23
Quintile 3	15	19%	8	21%	23
Quintile 4	13	17%	10	26%	23
Quintile 5	9	12%	14	37%	23
Total	78	100%	38	100%	116
Subindex: Restricted Civil Liberties 2012					
Quintile 1	19	24%	5	13%	24
Quintile 2	18	23%	6	15%	24
Quintile 3	18	23%	5	13%	23
Quintile 4	11	14%	13	33%	24
Quintile 5	13	16%	10	26%	23
Total	79	100%	39	100%	118
Subindex: Restricted Physical Integrity 2012					
Quintile 1	19	29%	1	3%	20
Quintile 2	17	26%	3	9%	20
Quintile 3	14	22%	6	18%	20
Quintile 4	8	12%	12	35%	20
Quintile 5	7	11%	12	35%	19
Total	65	100%	34	100%	99
Subindex: Son Bias 2012					
Quintile 1	9	15%	10	28%	19
Quintile 2	11	19%	8	22%	19
Quintile 3	12	20%	7	19%	19
Quintile 4	16	27%	3	8%	19
Quintile 5	11	19%	8	22%	19
Total	59	100%	36	100%	95
Subindex: Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012					
Quintile 1	23	28%	3	8%	26
Quintile 2	28	35%	9	24%	37
Quintile 4	24	30%	14	38%	38
Quintile 5	6	7%	11	30%	17
Total	81	100%	37	100%	118

Source: Own elaboration based on data from www.genderindex.org and OECD (2013a).

Figure 10-1: Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices Discriminatory Family Code, Restricted Civil Liberties, Restricted Physical Integrity, Son Bias and Restricted Resources and Entitlements, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)






Figure 10-2: Building the subindices for SIGI 2012, dimension Discriminatory Family Code 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Subindex Discriminatory Family Code: Parental authority in marriage 2012




Subindex Discriminatory Family Code: Parental authority after divorce 2012




Subindex Discriminatory Family Code: Inheritance daughters 2012



Subindex Discriminatory Family Code: Inheritance widows 2012



Subindex Discriminatory Family Code: Early marriage 2012



Subindex Discriminatory Family Code: Legal age of marriage 2012






Figure 10-3: Building the subindices for SIGI 2012, dimension Restricted Civil Liberties 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)

Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties: Access to public space 2012



Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties: Political voice, political participation 2012



Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties: Political voice, political voice quotas 2012






Figure 10-4: Building the subindices for SIGI 2012, dimension Restricted Physical Integrity 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)

Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity: Female Genital Mutilation 2012




Note: 39 Fragile states and 84 Non-fragile states
Source: Branisa et al (2014) and OECD (2013a)

Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity: Violence against women, domestic violence attitudes 2012




Note: 39 Fragile states and 82 Non-fragile states
Source: Branisa et al (2014) and OECD (2013a)

Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity: Violence against women, domestic lifetime prevalence 2012




Note: 18 Fragile states and 39 Non-fragile states
Source: www.genderindex.org and OECD (2013a)

Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity: Violence against women (laws) rape 2012




Note: 39 Fragile states and 85 Non-fragile states
Source: World Development Indicators and www.genderindex.org
Graphs by Fragile State by OECD

Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity: Violence against women (laws) domestic violence 2012



Note: 38 Fragile states and 84 Non-fragile states
Source: World Development Indicators and www.genderindex.org
Graphs by Fragile State by OECD

Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity: Violence against women (laws) sexual harassment 2012



Note: 39 Fragile states and 84 Non-fragile states
Source: World Development Indicators and www.genderindex.org
Graphs by Fragile State by OECD

Restricted Physical Integrity: Reproductive integrity 2012




Figure 10-4. (Continued)

Figure 10-5: Building the subindices for SIGI 2012, dimension Son Bias 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)







Figure 10-6: Building the subindices for SIGI 2012, dimension Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)

Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements: Women's access to land 2012



Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements: Women's access to bank loans 2012



Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements: Women's access to property other than land 2012




Table 10-2: Mean-comparison test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test for Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)

Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)	Rank sum		Expected		Wilcoxon test Z-statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States		Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
SIGI_2012	55	31	0.2095 (.1182)	0.3321 (.1082)	-4.7541 (0.0000)	1899	1842	2393	1349	-4.4390 (0.0000)
subindex_family_2012	78	38	0.3233 (.2374)	0.5386 (.1900)	-4.8768 (0.0000)	3783	3003	4563	2223	-4.5880 (0.0000)
subindex_civil_2012	79	39	0.4738 (.2688)	0.6167 (.2541)	-2.7643 (0.0066)	4238	2784	4701	2321	-2.6490 (0.0081)
subindex_physical_2012	65	34	0.3059 (.2175)	0.5061 (.2325)	-4.2474 (0.0000)	2677	2273	3250	1700	-4.2220 (0.0000)
subindex_son_2012	59	36	0.5418 (.1908)	0.5121 (.1766)	0.7562 (0.4514)	3005	1555	2832	1728	1.3270 (0.1845)
subindex_ownership_2012	81	37	0.3093 (.2294)	0.4930 (.2072)	-4.1554 (0.0001)	4165	2856	4820	2202	-3.8860 (0.0001)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from www.genderindex.org and OECD (2013a).

Note: SIGI_2012 refers to Social Institutions and Gender Index; subindex_family_2012 refers to Discriminatory Family Code; subindex_civil_2012 refers to Restricted Civil Liberties; subindex_physical_2012 refers to Restricted Physical Integrity; subindex_son_2012 refers to Son Bias; and subindex_ownership_2012 refers to Restricted Resources and Entitlements; all for the year 2012.

Table 10-3: Mean-comparison test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test for building the subindices in the dimensions of Discriminatory Family Code, Restricted Civil Liberties, Restricted Physical Integrity, Son Bias and Restricted Resources and Entitlements, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a).


Index	Observations		Mean (SD)		T statistic (p-value)	Rank sum		Expected		Wilcoxon test Z-statistic (p-value)
	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States		Non Fragile States	Fragile States	Non Fragile States	Fragile States	
age_marriage_2012	80	39	0.4438 (.4638)	0.5897 (.4423)	-1.6359 (0.1046)	4535	2605	4800	2340	-1.6300 (0.1032)
early_marriage_2012	81	38	0.1354 (.1040)	0.2421 (.1244)	-4.8918 (0.0000)	4065	3076	4860	2280	-4.539 (0.0000)
authority_marriage_2012	80	39	0.3000 (.4103)	0.6026 (.3835)	-3.8557 (0.0002)	4180	2960	4800	2340	-3.797 (0.0001)
authority_divorce_2012	77	35	0.2273 (.3492)	0.4571 (.3905)	-3.1102 (0.0024)	3907	2422	4351	1978	-3.122 (0.0018)
inh_daughter_2012	82	38	0.4207 (.4117)	0.5658 (.3322)	-1.9021 (0.0596)	4636	2625	4961	2299	-1.954 (0.0507)
inh_widow_2012	79	38	0.3924 (.4056)	0.5789 (.2732)	-2.5656 (0.0116)	4235	2669	4661	2242	-2.659 (0.0078)
laws_rape_2012	82	39	0.3780 (.2124)	0.4679 (.1737)	-2.3005 (0.0232)	4620	2762	5002	2379	-2.326 (0.0200)
laws_violance_2012	81	38	0.4506 (.3021)	0.6447 (.3055)	-3.2560 (0.0015)	4322	2819	4860	2280	-3.189 (0.0014)
laws_harassment_2012	70	31	0.3929 (.3844)	0.4194 (.3673)	-0.3238 (0.7468)	3502	1650	3570	1581	-0.53 (0.5964)
genital_mutilation_2012	74	36	0.0620 (.2042)	0.2392 (.3426)	-3.3871 (0.0010)	3571	2535	4107	1998	-4.465 (0.0000)
dom_violance_att_2012	45	32	0.4029 (.2499)	0.5391 (.2069)	-2.5260 (0.0136)	1529	1475	1755	1248	-2.342 (0.0192)
dom_violance_prev_2012	39	18	0.2939 (.1225)	0.4259 (.1884)	-3.1707 (0.0025)	974	679	1131	522	-2.695 (0.0070)
repro_integrity_2012	70	37	0.1750 (.1226)	0.2281 (.0981)	-2.2749 (0.0249)	3384	2395	3780	1998	-2.599 (0.0094)
miss_women_2012	82	39	0.0854 (.1766)	0.1090 (.2051)	-0.6518 (0.5158)	4893	2489	5002	2379	-0.795 (0.4265)
fer_preference_2012	58	36	0.4990 (.0300)	0.4814 (.0298)	2.7652 (0.0069)	3114	1352	2755	1710	2.805 (0.0050)
access_land_2012	81	37	0.3765 (.2798)	0.5405 (.2465)	-3.0614 (0.0027)	4396	2626	4820	2202	-2.97 (0.0030)
access_credit_2012	82	39	0.3110 (.2562)	0.4872 (.2921)	-3.3768 (0.0010)	4531	2850	5002	2379	-3.061 (0.0022)
access_other_2012	82	37	0.2256 (.2849)	0.4459 (.3287)	-3.7195 (0.0003)	4381	2760	4920	2220	-3.462 (0.0005)
access_publicspace_2012	82	39	0.2744 (.3527)	0.5897 (.3218)	-4.7246 (0.0000)	4251	3131	5002	2379	-4.504 (0.0000)
political_participation_2012	80	39	0.1773 (.0996)	0.1744 (.1139)	0.1417 (0.8876)	4870	2271	4800	2340	0.394 (0.6937)
political_quotas_2012	81	39	0.6667 (.4330)	0.6538 (.3998)	0.1556 (0.8766)	4959	2301	4901	2360	0.367 (0.7135)

Source: Own elaboration based on data from www.genderindex.org and OECD (2013a).


Note: age_marriage_2012 refers to Legal Age of Marriage ; early_marriage_2012 refers to Early Marriage ; authority_marriage_2012 refers to Parental Authority In Marriage; authority_divorce_2012 refers to Parental Authority After Divorce; nh_daughter_2012 refers to Inheritance Daughters; nh_widow_2012 refers to Inheritance Widows; laws_rape_2012 refers to Violence Against Women (Laws) Rape; laws_violance_2012 refers to Violence Against Women (Laws) Domestic Violence; laws_harassment_2012 refers to Violence Against Women (Laws) Sexual Harassment; genital_mutilation_2012 refers to Female Genital Mutilation; dom_violance_att_2012 refers to Domestic Violence Attitudes; dom_violance_prev_2012 refers to Domestic Violence Lifetime Prevalence; repro_integrity_2012 refers to Reproductive integrity; miss_women_2012 refers to Missing women; fer_preference_2012 refers to Fertility preferences; access_land_2012 refers to Access to land; access_credit_2012 refers to Access to credit; access_other_2012 refers to Access to property other than land; access_publicspace_2012 refers to Access to public space; political_participation_2012 refers to Political voice political participation; political_quotas_2012 refers to Political voice quotas; all for the year 2012.

Figure 10-7: Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – SIGI 2012




Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Ratio of female to male primary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-8: Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – SIGI 2012




Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Ratio of female to male secondary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-9: Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – SIGI 2012




Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Ratio of female to male tertiary enrollment 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-10: Female primary completion rate 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Primary completion rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Primary completion rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Primary completion rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Primary completion rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Primary completion rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Primary completion rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-11: Adolescent fertility rate (births per 1,000 women ages 15-19) 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Adolescent fertility rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Adolescent fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Adolescent fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Adolescent fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Adolescent fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Adolescent fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-12: Total Fertility rate (births per woman) 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Fertility rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Fertility rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-13: Maternal mortality ratio per 100,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – SIGI 2012




Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Maternal mortality ratio 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-14: Total infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Total infant mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Total infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-15: Female infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Female infant mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Female infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-16: Male infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Male infant mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Male infant mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-17: Total Under-five mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Total under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-18: Female Under-five mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Female under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012






Figure 10-19: Male Under-five mortality rate per 1,000 live births 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)


Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – SIGI 2012




Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Discriminatory Family Code 2012




Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Civil Liberties 2012



Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Physical Integrity 2012



Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Son Bias 2012



Male under-five mortality rate 2010 – Subindex Restricted Resources and Entitlements 2012




Figure 10-20: Malnutrition child prevalence, weight for age (% of children under five) 2010 and Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) and its five subindices, year 2012, Fragile States and Non-Fragile States, according to the classification by the OECD (2013a)

