



InGRID

Supporting expertise in inclusive growth

www.inclusivegrowth.eu

Deliverable 8.2

TOWARDS AN IPOLIS SOCIAL POLICY MODEL

Eneroeth, M., Gábos, A., Kneeshaw, J., Marchal, S.,
Nelson, K. & Nieuwenhuis, R.

August 2019



This project has received funding from the European Union's
Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under
Grant Agreement No 730998

Abstract

The purpose of this report is to outline the basic foundations of an IPOLIS social policy module, and to suggest of number of social policy indicators that fruitfully can be added to the IPOLIS database. Two types of indicators are suggested. Based on income distributions data we propose several indicators (GINI, AROP, and poverty gap) that show the shape of the income distribution at various stages of the distributive process. Also a measure of redistribution (i.e. reductions in the GINI and AROP) are suggested. Based on model family analysis, we propose several indicators on the size of benefits, as stipulated in legal frameworks. Attached to this report is an excel file that includes all this data for a large number of European countries and years.

This report constitutes Deliverable 8.2, for Work Package 8 of the InGRID-2 project.

August 2019

© Type the year, city – InGRID-2, Integrating Research Infrastructure for European expertise on Inclusive Growth from data to policy – project number 730998

General contact: inclusive.growth@kuleuven.be
p.a. InGRID
HIVA - Research Institute for Work and Society
Parkstraat 47 box 5300, 3000 LEUVEN, Belgium

For more information kenneth.nelson@sofi.su.se

Please refer to this publication as follows:

Eneroth, M., Gábos, A., Kneeshaw, J., Marchal, S., Nelson, K. & Nieuwenhuis, R. (2019). Towards an IPOLIS Social Policy model, Deliverable 8.2, Leuven, InGRID-2 project 730998 – H2020

Information may be quoted provided the source is stated accurately and clearly.
This publication is also available via <http://www.inclusivegrowth.eu>

This publication is part of the InGRID-2 project, this project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 730998.

The information and views set out in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Contents

Introduction	4
1. IPOLIS	5
2. The conceptualization and measurement of social policy	6
3. The IPOLIS social policy module	8
4. Variables	10
5. Concluding summary	20
5. References	21

Introduction

European social monitoring requires good quality data on living conditions and wellbeing at individual level, but also accurate indicators on how countries have organized social policy, as well as analyses of impacts. Whereas the establishment of European-wide socio-economic surveys has substantially improved the possibilities to analyse social inclusion outcomes at individual level, actual usage of this micro-level data is restricted due to lack of contextual-level policy data.

The purpose of this deliverable is to propose a set of policy indicators that fruitfully can be included in the InGRID IPOLIS database. The addition of a social policy module to IPOLIS will considerably improve the possibilities to analyse European social integration. The data include indicators on social rights as laid down in policy frameworks, and distributional data on impacts. Together, these data allow for describing policy variation across European countries, and link policies to a various set of outcomes that commonly are in focus in debates about the social dimension of EU cooperation.

This deliverable outlines the coding principles and the decisions made in collecting this social policy data. It also serves as a codebook. Attached to this document is an Excel data file ([clickable link below](#)), which includes all social policy indicators that we suggest to be included in IPOLIS.

The deliverable is organized as follows. Next, we briefly explain the purpose of IPOLIS, and its basic structure. Thereafter we provide a brief overview of different types of social policy data, and explain how our proposed indicators contribute to state-of-the-art in data collection and analysis. Each indicator is then described in more detail, and some basic descriptive statistics are presented. A concluding summary is presented at the end.

1. IPOLIS

IPOLIS is an acronym for Integrated Poverty and Living Conditions Indicator System, and the IPOLIS database includes macro-level time-series data on the quality of life of vulnerable groups in a large number of European countries. The database is multi-dimensional as it includes both objective and subjective measures on the quality of life. The domains currently included in IPOLIS are material living conditions, labour market attachment, work-life balance, education and training, health and risk behaviours, as well as social connectedness and participation. All these data are organized around three vulnerable groups; children, youth, and elderly. Each domain contains several indicators that apply to all vulnerable groups. In addition, there are sub-indicators specific to children, youth, and the elderly.

Much of these data on the quality of life are from the European Statistical System, and thus not unique to IPOLIS. However, one of the chief benefits of IPOLIS is that all data and indicators have been cross-checked for consistency and are easily available to researchers, policy makers, media, and the interested public. The database also includes a very useful visualization tool, which facilitates online descriptive analyses on the quality of life in European countries. More information about IPOLIS is provided in an earlier InGRID deliverable, Gábos and Kopasz (2014), and the visualization tool together with the IPOLIS data can be accessed online at <http://ipolis.tarki.hu/>.

IPOLIS already includes some contextual-level data, such as economic performance and demographic structures. Policy data are also included, although mostly in the form of social spending, and thus only providing a rough indication of policy impacts, and of how the European countries have organized their social policies. It is this social policy domain of IPOLIS that we will improve in this InGRID-2 deliverable.

2. The conceptualization and measurement of social policy

Social policies are complex entities, and as such they can be described and analyzed in different ways. In academia, there is a longstanding debate about the most appropriate way to conceptualize and measure social policy (Green-Pedersen, 2004; Clasen & Siegel, 2007). Different strategies for conceptualization and measurement come with different benefits. Qualitative descriptions of legislation and policies are often detailed (see the ‘Mutual Information System on Social Protection, MISSOC’, or the ‘Social Security Programs throughout the World’, published by the U.S. Social Security Administration), but not expressed as indicators readily available for quantitative comparative analysis. Indicators based on public expenditure, enrolment or beneficiary rates, and distributive impacts are more readily available from national accounts or surveys. Yet, policy inference is often difficult because of the sensitivity to differences or changes in welfare needs. Indicators based on a ‘social rights approach’ capture how policies are designed, and thus provide an institutional account that is independent of differences in welfare needs. If done properly, social rights indicators are comparable over time and across countries. However, this data does not necessarily represent what citizens *de facto* receive. Focus is rather on *de jure* rights. Due to the pros and cons of all these different types of data, there nowadays seems to be an agreement in the literature that an appropriate strategy is to analyse policies across several different dimensions, thus using a greater variety of data sources and indicators (Green-Pedersen, 2007; Kühner, 2007; Dedeken & Clasen, 2011).

We propose that the social policy module to IPOLIS contain indicators based on complementary principles. The first type of data is based on legislative frameworks, showing what type of benefits people in principle should be able to receive. The second type of data is based on socio-economic surveys, showing the actual distributive impact of policies in terms of income. The two types of data are detailed further below.

In social policy research, the idea to collect information on legislative structures was to large extent inspired by T.H. Marshall’s (1950) theory of social citizenship, dating back to the immediate Post-war decades. This theoretical framework was originally used in comparative research to analyse the role of interest-coalitions and working class mobilisation in social policymaking (Korpi, 1989; Esping-Andersen, 1990). Indicators based on legislative frameworks often come very close to what policy makers have in mind when they design policies. Examples of indicators of this kind are replacement and coverage rates, eligibility criteria, and financing structures in the form of employee and employer contributions. Although social rights indicators are particularly valuable in research on the causes and consequences of social policy, their use is not without pitfalls. Besides being very time consuming to collect, social rights indicators are sometimes accused of expressing a paper reality, at best showing what kinds of benefits and services people in principle and according to legislation should receive (Oorschot, 2013). This paper reality may sometimes be very different from the ways in which policies actually work, and the benefits finally received by vulnerable groups. For one reason or the other, many people may have difficulties fulfilling eligibility criteria, while other people do not claim benefits or services, even if they are entitled. Generally, the more benefits and services are low-income targeted, the bigger are the problems of incomplete take-up (Hernanz et al., 2004). In such scenarios, it may be necessary to complement an analysis of social rights with income distribution data. If policies seem to be good on paper, while there are extensive problems of low-income and limited

redistribution, there is most likely a problem of lack of benefit coverage or a problem of low take-up, or a combination of both, that are not fully captured in legislative frameworks.

Income distribution data can be obtained from socio-economic surveys. If we aggregate benefit income data in the socio-economic surveys to the national level, we should come very close to the level of social expenditure reported in the national accounts (Behrendt, 2002). Doing so, we can compare the income distribution pre- and post-benefit income. For instance, by deducting all received benefits from disposable incomes, a direct measure of redistribution is obtained (i.e. the extent to which the welfare state and social policies reduce differences in market income). This basic logic of analysing the distribution of income at various stages of the income formation process can be applied to various statistics, including poverty headcounts and gaps, as well as different inequality indices – for the population as a whole or for specific subgroups.

Although analyses on the distributive outcomes of social policies based on survey data are illustrative for descriptive research purposes, they are often less suitable for causal interpretation, particularly when it comes to institutional effects related to the ways in which social policies are organized (Ferrarini et al., 2014). Changes in the income distribution, as well as cross-national differences in poverty and income inequality, may have as much to do with social policy, as they have with changes in welfare needs. For example, although policies remain the same, poverty typically increases during economic downturns when unemployment goes up. Sometimes this happens also to the degree of redistribution. Demographic changes and changes in population health are other examples of structural factors that affects welfare needs. That is why, in order to close in on causal interpretation, we need to know how policies have changed, and consider this factor in the empirical analysis - which is where the first set of social rights indicators described above come into play.

3. The IPOLIS social policy module

In this proposal for an IPOLIS social policy module, we have tried to strike a fruitful balance between some core indicators based on legislative frameworks, and indicators on distributive impacts derived from socio-economic surveys. Considering the former, focus is on major cash benefit schemes of outmost importance for economic wellbeing of the vulnerable groups identified in IPOLIS. More specifically, we include minimum income protection (minimum wages, social assistance, and minimum pensions), unemployment benefits, sickness benefits, child benefits, and standard pensions. All these indicators are based on model family analyses, where incomes for a pre-defined set of families are calculated based on social policy legislation. The model families are assumed to have certain characteristics, in the form of composition, labour market history, etc. Model family analyses of this kind have emerged as a powerful tool to compare social policies across countries, and over time (Bradshaw et al., 1993). Data on minimum income protection is generated by the Hypothetical Household Tool (HHoT) in Euromod.¹ HHoT was developed in the first InGRID project, and documented in previous InGRID deliverables (Hufkens et al., 2016). It is continuously updated and elaborated in the InGRID-2 project. Data on unemployment benefits, sickness benefits, child benefits, and standard pensions are from the SPIN-database.² The SPIN-database is compiled and distributed by the Swedish Institute for Social Research (SOFI) at Stockholm University, a core partner of the InGRID project.

Data on the generosity of minimum income protection is based on the assumption that model families have no income from work (except for the minimum wage indicator), and lack access to contributory benefits (social security). These indicators often include a package of non-contributory benefits for which the model families are entitled. Data on minimum wages and social assistance are collected for four model families: a single person, a one-earner couple, a one-earner family with two children, and a single person with two children. Minimum wages are only calculated in countries with statutory regulations. For data on minimum pensions, a single person and a couple of pensionable age are used. Further information on the model families are provided by Marchal et al. (2018), as well as all necessary assumptions imposed on the data. All incomes are collected net of taxes and social security contributions, and each variable is expressed in current and fixed prices (national currencies), purchasing power parities, and as a fraction of the EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.

Data on unemployment and sickness benefits are calculated for two model families; a single person and a one-earner couple with two children. For standard pensions, we use a single person and a one-earner couple. For child benefits, we use a one-earner couple with two children. Child benefits include universal child allowances, employment based child benefits, means- or income-tested child benefits, the real value of child tax allowances and child tax credits (see Ferrarini et al., 2012). Social assistance and other minimum income benefits (such as income-tested housing benefits) are not included in any of this data. Since benefits may differ over the duration of receipt, two periods of duration are used for unemployment and sickness benefits, 1 week and 26 weeks of receipt. Standard pensions are calculated for a whole year, assuming 40 years of contributions (occupational or private pensions are not included, if not mandatory). Child benefits are also calculated for a whole year. All incomes are calculated net of taxes and social security contributions, and expressed as a percentage of an average production worker's net wage (i.e. replacement rates). For each model family type, benefits are

¹ www.euromod.ac.uk.

² www.spin.su.se.

calculated at the earnings-level of an average production worker. More information about this data are provided by Ferrarini et al. (2013) and Birnbaum (2017).

Based on EU-SILC, we include several outcome-oriented variables, calculated at various stages of the distributive process. The Gini index, the EU at-risk-of-poverty rate (AROP), and the poverty gap are calculated both before (factor income) and after social benefits and taxes (disposable income). The importance of the shape of the income distribution before benefits and taxes (i.e. factor income) for understanding poverty or inequality of disposable income was repeatedly put on the agenda by Atkinson (2015). By comparing relative income poverty among working single parents based on earnings (part of factor income) to that of disposable income, Nieuwenhuis and Maldonado (2018) also highlighted the role of market inequalities for the final redistribution of income achieved by benefits and taxes.

The Gini coefficient is a common measure of income inequality, and it is based on the comparison of cumulative shares of the population against cumulative shares of income. It varies between zero (perfect equality) and one (perfect inequality). A Gini coefficient of zero implies that everyone has the same level of income, whereas a Gini coefficient of one is due to one person in the population having all income. AROP is a relative poverty measure, showing the share of households below a poverty line of 60 percent of the median income in the population. The poverty gap shows the intensity of poverty, measured as the average distance between the incomes of the poor households and the AROP poverty threshold, as a percentage of the poverty line. All these indicators are based on equivalized incomes, and thus adjusted for household size and composition. The so-called modified OECD scale is used, assigning a weight of 1 to the household head, 0.5 to each additional adult member, and 0.3 to each child.

The income distribution indicators are calculated at several stages of the distributive process, besides at factor and disposable income. Included are also indicators capturing the income distribution at disposable income less means-tested benefits, disposable income less non means-tested benefits, disposable income plus direct taxes, and disposable income plus social security contributions. Notably, benefit income is measured before taxes. Comparisons between non-taxable and taxable benefits in this income distribution data should therefore be interpreted with caution (Ferrarini & Nelson, 2003). Finally, we include measures on the redistributive impact, that is, the relative reduction in the Gini and AROP when we go from factor to disposable income. All these variables are calculated for the same vulnerable groups as included in IPOLIS (children, youth, and elderly), using the same definitions.

4. Variables

Below is a description of the various indicators that we suggest should be included in an IPOLIS social policy module. For each variable, we provide a brief description of its content, country coverage, and years for which data are available, and some basic descriptive statistics. Further information about the construction of each variable is in the sources above.

Table 1. Suggested variables for inclusion in the IPOLIS social policy module

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
MinWageSiDpi	Disposable income at minimum wage for a single person in national currencies.	21	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 183.72 Max: 83512.50 Mean: 4532.30 Std: 14347.95
MinWageCoDpi	Disposable income at minimum wage for a couple in national currencies.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 175.66 Max: 83512.50 Mean: 4498.59 Std: 15188.13
MinWageFaDpi	Disposable income at minimum wage for a family with two children in national currencies.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 209.54 Max: 137204.17 Mean: 6816.25 Std: 23713.58
MinWageLpDpi	Disposable income at minimum wage for a lone parent with two children in national currencies.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 260.29 Max: 145454.17 Mean: 7863.09 Std: 24781.27
MinWageSiFix	Disposable income at minimum wage for a single person in 2017 prices (national currencies).	21	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 187.97 Max: 83512.5 Mean: 4797.36 Std: 15194.24
MinWageCoFix	Disposable income at minimum wage for a couple in 2017 prices (national currencies).	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 184.75 Max: 83512.50 Mean: 4768.50 Std: 16129.54
MinWageFaFix	Disposable income at minimum wage for a family with two children in 2017 prices (national currencies).	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 220.39 Max: 137204.17 Mean: 7228.30 Std: 25075.71
MinWageLpFix	Disposable income at minimum wage for a lone parent with two children in 2017 prices (national currencies).	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 287.04 Max: 145454.17 Mean: 8317.87 Std: 26158.28
MinWageSiPpp	Disposable income at minimum wage for a single person in EU purchasing power parities.	21	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 204.16 Max: 1515.39 Mean: 741.49 Std: 339.25
MinWageCoPpp	Disposable income at minimum wage for a couple in EU purchasing power parities.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 229.12 Max: 1993.39 Mean: 870.18 Std: 466.74

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
MinWageFaPpp	Disposable income at minimum wage for a family with two children in EU purchasing power parities.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 309.92 Max: 2763.23 Mean: 1209.11 Std: 679.39
MinWageLpPpp	Disposable income at minimum wage for a lone parent with two children in EU purchasing power parities.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 315.60 Max: 2282.80 Mean: 1124.69 Std: 593.16
MinWageSiPov	Disposable income at minimum wage for a single person as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	21	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 63.7 Max: 171.14 Mean: 107.87 Std: 19.38
MinWageCoPov	Disposable income at minimum wage for a couple as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 47.67 Max: 121.20 Mean: 81.59 Std: 16.78
MinWageFaPov	Disposable income at minimum wage for a family with two children as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 38.78 Max: 114.46 Mean: 73.21 Std: 17.70
MinWageLpPov	Disposable income at minimum wage for a lone parent with two children as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	20	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 52.58 Max: 141.56 Mean: 89.39 Std: 19.91
SocAssSiDpi	Disposable income at social assistance for a single person in national currencies.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 35.00 Max: 33225.00 Mean: 2741.94 Std: 6074.73
SocAssCoDpi	Disposable income at social assistance for a couple in national currencies.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 50.00 Max: 63,075.00 Mean: 4,648.11 Std: 11,050.99
SocAssFaDpi	Disposable income at social assistance for a family with two children in national currencies.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 149.44 Max: 92,980.50 Mean: 7,128.66 Std: 17,435.64
SocAssLpDpi	Disposable income at social assistance for a lone parent with two children in national currencies.	22	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 142.50 Max: 68,985.00 Mean: 5,524.85 Std: 14,384.01
SocAssSiFix	Disposable income at social assistance for a single person in 2017 prices (national currencies).	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 35.40 Max: 39,996.01 Mean: 2,901.63 Std: 6,574.81
SocAssCoFix	Disposable income social assistance for a couple in 2017 prices (national currencies).	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 50.58 Max: 75,929.22 Mean: 4,922.86 Std: 11,977.57
SocAssFaFix	Disposable income at social assistance for a family with two children in 2017 prices (national currencies).	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 149.50 Max: 11,1417.86 Mean: 7,543.39 Std: 18,800.66
SocAssLpFix	Disposable income at social assistance for a lone parent with two children in 2017 prices (national currencies).	22	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 142.56 Max: 83,043.63 Mean: 5,858.82 Std: 15,436.60

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
SocAssSiPpp	Disposable income at social assistance for a single person in EU purchasing power parities.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 43.20 Max: 1,119.77 Mean: 490.79 Std: 304.81
SocAssCoPpp	Disposable income at social assistance for a couple in EU purchasing power parities.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 61.72 Max: 1,708.97 Mean: 735.98 Std: 454.79
SocAssFaPpp	Disposable income at social assistance for a family with two children in EU purchasing power parities.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 178.39 Max: 2,383.20 Mean: 1,126.97 Std: 623.63
SocAssLpPpp	Disposable income at social assistance for a lone parent with two children in EU purchasing power parities.	22	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 169.13 Max: 1,948.67 Mean: 930.48 Std: 518.07
SocAssSiPov	Disposable income at social assistance for a single person as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 9.33 Max: 107.09 Mean: 61.25 Std: 22.13
SocAssCoPov	Disposable income at social assistance for a couple as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 8.89 Max: 107.12 Mean: 62.07 Std: 22.02
SocAssFaPov	Disposable income at social assistance for a family with two children as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 17.28 Max: 97.15 Mean: 63.73 Std: 17.32
SocAssLpPov	Disposable income at social assistance for a lone parent with two children as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	22	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 21.05 Max: 108.14 Mean: 68.61 Std: 17.34
MinPenSiDpi	Disposable income at minimum pension for a single person in national currencies.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 95.39 Max: 31,800.00 Mean: 3,088.51 Std: 6,540.70
MinPenCoDpi	Disposable income at minimum pension for a couple in national currencies.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 160.66 Max: 51,675.00 Mean: 4,816.16 Std: 10,516.41
MinPenSiFix	Disposable income at minimum pension for a single person in 2017 prices (national currencies).	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 98.8 Max: 38,280.60 Mean: 3,254.27 Std: 6,993.15
MinPenCoFix	Disposable income at minimum pension for a couple in 2017 prices (national currencies).	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 163.60 Max: 62,205.98 Mean: 5,075.78 Std: 11,250.78
MinPenSiPpp	Disposable income at minimum pension for a single person in EU purchasing power parities.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 130.17 Max: 1,263.98 Mean: 627.92 Std: 345.15
MinPenCoPpp	Disposable income at minimum pension for a couple in EU purchasing power parities.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 235.33 Max: 1851.93 Mean: 979.80 Std: 484.68

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
MinPenSiPov	Disposable income at minimum pension for a single person as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 29.070 Max: 135.89 Mean: 79.97 Std: 25.00
MinPenCoPov	Disposable income at minimum pension for a couple as percentage of EU at-risk-of poverty threshold.	24	2009-2017	Yes	Min: 32.09 Max: 143.86 Mean: 85.45 Std: 25.51
UnemInsSi	Unemployment insurance benefits as a percentage of an average production workers' wage (net of taxes) for a single person	18	2000 2005 2010 2015	Yes	Min: 13.58 Max: 83.01 Mean: 55.56 Std: 17.43
UnemInsFa	Unemployment insurance benefits as a percentage of an average production workers' wage (net of taxes) for a one-earner family with two children.	18	2000 2005 2010 2015	Yes	Min: 13.94 Max: 86.72 Mean: 57.86 Std: 16.84
SickInsSi	Sickness insurance benefits as a percentage of an average production workers' wage (net of taxes) for a single person.	18	2000 2005 2010 2015	Yes	Min: 16.58 Max: 100.00 Mean: 70.12 Std: 23.09
SickInsFa	Sickness insurance benefits as a percentage of an average production workers' wage (net of taxes) for a one-earner family with two children.	18	2000 2005 2010 2015	Yes	Min: 18.35 Max: 100.00 Mean: 70.32 Std: 20.88
StandPenSi	Pensions as a percentage of an average production workers' wage (net of taxes) for a single person.	18	2000 2005 2010 2015	Yes	Min: 35.12 Max: 100.57 Mean: 61.29 Std: 18.67
StandPenCo	Pensions as a percentage of an average production workers' wage (net of taxes) for a couple.	18	2000 2005 2010 2015	Yes	Min: 40.36 Max: 112.18 Mean: 69.92 Std: 16.82
ChildBenFa	Child benefits as a percentage of an average production workers' wage (net of taxes) for a one-earner family with two children.	18	2000 2005 2010 2015	Yes	Min: 2.93 Max: 21.83 Mean: 12.26 Std: 4.48
Gini	Gini coefficient of disposable income in total population	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.21 Max: 0.38 Mean: 0.29 Std: 0.04
GiniChild	Gini coefficient of disposable income among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.20 Max: 0.40 Mean: 0.28 Std: 0.06
GiniYouth	Gini coefficient of disposable income among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.22 Max: 0.40 Mean: 0.28 Std: 0.05
GiniElderly	Gini coefficient of disposable income among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.15 Max: 0.37 Mean: 0.25 Std: 0.04

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
Gini_less mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less means-tested benefits in total population	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.23 Max: 0.40 Mean: 0.32 Std: 0.05
GiniChild_less mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less means-tested benefits among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.22 Max: 0.47 Mean: 0.32 Std: 0.06
GiniYouth_less mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less means-tested benefits among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.24 Max: 0.43 Mean: 0.32 Std: 0.05
GiniElderly_less mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less means-tested benefits among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.16 Max: 0.41 Mean: 0.27 Std: 0.05
Gini_less non-mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less non-means-tested benefits in total population	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.23 Max: 0.38 Mean: 0.31 Std: 0.36
GiniChild_less non-mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less non-means-tested benefits among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.23 Max: 0.42 Mean: 0.32 Std: 0.47
GiniYouth_less non-mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less non-means-tested benefits among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.24 Max: 0.41 Mean: 0.31 Std: 0.04
GiniElderly_less non-mt	Gini coefficient of disposable income less non-means-tested benefits among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.16 Max: 0.37 Mean: 0.25 Std: 0.04
Gini_plus tax	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus taxes in total population	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.23 Max: 0.39 Mean: 0.32 Std: 0.04
GiniChild_plus tax	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus taxes among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.24 Max: 0.42 Mean: 0.32 Std: 0.05
GiniYouth_plus tax	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus taxes among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.23 Max: 0.41 Mean: 0.32 Std: 0.04
GiniElderly_plus tax	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus taxes among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.17 Max: 0.41 Mean: 0.28 Std: 0.05
Gini_plus sic	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus social security contributions in total population	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.23 Max: 0.39 Mean: 0.30 Std: 0.42
GiniChild_plus sic	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus social security contributions among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.20 Max: 0.41 Mean: 0.29 Std: 0.05

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
GiniYouth_plus sic	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus social security contributions among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.22 Max: 0.40 Mean: 0.29 Std: 0.04
GiniElderly_plus sic	Gini coefficient of disposable income plus social security contributions among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.17 Max: 0.37 Mean: 0.26 Std: 0.04
Gini_factor	Gini coefficient of factor income in total population	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.39 Max: 0.57 Mean: 0.49 Std: 0.04
GiniChild_factor	Gini coefficient of factor income among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.31 Max: 0.55 Mean: 0.41 Std: 0.06
GiniYouth_factor	Gini coefficient of factor income among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.29 Max: 0.53 Mean: 0.41 Std: 0.05
GiniElderly_factor	Gini coefficient of factor income among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.53 Max: 0.88 Mean: 0.78 Std: 0.08
Arop	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 6.85 Max: 24.50 Mean: 15.57 Std: 4.52
AropChild	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 5.57 Max: 35.13 Mean: 17.89 Std: 6.75
AropYouth	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 9.39 Max: 31.44 Mean: 18.94 Std: 5.11
AropElderly	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 1.95 Max: 40.13 Mean: 13.02 Std: 8.19
Arop_less mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less means-tested benefits in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 11.43 Max: 32.77 Mean: 20.13 Std: 4.59
AropChild_less mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less means-tested benefits among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 13.00 Max: 43.50 Mean: 24.76 Std: 7.02
AropYouth_less mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less means-tested benefits among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 12.20 Max: 39.57 Mean: 24.23 Std: 6.10
AropElderly_less mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less means-tested benefits among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 4.20 Max: 40.30 Mean: 17.29 Std: 7.75

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
Arop_less non-mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 12.06 Max: 27.21 Mean: 21.16 Std: 3.57
AropChild_less non-mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 9.66 Max: 44.82 Mean: 28.07 Std: 6.79
AropYouth_less non-mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 12.08 Max: 42.40 Mean: 25.63 Std: 6.02
AropElderly_less non-mt	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.55 Max: 42.24 Mean: 14.43 Std: 8.26
AROP_plus tax	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus taxes in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.43 Max: 22.69 Mean: 13.50 Std: 4.81
AropChild_plus tax	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus taxes among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 1.99 Max: 32.77 Mean: 15.95 Std: 7.05
AropYouth_plus tax	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus taxes among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 9.09 Max: 29.83 Mean: 16.41 Std: 4.85
AropElderly_plus tax	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus taxes among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 0.03 Max: 38.74 Mean: 10.97 Std: 8.33
Arop_plus sic	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus social security contributions in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 2.62 Max: 21.97 Mean: 13.01 Std: 4.78
AropChild_plus sic	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus social security contributions among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 1.21 Max: 32.17 Mean: 14.36 Std: 6.85
AropYouth_plus sic	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus social security contributions among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.95 Max: 27.17 Mean: 15.43 Std: 5.49
AropElderly_plus sic	At-risk-of poverty rate (disposable income) plus social security contributions among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 1.39 Max: 40.02 Mean: 12.61 Std: 8.17
Arop_factor	At-risk-of poverty rate (factor income) in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 21.12 Max: 44.58 Mean: 35.98 Std: 4.42
AropChild_factor	At-risk-of poverty rate (factor income) among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 13.25 Max: 42.34 Mean: 26.99 Std: 7.26

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
AropYouth_factor	At-risk-of poverty rate (factor income) among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 14.75 Max: 45.73 Mean: 26.73 Std: 6.25
AropElderly_factor	At-risk-of poverty rate (factor income) among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 55.81 Max: 90.30 Mean: 79.70 Std: 8.13
Gap	Poverty gap (disposable income) in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 5.28 Max: 34.97 Mean: 20.66 Std: 6.43
GapChild	Poverty gap (disposable income) among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.58 Max: 41.39 Mean: 20.65 Std: 8.89
GapYouth	Poverty gap (disposable income) among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 5.54 Max: 39.88 Mean: 23.48 Std: 7.45
GapElderly	Poverty gap (disposable income) among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.71 Max: 24.89 Mean: 12.89 Std: 4.73
Gap_less mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less means-tested benefits in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 19.30 Max: 70.20 Mean: 31.74 Std: 9.05
GapChild_less mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less means-tested benefits among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 14.78 Max: 68.73 Mean: 35.85 Std: 10.73
GapYouth_less mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less means-tested benefits among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 20.23 Max: 62.83 Mean: 35.79 Std: 9.16
GapElderly_less mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less means-tested benefits among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.03 Max: 96.08 Mean: 20.21 Std: 16.07
Gap_less non-mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 18.65 Max: 39.68 Mean: 26.90 Std: 5.10
GapChild_less non-mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 17.66 Max: 52.68 Mean: 29.24 Std: 7.85
GapYouth_less non-mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 19.11 Max: 54.71 Mean: 30.33 Std: 7.68
GapElderly_less non-mt	Poverty gap (disposable income) less non-means-tested benefits among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 4.25 Max: 24.24 Mean: 13.61 Std: 4.58

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
Gap_plus tax	Poverty gap (disposable income) plus taxes in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 4.76 Max: 35.24 Mean: 21.52 Std: 6.50
GapChild_plus tax	Poverty gap (disposable income) plus taxes among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 4.04 Max: 40.58 Mean: 21.44 Std: 8.79
GapYouth_plus tax	Poverty gap (disposable income) plus taxes among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 4.71 Max: 40.22 Mean: 24.45 Std: 7.76
GapElderly_plus tax	Poverty gap (disposable income) plus taxes among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 1.68 Max: 23.79 Mean: 12.71 Std: 4.45
Gap_plus sic	Poverty gap (disposable income) plus social security contributions in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 5.59 Max: 36.15 Mean: 20.76 Std: 6.23
GapChild_plus sic	Poverty gap (disposable income) plus social security contributions among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.84 Max: 42.08 Mean: 20.96 Std: 8.93
GapYouth_plus sic	Poverty gap (disposable income) plus social security contributions among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 4.62 Max: 42.72 Mean: 24.01 Std: 7.74
GapElderly_plus sic	Poverty gap (disposable income) social security contributions among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.65 Max: 25.67 Mean: 12.74 Std: 4.73
Gap_factor	Poverty gap (factor income) in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 59.97 Max: 99.86 Mean: 86.20 Std: 10.20
GapChild_factor	Poverty gap (factor income) among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 30.36 Max: 89.45 Mean: 52.23 Std: 13.88
GapYouth_factor	Poverty gap (factor income) among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 32.45 Max: 81.79 Mean: 53.15 Std: 11.62
GapElderly_factor	Poverty gap (factor income) among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 58.95 Max: 100.00 Mean: 95.52 Std: 9.49
GiniRed	$((\text{Gini factor income} - \text{Gini disposable income}) / \text{Gini factor income}) * 100$ in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 28.00 Max: 56.08 Mean: 42.44 Std: 6.61
GiniRedChild	$((\text{Gini factor income} - \text{Gini disposable income}) / \text{Gini factor income}) * 100$ among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 11.22 Max: 49.27 Mean: 31.96 Std: 8.89

Variable name	Description	Countries	Years	Model family analysis	Descriptive statistics
GapElderly_plus sic	Poverty gap (disposable income) social security contributions among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 3.65 Max: 25.67 Mean: 12.74 Std: 4.73
GiniRedYouth	$((\text{Gini factor income} - \text{Gini disposable income}) / \text{Gini factor income}) * 100$ among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 12.96 Max: 48.66 Mean: 30.21 Std: 8.45
GiniRedElderly	$((\text{Gini factor income} - \text{Gini disposable income}) / \text{Gini factor income}) * 100$ among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 54.08 Max: 80.21 Mean: 67.41 Std: 6.50
AropRed	$((\text{AROP factor income} - \text{AROP disposable income}) / \text{AROP factor income}) * 100$ in total population.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 32.94 Max: 81.43 Mean: 56.96 Std: 10.21
AropRedChild	$((\text{AROP factor income} - \text{AROP disposable income}) / \text{AROP factor income}) * 100$ among children.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: -5.72 Max: 81.37 Mean: 33.14 Std: 18.26
AropRedYouth	$((\text{AROP factor income} - \text{AROP disposable income}) / \text{AROP factor income}) * 100$ among youth.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: -4.40 Max: 64.89 Mean: 28.34 Std: 13.85
AropRedElderly	$((\text{AROP factor income} - \text{AROP disposable income}) / \text{AROP factor income}) * 100$ among the elderly.	28	2011-2018	No	Min: 45.41 Max: 97.66 Mean: 83.62 Std: 10.55

5. Concluding summary

The purpose of this InGRID-2 deliverable was to suggest indicators that can fruitfully be used to establish the foundations for a social policy module in IPOLIS. Social policies can be analysed in various ways, using a multitude of different types of indicators. In this report, we made a distinction between indicators that show how much money people actually receive in benefits, and indicators describing what type of benefits people in principle should be able to receive. For the former dimension, we proposed several indicators based on EU-SILC, depicting the shape of the income distribution at various stages of the distributive process. Concerning the latter dimension, we suggest to use social rights data, where social policy legislation is codified into standardized and comparable indicator. For establishing an IPOLIS social policy module, attached to this report is also a data set, which includes all suggested indicators for a large number of European countries, and over time.

The data we have outlined and collected will certainly prove to be valuable additions to the IPOLIS database. However, the construction of an IPOLIS Social Policy Module should be considered an ongoing process, where this deliverable constitutes the first part. Once new data become available, additions to the social policy module should fruitfully be made. Particularly, this concerns data on coverage and take-up of benefits, as well as data on public services. Unfortunately, comparative data on public services, at least when defined in terms of quantitative indicators, are lacking. Several pioneering datasets on public services either are discontinued, or updated very slowly (Doctrinal et al. 2017). In the continuation of the InGRID-2 infrastructure project, we are performing new pilot studies on early childhood education and care, as well as collecting new data on benefit take-up. To the extent that these work tasks prove successful, we will have the tools ready to feed additional policy data into IPOLIS. This also concerns policy data on hard-to-reach groups, such as new migrants. In the InGRID-2 infrastructure project, we are involved in a study on immigrants' social rights, developing new coding templates for large-scale comparative data collection.

Much work lies ahead in collecting new policy data, and help develop IPOLIS into a state-of-the-art resource for analyses on the quality of life in European countries. Although our suggestion for a new IPOLIS social policy module is a step in this direction, further infrastructure efforts are needed in terms of conceptualizing social policies, defining standards for data collection, and constructing new indicators for analysis.

5. References

- Atkinson, A. B.** (2015). *Inequality: What can be done?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Behrendt, C.** (2002). *At the Margins of the Welfare State: Social Assistance and the Alleviation of Poverty in Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom.* Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Birnbaum, S., Ferrarini, T., Nelson, K. & Palme, J.** 2017. *The Generational Welfare Contract: Justice, Institutions and Outcomes.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bradshaw, J., Ditch, J., Holmes, H. & Whiteford, P.** (1993). A comparative study of child support in fifteen countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 3(4), 255-271.
- Clasen, J. & Siegel, N. A.** (2007). *Investigating Welfare State Change. The 'Dependent Variable Problem' in Comparative Analysis.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- De Deken, J. & Clasen, J.** (2011). Tracking caseloads: The changing composition of working-age benefit receipt in Europe. In J. Clasen & D. Clegg (Eds.), *Regulating the risk of unemployment: National adaptations to post-industrial labour markets in Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doctrinal, L., Fredriksson, D., Nelson, K. & Sirén, S.** (2017). Deliverable 22.1: Inventory on core social policy databases and indicators for comparative research. Leuven, FP7 InGRID project.
- Esping-Andersen, G.** (1990). *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ferrarini, T., Nelson, K.** (2003). Taxation of Social Insurance and Redistribution: A Comparative Analysis of Ten Welfare States. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 13(1), 21-33.
- Ferrarini, T., Nelson, K. & Höög, H.** (2012). From Universalism to Selectivity. Old wine in New Bottles for Child Benefits. In Marx, I & K. Nelson (Eds.), *Minimum Income Protection in Flux.* HoundMills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Ferrarini T., Nelson, K., Korpi, W. & Palme, J.** (2013). Social citizenship rights and social insurance replacement rate validity: pitfalls and possibilities. *Journal of European Public Policy* 20, 1251-66.
- Ferrarini, T., Nelson, K. & Sjöberg, O.** (2014). Unemployment insurance and deteriorating self-rated health in 23 European countries. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 68, 657-662.
- Gábos, A. & Kopasz, M.** (2014). Deliverable 20.1: Concept paper - For an integrated poverty and living conditions indicator system (IPOLIS) database, Leuven, FP7 InGRID project.
- Green-Pedersen, C.** (2004). The dependent variable problem within the study of welfare state retrenchment: defining the problem and looking for solutions. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 6(1), 3-14.
- Green-Pedersen, C.** (2007). More than Data Questions and Methodological Issues: Theoretical Conceptualization and the Dependent Variable 'Problem' in the Study of Welfare Reform'. In J. Clasen & N. Siegel (Eds.), *Investigating Welfare State Change* (pp. 13-23). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hernanz, V., Malherbet, F. & Pellizzari, M.** (2004). Take-up of Welfare Benefits in OECD Countries: A Review of the Evidence (OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 17). Paris: OECD.
- Hufkens, T., Leventi, C., Rastrigina, O., Manios, K., Van Mechelen, N., Verbist, G., Sutherland, H. & Goedemé, T.** (2016). Deliverable 22.2: HHoT: a new flexible Hypothetical Household Tool for tax-benefit simulations in EUROMOD, Leuven, FP7 InGRID project
- Korpi, W.** (1989). Power, Politics, and State Autonomy in the Development of Social Citizenship-Social Rights During Sickness in 18 OECD Countries Since 1930. *American Sociological Review*, 54(3), 309-328.
- Kühner, S.** (2007). Country-Level Comparisons of Welfare State Change Measures: Another Facet of the Dependent Variable Problem within the Comparative Analysis of the Welfare State?. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 17(1), 5-18.
- Nieuwenhuis, R., & Maldonado, L. C.** (2018). Single-Parent Families and In-Work Poverty. In H. Lohmann & I. Marx (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on In-Work Poverty* (pp. 171-192). Edward Elgar.
- Marchal, S., Sjöland, L., & Goedemé, T.** (2018). Methodological working paper: Using HHoT to generate institutional minimum income protection indicators. Working paper no. 18. 20. Herman Deleeck Centre for Social Policy.
- Marshall, T. H.** (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Oorschot, W. (2013). Comparative Welfare State Analysis with Survey-based Benefit Reciprocity Data: The Dependent Variable Problem Revisited. *European Journal of Social Security*, 15(3), 224-249.

InGRID-2

Integrating Research Infrastructure for European expertise on Inclusive Growth from data to policy

Referring to the increasingly challenging EU2020-ambitions of Inclusive Growth, the objectives of the InGRID-2 project are to advance the integration and innovation of distributed social sciences research infrastructures (RI) on ‘poverty, living conditions and social policies’ as well as on ‘working conditions, vulnerability and labour policies’. InGRID-2 will extend transnational on-site and virtual access, organise mutual learning and discussions of innovations, and improve data services and facilities of comparative research. The focus areas are (a) integrated and harmonised data, (b) links between policy and practice, and (c) indicator-building tools.

Lead users are social scientist involved in comparative research to provide new evidence for European policy innovations. Key science actors and their stakeholders are coupled in the consortium to provide expert services to users of comparative research infrastructures by investing in collaborative efforts to better integrate microdata, identify new ways of collecting data, establish and improve harmonised classification tools, extend available policy databases, optimise statistical quality, and set-up micro-simulation environments and indicator-building tools as important means of valorisation. Helping scientists to enhance their expertise from data to policy is the advanced mission of InGRID-2. A new research portal will be the gateway to this European science infrastructure.

This project is supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 730998.

More detailed information is available on the website: www.inclusivegrowth.eu

Co-ordinator
Monique Ramioul



Partners

TÁRKI Social Research Institute Inc. (HU)
Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies – AIAS, University of Amsterdam (NL)
Swedish Institute for Social Research - SOFI, Stockholm University (SE)
Economic and Social Statistics Department, Trier University (DE)
Centre for Demographic Studies – CED, University Autònoma of Barcelona (ES)
Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research – LISER (LU)
Herman Deleeck Centre for Social Policy – CSB, University of Antwerp (BE)
Institute for Social and Economic Research - ISER, University of Essex (UK)
German Institute for Economic Research – DIW (DE)
Centre for Employment and Work Studies – CEET, National Conservatory of Arts and Crafts (FR)
Centre for European Policy Studies – CEPS (BE)
Department of Economics and Management, University of Pisa (IT)
Department of Social Statistics and Demography – SOTON, University of Southampton (UK)
Luxembourg Income Study – LIS, asbl (LU)
School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester (UK)
Central European Labour Studies Institute – CELSI (SK)
Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences (GR)
Central Institute for Labour Protection – CIOP, National Research Institute (PL)

InGRID-2

Integrating Research Infrastructure for
European expertise on Inclusive Growth from
data to policy Contract N° 730998

For further information about the InGRID-2
project, please contact
inclusive.growth@kuleuven.be
www.inclusivegrowth.eu
p/a HIVA – Research Institute
for Work and Society
Parkstraat 47 box 5300
3000 Leuven
Belgium

Copyright © Integrating Research Infrastructure for European expertise on Inclusive Growth from data to policy – InGRID-2 project

All rights reserved. No part of the report may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, and may not be quoted or cited, without prior permission in writing from the Project Co-ordinator.

The views expressed during the execution of the InGRID-2 project, in whatever form and or by whatever medium, are the sole responsibility of the authors. The European Union is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.