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Abstract

Development practitioners worldwide increasingly recognize the importance of informal institutions—such as norms of cooperation, non-discrimination, or the role of community oversight in the management of investment activities—in affecting well-being, poverty, and even economic growth or aid effectiveness. However, there has been little empirical analysis that tests the relationships between informal institutions and (inclusive) growth at the international level. This is largely due to data limitations.

The International Institute of Social Studies now hosts a large database of social development indicators compiled from a wide range of sources in a first attempt to overcome such data constraints. The Indices of Social Development are based on over 200 measures from 25 reputable data sources for the years 1990 to 2010, aggregated into six composite indices: civic activism, interpersonal safety and trust, inter-group cohesion, clubs and associations, gender equality, and inclusion of minorities.

This paper presents the database, highlights the differences, similarities, and complementarities with other measures of well-being, including those around income poverty, multidimensional poverty, and human development. Against emerging analysis that chart global linkages, this paper will explore whether Africa as a region diverges from global patterns, divergence across the continent, and the implications of these for our understanding of inclusive growth in Africa.

Keywords: measurement, social development, well-being, indicators
1. Introduction

Development practitioners worldwide including in Africa increasingly recognize the importance of informal institutions—such as norms of cooperation, non-discrimination, or the role of community oversight in the management of investment activities—in affecting well-being, poverty, and even economic growth or aid effectiveness. These questions have arisen as the debates on poverty and growth have broadened beyond earlier uni-dimensional measures, and have been underlined in recent conceptualisations of ‘inclusive growth’, which focuses on the links between growth and various dimensions of equity (de Haan and Thorat 2013).

However, there has been little empirical analysis that tests the relationships between informal institutions and growth or other development indicators at the international level, in the way notable the relationships between governance (mostly, formal institutions’) indicators and growth have been researched. This is largely due to data limitations: few reliable, globally representative data sources exist that can provide a basis for cross-country comparison of social norms and practice, social trust, and community engagement.

The International Institute of Social Studies now hosts a large database of social development indicators compiled from a wide range of sources in a first attempt to overcome such data constraints, at low cost (http://www.IndSocDev.org). The Indices of Social Development are based on over 200 measures from 25 reputable data sources for the years 1990 to 2010. These measures are aggregated into six composite indices: civic activism, interpersonal safety and trust, inter-group cohesion, clubs and associations, gender equality, and inclusion of minorities. Not all data sources provide observations for indicators in each country, but together – using a method of aggregation called matching percentiles – these data sources produce comprehensive estimates of social behavior and norms of interaction across a broad range of societies, and increasingly with possibilities to track changes over time. The data has now been used to describe global trends (Huang 2011), and links with aid effectiveness (Foa 2012).

This paper is mainly a presentation of the database, highlighting the differences, similarities, and complementarities with other measures of well-being, including those around income poverty, multidimensional poverty, and human development (discussed in sections 2 and 3). Against emerging analysis that chart those linkages at global level, this paper will explore whether Africa as a region diverges from global patterns, divergence across the continent, and the implications of these for our understanding of inclusive growth in Africa. The paper will conclude with a discussion on the need for further investments in social development data.

2. Evolving measures of well-being

Global level comparisons of wealth and well-being have existed for a number of decades. GDP data have been produced for at least 60 years, though recent debates over purchasing power parities show the continuous challenges of applications at global levels. Internationally-comparable income/consumption poverty data have become available since the late 1970s. They continue to be heavily debated on international comparability and – like GDP – its uni-

---

1 The following is described in more detail in van Staveren et al. (2013).
dimensionality – but certainly in Africa investments in household surveys during the 1990s rapidly increased insight into levels of well-being in most countries on the continent.

Critique of poverty analysis contributed to the development of alternative or complementary measures of well-being and deprivation, highlighted in the MDG framework.² The UNDP’s Human Development Index is composed of (un-weighted) measures of health, education, and income, following examples of Physical Quality of Life Index, and a Basic Needs Approach. The HDI has undergone little change, but has been enriched with other measures, including on inequality. Stimulated by the MDG emphasis, also, much effort went into measuring human development indicators of health and education in the poorest countries, including in Africa. The arsenal of multi-dimensional measures has been enriched by the work of the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (Alkire and Santos 2010).³

Alongside the broadening of the measures of well-being, debates on inequalities and inclusiveness have come and gone in waves.⁴ Inequality was rediscovered (‘brought back on the agenda’) in the late 1990s, after a relative absence since the classic development theories. Debates on inclusiveness gained in strength, including in emerging economies of Brazil, China and India (de Haan and Thorat 2013), and again gained in force after the global financial crisis of 2007-08,⁵ the political crises in the Middle East and North Africa, and as part of the discussions on a ‘post-2015’ agenda.

A different sets of international measures developed over the last two decades relate to institutions, following the change in emphasis in analysis promoted in particular by Douglas North (1991). Starting in 1996, the Worldwide Governance Indicators project has brought together measures of governance for 200 countries, along dimensions of voice and accountability, political stability, government effectiveness, quality of regulation, rule of law, and corruption – data reflect subjective assessments of survey respondents and experts.⁶ Other projects in this category include the Corruption Perceptions Index⁷ and the Ibrahim Index of African Governance.⁸ As human development measures, governance measures are often correlated with GDP measures – though perhaps more often with the questions of governance as precondition of causal factor.⁹

² Ravallion (2010) expresses concern about what he labels mashup indices, composite indicators for which the design has been insufficiently argued or explained (GDP and poverty indicators, according to him, are also composites, under-built by evolving theory and practice). The four questions that he poses are relevant for any discussion: conceptual clarity regarding what is being measured, tradeoffs embedded in any (weights in) index, the need for robustness tests (of rankings), and to have a critical perspective on policy relevance.
³ This covers over 100 developing countries, and three-quarters of the world’s population, focusing on multidimensional poverty (ten indicators) as derived from household surveys (DHS, MICS, WHS). These measures have been commonly used in international comparisons (rankings), and are commonly correlated with levels of GDP.
⁴ Recent progress on inequality measurement includes a focus on inequality of opportunity (e.g. Brunori et al. 2013).
⁸ http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/interact/. The Doing Business Project and the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor may be relevant in this context as they (may) provide business views on governance issues.
3. Social development

Since the 1980s/90s there has been growing emphasis on ‘social development’ in the international development literature, and – as with concerns on inequality – this receives perennial impetus at times of social crisis (as during the Arab Spring, or Asia financial crisis). In its narrowest sense social development has focused on the need to avoid the unintended consequences of development projects. This has been most notable in the form of social safeguards (regarding displacement, minorities) which has been an important strand in the World Bank, often under pressure of civil society. A residual interpretation of what social development means had been represented more broadly in the international development debate, for example in the definition of social policy, and of social fund programming.

Further, organizations like DFID have focused on ‘mainstreaming’ social development, often building on and containing efforts to mainstream gender. This implies the need to assess and strengthen social development as part of and instrumental in broad development efforts, manifested for example in the practice of social assessments as part of project preparation; but there has been little emphasis on measurement.

Social development has emphasized a different take on development outcomes (extending the debates on ‘human development’), in stressing the importance of for example empowerment, social cohesion, participation, equity (gender in particular), etc. as intrinsic values. There has been significant increase in the funding and programming in areas of community-based development – which in most cases have remained localised thus not allowing for measures at macro-levels.

The social development discipline has traditionally felt challenged in terms of measurement of indicators. Much of the critique of the measurement of poverty emanated from the social development discipline – inhabited by anthropologists mostly, with a fair amount of aversion to quantitative analysis (at least compared to the quantitative-minded political scientists) – which focused on and built a body of knowledge around participatory poverty assessments. The integration of participatory poverty assessments within the broader field of poverty analysis has helped to narrow the gap between disciplines.

Two areas of research and practice helped to move the social development field into a direction of more (quantitative) measurement of what social development is and how it contributes to development more widely. First, gender equality has been subject of measurement for a fair amount of time now, and analysis has shown that correlations can be established, for example, between gender equity and productivity, and between gender equity and MDGs. A range of gender measures now exist, including the Gender-related Development Index, the

---

10 For a description of its evolvement within the World Bank, see Davis (2004) and Bebbington et al., eds. (2006) with respect to the notion of social capital.
11 For example, the World Bank’ emphasis on community development in Indonesia was intensified after the financial crisis.
12 See for example a discussion and material on mainstreaming in transport investments; http://go.worldbank.org/M5RZXHZON0.
13 The World Bank published its Social Indicator of Development (World Bank 1995), and UNRISD considered to develop its database.
Gender Empowerment Measure (both by UNDP), the WEF’s Gender Gap Index, etc. Van Staveren (2011) compares five measures of gender equality, showing a degree of overlap but country rankings varying significantly depending on the measure used (which she relates to different aspects of human development and capabilities).

Second, the notion of social capital helped to move the social discipline most forcefully into the debates on quantitative assessments. Narayan and Pritchett’s (1997) work on social capital in Tanzania suggested that the density of people’s networks had a direct and causal impact on poverty. The concept of social capital experienced a rapid rise within the development debate, and became widely criticised, at a time when social development was rapidly becoming more important within the World Bank and elsewhere (for example illustrated by the importance of participatory poverty assessment given in World Development Report 2000/01).

Easterley et al. (2006) was perhaps the first publication that analysed social cohesion, at global levels, using sources like the World Value Survey (an important source for ISD as well). They find that social cohesion is important, influencing institutional quality, which in turn influences growth.

While social development practitioners, in general, have put a lot of emphasis on inequalities, (and of course this is central to gender analysis), particularly the emphasis on community development and to some extent on participation has tended to focus on the different dimensions of well-being, rather than its distribution. For the ISD database, two aspects of social development have been central: the ‘soft’ dimensions of development, often invisible and relatively difficult to measure, such as social capital, discrimination and exclusion; and the institutions of societies through which development is enhanced, both formal (created by states and other entities such as laws, regulations, rules) and informal social norms that structure behaviour and interaction (norms, attitudes, beliefs, rules of thumb, etc).

4. Why might this be relevant for Africa?

While there is relatively little understanding or debate on the social aspects – in the way discussed here, i.e. different from a focus on human development indicators – of Africa’s development, there is fair amount of consensus on the social (and socio-political) conditions that limit growth and development more broadly.

Of course, conflict – with various origins, often defined as inter-ethnic – has been described as a reason for the lack of broader development (Easterly and Levine 1997).

---

16 The use of the terminology ‘capital’ and ability to define this as individual characteristic were probably amongst the reasons this found currency in the debate, while a notion of social exclusion for example did not obtain such popularity.
17 In 1997, Knack and Keefer where amongst the first to show the impact of trust and economic growth. The interest in development studies built on work in OECD countries, notably by Coleman and Putnam
20 See Kanbur et al. (2009) for a recent overview; this stress – with much support – that ethnic identity (and thus categorisation and measurement) need to be understood in broad historical and socio-political development.
growth spurt of the 2000s has been partly ascribed to the decline in conflict across the continent, with causality likely being in both directions.

Kinship has been considered important for even economic activity, including in the informal sector that dominates in most African countries. Unlike ‘human capital’, and despite strong evidence on the role of networks in most forms of business, kinship and its associated obligations and potential exclusion, have not been considered to be necessarily good for expansion of economic activity (or institutional quality).

Further, it has been common to ascribe poor development to a lack of development of formal and accountable institutions, informal institutions as anti-developmental and pre-modern, with an assumed dualism between formal and informal institutions (or sectors, as in the case of labour market analysis). Research like that by APPP (Booth 2012) challenges assumptions of dualism, and highlights the dominance of ‘hybrid’ systems.

Related, the literature on governance – which appears to have had a big impact in Africa in particular – has had a strong emphasis on the need to put in place (formal) systems of governance first. Instead, research on rapidly growing economies (like Khan’s) have contradicted ‘governance-first’ principles, and instead highlighted the interaction between the way institutions evolve historically and development more generally.

Moreover, while there is a common assumption of the static nature of Africa’s institutions, it is likely that these have undergone significant changes, including as a result of the dramatic changes in the external environment over the last half century. Independence brought intensive efforts towards modernisation. Structural adjustment brought these to a halt, and a period of stagnation and dismantling of state-led economic institutions was followed by – for many countries, and in diverse forms – a period of economic growth and opening up.

While there has been much emphasis on ethnic (inter-group) conflict, questions of interpersonal inequalities have received relatively little attention, partly because of assumptions that growth need to be enhanced before distribution can be seen as a concern, partly because of an assumption that income inequalities in Africa are not very large or significant – which inequality data across Africa shows is not the case in many countries. Gender inequalities have received some attention in the case of Africa; see in particular recent work by Akyeampong and Fofack (2013) showing a positive relationship between gender quality in education and labor force participation and economic growth.

While the ‘softer’ dimensions of development seem to receive increasing attention as countries become wealthier, they appear equally important for poorer countries. In fact, most development practitioners tend to emphasise the importance of informal institutions in such contexts (and hence limitations of formal governance indicators). It thus seems pertinent to explore these in more depth in low-income contexts, and we believe the ISD can make a contribution to this knowledge, in cross-county analysis.

5. Indices of Social Development

The Indices of Social Development combines a large number of indicators from about 25 sources (global, regional), to develop aggregate measures or composite indices of social development (the method of aggregation is discussed in the next section). ISD is an instrument to show that social development is something that we can define and measure – with all the challenges this entails – and ultimately advance. At present, the database presents insight into a range of social development issues in about 200 countries. Data coverage varies greatly depending on indicator and data source (between 4 and 170).

For Africa, for 2010, data can be generated for 47 countries, on at least two of the indices (in that year, 21 countries have data on all six dimensions). ISD of course draws on the Afrobarometer, (http://www.afrobarometer.org/) the main source on attitudes on social, political and economic data for the region, which for example allows comparisons across countries of relationships between corruption and poverty.\(^\text{22}\) The fifth round of the Afrobarometer will be administered in 35 countries.

An iterative process of consultation over an extended period of time, and technical tests including factor analysis, have led to categorisation of six indices of social development:

- Civic activism, referring to the strength of civil society, measured by levels of civic activism and access to information.
- Clubs and associations, referring to relations of trust and cohesion within local communities.
- Interpersonal safety and trust, referring to norms of nonviolence between persons in society.
- Inter-group cohesion, the relations of trust and cohesion between defined ethnic, religious, or linguistic identity groups.
- Inclusion of minorities, which measures levels of discrimination against vulnerable groups (indigenous peoples, migrants, refugees, lower caste; this index was most recently added).
- Gender equity and non-discrimination against women, drawing on an already rich theoretical literature and development of measurement.

This allows comparisons for each country (where sufficient data is available) of each of the dimensions of social development. This is illustrated for Ghana in the diagram below, which demonstrates for example high levels of clubs and associational activity, but low levels of safety and trust (which may look paradoxical, but as we will see below the relationship between the two is not very strong).

These dimensions can of course also be described over time, with currently five data points available for ISD as a whole. For Ghana, this suggests an increase in the value on intergroup cohesion, and decrease in value of clubs and associations (but also the limitations in

\(^{22}\) http://www.afrobarometer.org/publications/working-papers/item/133-corruption-institutional-discred...-exclusion-of-the-poor-a-poverty-trap
terms of available data points; and note that time periods are averages for several years of available data so it is not possible to link data to a specific year for a series of countries).

The data derive from a large variety of independent sources. The nature of the underlying indicators is varied, consisting of perceptions (e.g. of trust), recorded incidences (e.g. crime), and expert opinions (e.g. crime advisories). The varied nature of data has consequences for the analysis, and further diagnostic tests needs to examine its impact. The quality of the Indices is of course dependent on the quality of the underlying indicators; while all databases have a good reputation, this may vary. The tables generated include the standard error (shown in Table 1), as an easy means to assess the quality of data produced.

6. **How the indices are aggregated: matching percentiles**

For the aggregation, ISD uses a variant of the matching percentiles method used by Lambsdorff (1999, 2006), similar to the methodology used by the Worldwide Governance Indicators. This method is regarded as the best available to handle data with many missing values, without imputing values (see Foa and Tanner, undated). The approach converts a series of databases, each of which have different coverage, into one unified set that assigns scores or values (between 0 and 1) based on the ranking of each of the countries. Each index used has a minimum of three independent sources.

The following may help to explain the idea of the way the database is constructed (though it is an approximation, as proposed by Roberto Fao). Imagine five experts have experience about the value of a certain indicator in a number of countries, and these countries are different but with an overlap. Matching percentiles produces an ordinal ranking of the values assigned by the first expert. This ranking is then compared with the ranking of the second expert, and as long as at least one of the countries overlap, one can compare the two ranking, and ‘merge’ them, with the countries that have the same rank receiving the same score. It then compares the rank of the third expert, etcetera. If rankings of countries differ between experts, the value (ranking) is adjusted accordingly, in a form of averaging.

The ‘matched score’ become the value for that Index, provided, as mentioned above, that – in this example – at least three experts had given a score for that country, and that the knowledge of the experts was independent.

The method is not perfect, but it is relatively simply to carry out (even if not simple to explain). ISD aims to make the methodology and under-lying data as transparent and accessible as possible (though it does not, for practical and copy-right reasons, carry the underlying data on its website), thus creating the possibility for users’ experimentation and alternative analyses.

7. **What do we know about ISD for Africa?**

The following presents a first attempt to see whether there are any patterns in the ISDs for Africa, whether they may be related to levels of GDP, and indeed whether the data provides
sufficient coverage to develop such analysis. Moreover, we describe how these simple correlations compare to what we know, from earlier analysis, of global patterns.

**a. Civic activism**

Civic activism refers to the strength of civil society, measured by levels of civic activism and access to information. It uses data on the extent of engagement in activities like signing petitions, demonstrations, organisation and effectiveness of civil society, access to media, levels of awareness and information of political issues. For Africa, information from the Afrobarometer for 18 countries is included.

The ISD data for Africa for 2010 suggest a positive association between civic activism and GDP (+0.278). This is in line with the analysis by Huang (2011) of the global dataset, who moreover concluded that the causation runs from GDP to civic activism, and not the reverse, thus indicating that civic activism is increasing as people (countries) become more wealthy.23

Huang (2011) moreover showed that in OECD countries civic activism decreased over the last two decades while it increased in developing countries. In his view, this may be partly ascribed to changes in the form of civic activism, notably the increasing use of internet sources in wealthy countries – this change may not be sufficiently captured in ISD. Data for 1995-2010 (see Table 2) shows that in Africa, indeed, the indicator of civic activism has increased; given political liberalization this may not come as a surprise (while in South Africa for example there is no change since 1995).

**b. Clubs and associations.**

The index clubs and associations describes the relations of trust and cohesion within local communities. The strength of ties to neighbourhood and associational life is measured from data on membership of local voluntary groups, time spent socialising with relatives and in local clubs, attendance of community meetings, and participation in development associations. The World Value Survey (WVS) is a main source of data,24 and ISD uses Afrobarometer data from 16 African countries.

Interestingly, the African data for 2010 suggest a negative correlation between GDP and clubs and associations (-0.38). It is tempting to see this as, potentially, a sign of breakdown of traditional local social structures and solidarity, and indeed trust, for example as a result of urbanisation. However, the number of observations for this indicator is small (and the variation large, with Malawi, Tanzania and Ethiopia as positive outliers – and it may be worth reflecting whether the political histories contribute to this patterns, and – as for eastern Europe – specific forms of associational life).

23 See also Inglehart, Welzel, Norris, Dalton.

24 In terms of trust levels, WVS data show that African countries are in between high-trust central European and low-trust Latin American countries; Asian and high-income countries have highest levels of trust (Easterly et al. 2006).
Huang (2011) observes that over the 1990-2010 period the correlation (world-wide) between the clubs and association index and the other indices has changed – which he believes might be caused, in part, by changing forms of associational life that the indicator may not well reflect. For the African 2010 data, but with a limited number of observations (hence, also, we cannot report trends in clubs and associations), we see that clubs and association does not correlate with civic activism.

c. Safety and trust

The Index interpersonal safety and trust intends to measure norms of nonviolence between persons in societies. This uses indicators of trustworthiness such as reported levels of crime victimisation, survey responses on feelings of safety and security, homicide data, and risk reports on the likelihood of physical attack, extortion, or robbery. It uses data for 16 African countries from the Afrobarometer.

The 2010 data show no correlation between GDP and safety and trust. This would appear different from what the global data (Huang 2011) show, where an increased GDP seems to cause higher safety and trust, and a correlation between the two would be in line with much social capital and institutional theory. In the case of the African data, we see large outliers, with South African (where levels have declined since 1995) and (particularly) Equatorial Guinea being relatively rich and low scores on safety and trust. Moreover, there is a distinct downward trend in the safety indicator – which in itself of course is worth looking into in more detail (including whether this is related to improved recording of safety and crime data).

Further analysis of ISD also needs to incorporate the relationship with governance indicators, and the combined impact on growth (as shown in Easterly et al., 2006, for a global data set; and Collier’s observation (in Kanbur et al. 2009] of interaction of fractionalisation and democracy). Raw correlations with summary CPIA data suggest, unsurprisingly, the strongest correlates with interpersonal safety and trust (r = 0.56) and civic engagement (r = 0.55); with the other indices, the correlates are also positive but weaker.

d. Inter-group cohesion

Relations of trust and cohesion between groups – with ethnic, religious, or linguistic identity – are captured under the index inter-group cohesion. It includes Afrobarometer data from 16 countries. This Index is based on data on inter-group disparities, perceptions of being discriminated against, feelings of distrust against members of other groups, reported incidents of riots, terrorist acts, assassinations, kidnappings, civil disorder, terrorism, and violent riots and confrontations.

This Index shows the strongest correlation with GDP (r = 0.365). This suggests a pattern

---

25 See Foa (2012) on the role of safety and trust for donor behaviour, which may be of relevance for many of the countries discussed here.
different from Huang’s (2011) analysis of global data, where the cohesion data showed no correlations. It may be that cohesion is particularly important in Africa, and/or at lower levels of GDP, and civil wars and similar expressions of low cohesion are particularly important for economic growth dynamics (negative outliers like Nigeria, Somalia and Sudan would fall into this pattern; though natural resources might allow at least short-term wealth creation). The data over the different points in time show a rather unpredictable pattern: it suggests a worsening of the indicator but the number of observation may be too small to come to clear Africa-wide conclusions.

e. Inclusion minorities

The index on inclusion of minorities has most recently been added (some of indicators were previously included in the cohesion index, hence affecting earlier analysis; and the two appear positively correlated). It measures levels of discrimination against vulnerable groups such as indigenous peoples, migrants, refugees, or lower caste groups; and is thus potentially a large improvement on earlier indicators focusing on ethno- or linguistic fractionialization. It is based on direct measures of social institutions and their outcomes, as well as perception-based indicators (for Africa, for 18 countries such data comes from the Afrobarometet), and proxy measures to measure the access to jobs and educational attainment.

For 2010, there is a fairly good coverage for this index for Africa. This shows a positive correlation with GDP (0.26). There also appears to be a fairly good correlation with the ISD inter-group cohesion, but – as one might expect – some significant outliers: Somalia scores fairly high on the inclusion index but low on inclusion, while Angola scores relatively high on cohesion and low on inclusion.

f. Gender equality

Aspects of gender equality have been relatively well measured and described, including the possible associations with economic growth, with particularly equality in education (and to some extent access to finance and production inputs) considered instrumental for promoting growth. As described above, there is also a fair amount of literature and measurement on Africa. Huang (2011) describes how the gender in the ISDs have fairly complete coverage, relatively little dispersion, but a slightly curious pattern during the 1990s.

The ISD also show fairly good coverage of gender indicators in Africa. And this shows a positive correlation between gender equity and GDP (0.24). This is in line with Huang’s (2011) finding using the global data set; Huang moreover establishes that there is a causal relation from gender equity to growth.

8. Towards conclusion: does social development matter for inclusive growth in Africa
The papers suggest some important points about social development, and some potentially good news on the question of inclusive growth. But these points are merely suggestive, and further work should focus on multivariate analysis with appropriate control variables. Of course in all cases of correlation, causation could run in both directions; to address this for Africa may be more challenging, but further work is definitely warranted to explore this.

Our basic description for Africa and comparisons with more detailed analysis using the global ISD data suggest positive correlation between GDP per capita and civic activism, inter-group cohesion, inclusion of minorities, and gender. We find a negative correlation with the indicator of clubs and associations, and no association with safety and trust.

At a broad level, this appears in line with what’s been found for the global data set: Huang (2011) found the most consistent and positive relations between GDP and civic activism, inter-group cohesion, and gender equity (the indicator on minorities was not included in the data set yet), and a negative association between clubs and GDP. The raw correlations thus suggests that Africa is no different from the rest of the world in terms of associations between growth and social development.

In terms of our second set of ISDs, focusing around inclusiveness, the data suggest that there are no clear trade-offs: there are strong indications that enhancing women’s access is good for growth, and countries with higher GDPs also have higher scores on both inter- and intra-group cohesion.

The picture on the ISDs that focus on institutions suggest a more mixed set of relationships. Like for gender and groups exclusion, countries with higher GDPs also have higher scores on civic activism (and the trend in Africa appears positive); but we see no positive relationships between GDP and clubs (which may be due to the indicator) and safety (perhaps partly related to outliers of rich and unsafe countries).

---

27 Huang (2011) used the Granger method to establish causality, using the global data set, which show that clubs exerts a negative impact on growth, gender a positive, that GDP influences safety, and there is no causal correlation between GDP and civic activism and cohesion.
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## Table  Overview ISD data Africa 2010

ISD values for each country and year, with standard error [s.e.]; empty cells imply data not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>civic activism</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>intergroup cohesion</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>clubs &amp; associations</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>interpersonal safety &amp; trust</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>inclusion</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>gender equality</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Value1</td>
<td>Value2</td>
<td>Value3</td>
<td>Value4</td>
<td>Value5</td>
<td>Value6</td>
<td>Value7</td>
<td>Value8</td>
<td>Value9</td>
<td>Value10</td>
<td>Value11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [www.indsocdev.org](http://www.indsocdev.org), August 2013
Table 2: ISD trends average Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>civic</th>
<th>safety</th>
<th>inter-group cohesion</th>
<th>inclusion</th>
<th>gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995</strong></td>
<td>0.409404</td>
<td>0.529577</td>
<td>0.645009</td>
<td>0.482197</td>
<td>0.5825495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td>0.441433</td>
<td>0.495238</td>
<td>0.53813</td>
<td>0.467376</td>
<td>0.5570064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td>0.469914</td>
<td>0.395271</td>
<td>0.623918</td>
<td>0.443199</td>
<td>0.6741819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>0.468683</td>
<td>0.375163</td>
<td>0.4878</td>
<td>0.420103</td>
<td>0.6839197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>