

## *Session C:*

### *EU Indicators for Poverty and Social Exclusion*



## Indicators of Social Inclusion from the Czech perspective

### ➤ Main points of presentation

- ➔ specific context in post-communist countries
- ➔ central issue: non monetary poverty/deprivation indicators
- ➔ comments to the other indicators

### Indicators of Social Inclusion from the Czech perspective

- **Specific context in post/communist countries (Czech experience)**
  - ➔ problem with reliability and validity of data (mainly on income poverty and other)
    - a. low response rates
    - b. incomplete/unreliable data on incomes
  - ➔ academic research on social exclusion is not much developed
  - ➔ (accessibility of data collected to researchers is limited)
  
  - ➔ implications:
    - a. danger of misinterpretation of the indicators (hence oversimplification and bureaucratic approach may emerge in NAP agenda)
    - b. results given by indicators need to be underpinned and supplemented by further investigations

## Indicators of Social Inclusion from the Czech perspective

- **The role of non-monetary poverty/deprivation indicators is crucial**
  - ➔ Situation (in incomes and living costs) in most of post-communist countries
    - a. relative lower level of incomes and living standards to EU-15 (in PPS)
    - b. increasing living costs (mainly housing costs)
    - c. lower income inequalities relative to EU-15
  - ➔ Implications for poverty/material deprivation
    - a. relative lower level of income poverty
    - b. relative higher level of material deprivation
    - c. weak association between the two indicators mentioned above

## Indicators of Social Inclusion from the Czech perspective

### ➤ *Example*

- Table: **income poverty** (60 % median) versus **subjective poverty**, persons over 16 (Czech rep. 2001)

	<b>income poor</b>	income non-poor	total
<b>feel poor</b>	2.7	14.2	<b>16.9</b>
don't feel poor	3.8	79.3	83.1
total	<b>6.5</b>	93.5	100

Source: Czech Statistical Office (Social Conditions of Households Survey, N=27,000),  
own calculations

### Indicators of Social Inclusion from the Czech perspective

- Table: Indicators of **material deprivation** (share of persons in households who...), source: Eurostat 2000 (data from 1996), Czech Statistical Office (data from 2001, N = 27,000)

	Czech Republic	Denmark	Germany	UK	Portugal
have a great difficulties in making ends meet	17	4	2	6	17
are in arrears with (re)payments	13	4	3	3	4
don't eat meat/fish/chicken every other day	41	1	4	7	6
don't buy new clothes	48	4	13	13	42
don't have a week's holiday away from home	50	14	13	35	61

### Indicators of Social Inclusion from the Czech perspective

➤ **Suggested indicators commented:**

- ➔ Suggestions by the report (ch. 5) will improve understanding of social exclusion
- ➔ Some suggestions to be considered (as secondary or third level indicators):
  - a. as housing costs bring crucial impact on poverty/deprivation, an indicator “at-risk-of-poverty after housing costs” would be a useful indicator
  - b. inequalities in chances of children from specific social groups for educational attainment (high education level) would be a suitable measure of inter-generation disadvantage (in the Czech republic the chances for children of low educated parents are 9 times lower compared to children of high educated parents)

## Indicators of Social Inclusion from the Czech perspective

### ➤ Some other comments:

- ➔ ethnic dimension is very central to the problem of social exclusion (Roma in the Czech republic are the best example): as neither administrative not survey data on ethnicity are available (due to legal and administrative restrictions), there should be discussion started how to cope with this issue
- ➔ some indicators based on “difference” between (sub)groups inside country might be implemented at least as third level indicators because concentration of social exclusion matters very much:
  - a. for example in the Czech republic although general at-risk-of-poverty is low, concentration of the risk to specific group is extremely high
  - b. the risk of poverty is 6 times as high for the unemployed than for the entire population (while in EU-15 the risk is only 3 times as high than for entire population)
  - c. the same is true for the Roma population.