EUROSHIP

closing gaps in European social citizenship

Summary of Outcomes of Social Indicator Workshop

EUROSHIP Working Paper No. 20

November 2022

Clara MacNaughton
András Gábos
István György Tóth
Federico Ciani
Mario Biggeri
Jerome Bickenbach

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 870698. The opinions published in this deliverable only reflect the authors` view. The Agency and the Commission are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

EUROSHIP Working Papers are scientific outputs from the EUROSHIP project. The series is edited by the project coordinator Professor Rune Halvorsen. The working papers are intended to meet the European Commission's expected impact from the project:

i) to advance the knowledge base that underpins the formulation and implementation of relevant policies in Europe with the aim of exercising the EU social rights as an integral part of EU citizenship and promoting upward convergence, and
ii) to engage with relevant communities, stakeholders and practitioners in the research with a view to supporting social protection policies in Europe. Contributions to a dialogue about these results can be made through the project website (euroship-research.eu), or by following us on Twitter: @EUROSHIP_EU.

To cite this report:

MacNaughton, C, Gábos, A, Tóth, I et al. (2022) Summary of Outcomes of Social Indicator Workshop. EUROSHIP Working Paper no. 20. Oslo: Oslo Metropolitan University. DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.21564498. Available at: https://euroship- research.eu/publications.

The original version of this working paper was submitted to the European Commission's Research Executive Agency (REA) as EUROSHIP Deliverable 3.6 in September 2022.

Authors

Clara MacNaughton, Swiss Paraplegic Research
András Gábos, TÁRKI Social Research Institute
István György Tóth, TÁRKI Social Research Institute
Federico Ciani, University of Florence
Mario Biggeri, University of Florence
Jerome Bickenbach, Swiss Paraplegic Research

Table of Contents

Background

The **European Pillar of Social Rights** (EPSR) is a normative guide and strategic asset for the future of the European Union (EU). Recent events – the 2008 crisis and its aftermaths, the COVID-19 pandemic and its social and economic consequences, and the growing instability nearby the European borders – have made clear the need to focus on social rights as an essential component of European citizenship. The human, social and economic consequences of the war in Ukraine, although not currently known, are so potentially large that the relevance of protecting and fostering social rights is even greater.

Fostering the upward social convergence of the EU is an opportunity to build a sustainable, resilient and prosperous future for the EU. To effectively monitor the implementation of the EPSR is therefore an important issue from both scientific and political points of view (Eurofound, 2018). Monitoring requires sound and relevant indicators, both qualitative and quantitative. Moreover, reorienting (or at least rebalancing) the focus of European institutions from merely maintaining macro-stability parameters to fostering upward social convergence might require a rethinking of which indicators fully capture the scope and significance of social convergence.

Over the last decades, the international policy setting has been affected by the identification and public awareness of dashboards of indicators, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), that aim to increase the accountability of policy making and improve the quality of public debate. The **Social Scoreboard** (SSB) was part of this shift and was developed as a set of 35 indicators to monitor the implementation of the EPSR.

The debate over social indicators, however, is much wider and cannot be limited to a discussion on how to improve the SSB. The development of social indicators can be traced back to the attempt to shift the focus of measurement (and debate) from means (e.g. income) to ends (e.g. well-being, quality of life, social inclusion). Moving effectively "beyond GDP" entailed the elaboration of concepts and frameworks more complex and multifaceted than income and other related indicators. Concepts such as standard of living (Sen, 1988), level of living (Johanson, 1973), social exclusion (Atkinson, 2000), quality of life (Diener, 1995) and, finally human development (Sen, 2000) and sustainable development (UN General assembly), are inherently multidimensional: as a consequence, their operationalisation needs, in first instance, a dashboard of indicators selected to align with the underlying key concept(s). The most widely used sets of indicators, including composite indices in the "beyond GDP" approaches are the **Human Development Index** by the United Nations Development Progamme (UNDP), the **SDG Index** by the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and Bertelsmann Stiftung, the **Social Progress Index** by Social Progress Imperative and the **Transition Performance Index** by the European Commission.

The EUROSHIP project itself is an attempt to bring attention to the importance, in the wider context of social citizenship, not merely of income security, but also of the more subtle, and human rights-focused, domains of autonomy and influence. This paper presents the summary of EUROSHIP's Social Indicator Workshop and the recommendations for indicator development and data improvement in Europe.

The Social Indicators Workshop

Aim of the Workshop

The Horizon 2020 project EUROSHIP "Closing gaps in social citizenship: New tools to foster social resilience in Europe" will provide new, gender-sensitive, comparative knowledge about the effectiveness of changing social protection policies targeted at reducing poverty and social exclusion in Europe, to further implementation of the European Pillar of Social Rights and Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development towards an upward social convergence between Member States. 'Social citizenship' is at the core of the project and is "… a question of practices: living a decent life in accordance with the prevailing standards in society, being able to act autonomously, being able to participate in social and political life in the broadest sense, and having 'civic' orientations to the political community and to one's fellow citizens". (Andersen & Halvorsen, 2002:12-3) Social Citizenship is theorized in terms of **Security** (effectively using social rights to protect against major life risks, such as poverty, disability and illness); **Autonomy** (allowing to decide for themselves how to live their lives); and **Influence** (creating the conditions for citizens' participation in public deliberation).

The final stage of EUROSHIP, to develop and implement evidence-based policy recommendations, depends crucially on EU social indicators that can be employed to monitor the implementation of the European Pillar of Social Rights (Eurofound, 2018) to enable European citizens to exercise social rights in a more effective way and contribute to a cohesive and resilient Europe. The consortium focused on indicators for poverty (representing the Security dimension of social citizenship) and social exclusion (representing the Autonomy and Influence dimension of social citizenship).

In Work Package 3 "Mapping gaps in social citizenship: diversity and needs for new indicators" the task of EUROSHIP researchers was therefore to critically assess the adequacy and suitability of existing EU social indicators dashboards for poverty and social exclusion, review concerns of data availability and reliability, whether fragile groups are adequately covered by standard EU surveys, explore the value of a synthetic composite social indicator to augment the Social Scoreboard (SSB), discuss the challenges of developing indicators beyond Security, namely for Autonomy and Influence, and finally the methodological challenges inherent in combining quantitative and qualitative social indicators. These issues and open questions can be grouped for discussion into three themes: **dashboard indicators**, **composite indicators** and **new indicators for social citizenship**.

The following background Working Papers are available and provided background and supporting documentation for this workshop:

- *State-of-the-art review of indicators and data on poverty and social exclusion*[1]
- *Diversity and change in citizenship: mapping poverty in Europe*[2]
- *Alternative approaches to the study of poverty and social exclusion in Europe*[3]

[1] https://euroship-research.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EUROSHIP-Working-Paper-No-1-final.pdf
[2] https://euroship-research.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/EUROSHIP-Working-Paper-2.pdf
[3] https://euroship-research.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/EUROSHIP-Working-paper-No-13-Alternative-approaches-to-the-study-of-poverty-and-social-exclusion-in-Europe.pdf

The aim of the Social Indicator Workshop was to critically review and evaluate the preliminary conclusions and open questions of the EUROSHIP consortium researchers to contribute to the final state of the EUROSHIP project of recommendations and an implementation plan for indicator development and data improvement in Europe.

Summary of the Workshop

The workshop took place as a hybrid event – at the Oslo Region European Office Brussels and virtually – on 28 April 2022. It was carried out in three parts, (1) Dashboard Indicators, (2) Composite Indicators and (3) Looking Forward: New Indicators for Social Citizenship. Each part was opened with a summary of the current challenges and followed by a discussion with the invited experts.

1. Dashboard Indicators

1.1. Challenges and Preliminary Work

The main limitation of the Social Scoreboard is that it is unable to cover vulnerable social groups – we are focusing too much on the averages and not enough on the distribution of social groups. However, these social groups are of high importance for social policy. The reasons for this limitation are (1) gaps in the data infrastructure, (2) problems with reaching vulnerable groups through sample surveys (e.g. homeless, irregular migrants, people in detention), even though information about these groups is even more relevant, as they are citizens who are at very high risk of experiencing multidimensional deprivation and exclusion from development processes, (3) a bias in existing sets of indicators towards the income security dimension of social citizenship, and (4) autonomy and participation dimensions are not/hardly represented in the social scoreboard.

EUROSHIP's Work Package 3 (WP3) assessed existing indicators, provided a macro-level comparative analysis of poverty and social exclusion in Europe, and proposed how the EU and national governments can further develop their social indicators to improve monitoring of the developments in European social policies and assessment tools for delivering Social Europe. In WP3's deliverable 3.1 (Gábos et al., 2021), reliability checks for selected vulnerable groups, indicators and breakdowns, using EU-SILC and EU-LFS were performed, as well as an online expert survey with representatives from civil society organisations. The main results of deliverable 3.1 are that (a) indicators are mostly reliable for some groups (e.g. those with low education or disabilities), however, there are problems with others (migrants most of all), (b) most indicators are reliable, however, most problems were found with the severe housing deprivation rate, (c) problems with the reliability of groups (see result a) are consistent across databases, but thanks to the larger sample size of the EU-LFS the indicators are more reliable in comparison to EU-SILC, (d) the listed problems are aggravated when looking additionally at the breakdown by sex. From the expert surveys, it is known that member states are planning on dealing with these issues by either increasing the sample size (e.g. Spain) or linking the EU-SILC data to micro census data (e.g. Germany). Additionally, disaggregation at the NUTS-2 level is not available for many countries and indicators, and therefore geographical disaggregation is a serious issue that should be tackled in the further development of the indicators. Another lesson from deliverable 3.1 was the inability of the indicators to capture the heterogeneity of outcomes through the life course. For example, as one ages, people's needs and characteristics evolve and the various problems and indicators vary with severity. Similarly, at different times in history, different groups are most at risk of shocks (e.g. youth in the COVID-19 pandemic). Therefore, the number of indicators should vary with and account for these traits and shocks.

In deliverable 3.3 (Biggeri et al., 2022), prospects for additional indicators were discussed. In the deliverable, three approaches for improving the methods for measuring social inequalities were presented: firstly to focus on multidimensional inequalities; secondly to include social policy indicators on outcomes, which is an important part of the monitoring system; and finally to use a pan-European poverty standard, which is a mixture of national relative and European poverty standards and applying the European poverty line to the national income distributions. This last approach involves a quasi-objective measure of poverty, a mixture of objective and relative indicators.

1.2. Summary of Discussion of Issues Raised

1: How well social rights are protected cannot be evaluated by the outcomes alone. As an example, if poverty is low, is it because the economy is doing well, is it because of the demography of the country or is it thanks to social rights protection policies? From a social resilience perspective, the question is then also how well are these people protected if the economy plummets or a pandemic spreads. The idea of social protection is that the population is protected even in times of crisis. Therefore, we need to measure policy itself and how well these policies function to protect social rights, in addition to outcomes. Measuring policy outcomes rather than policies themselves can be deceptive. The example was given that since 2011, the number of unmet medical needs has been decreasing in Europe, however, this is linked to increasing incomes and not improvements in social policy. This is dangerous because as soon as income decreases, people will no longer be able to pay for supplementary insurances and meet their medical needs. It was concluded that there is potential in the Social Scoreboard for a dimension on social policy indicators.

2: There are two main challenges with households being a unit which are not easily solvable with the data infrastructure available. The first issue is that the relations between persons within households are difficult to capture, for example, they may exchange care and money. This is particularly notable with children, as they may live in multiple households due to separated parents with joint custody. Those dynamics matter for the well-being of children, but we don't capture them. As a result, we underestimate the number of single parents and overestimate the child poverty amongst single parents. This is because children of separated parents may receive resources from each household (e.g. school books from one parent and clothes from another). Therefore, although each household may be described as below the poverty line, the child may not be. Another similar issue is that when we measure household-level indicators (e.g. at risk of poverty or material deprivation), these hide inequalities within households. The gender gap in poverty is driven by singles and same-sex couples and does not capture the reality of heterosexual couples in households.

Households as a unit also bring up the difficulty of international comparability, as it is more of a problem in some countries than in others. For example, in times of crisis, in some countries, the youth move home back to their parent's house, and in others, they don't. This has a huge effect on the data comparability of youth poverty. Resource division within households is a difficult issue that no one was able to solve in the last decades. There was a module of EU-SILC that tried to cover this, but it was not continued.

3: Going beyond the average is very important, but we need a framework for how we select the groups that we focus on. This process is often based on common sense. For example, we do need to look at the life course, but why focus on the life course particularly rather than on family form or educational trajectory. Do we select those groups on policy goals, empirically through data mining and understanding where the biggest differences are or do we think of a theoretical framework? It's important to be transparent about how we are choosing these areas. Intersectionality is not just about risk groups, but rather about combinations of risks, and in order to take this seriously, we need to capture that and shift our thinking from risk groups to the risks to which people are exposed. To go with this change, we need to start presenting confidence intervals, because we strongly overestimate trends and differences between countries which might just be a sampling error.

4: The point that there is more than explicit exclusion of certain groups from surveys was raised. There is also implicit exclusion that affects the reliability of survey data, for example, migrants may not speak the language of the survey, or surveys may not speak to the issues faced by the elderly in residential care. Many surveys are also not designed for getting responses from people with intellectual disabilities, visual impairments or forms of dementia. We, therefore, need to be careful when saying that these tools are reliable by statistical standards.

5: Indicators to measure the ability to participate in social and political life are insufficiently represented in the Social Scoreboard. Therefore, new indicators that we might consider in the future could focus more on that. By measuring if groups can actively participate or not, you may macro-economically address the case of some excluded people. This may include persons with disabilities, but also people who are locally excluded (rural remote areas). Nowadays, with increasing costs of energy, increasing costs of food, and the difficulty to finance social services, there is a risk of territorial exclusion. Distance from housing to employment is data that exists already and can be used as an indicator for social inclusion and would partly address cases of some populations at risk of exclusion. The average cost for transportation, the average distance to social services, or the variance of the rate of crime in a country would also be useful measures for territorial exclusion. Using existing data in other ways may be a solution to finding new indicators for social citizenship.

Inflation of course plays a role in excluding these remote populations, but on the other hand, the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the ability to remotely connect to society. In this light, online accessibility of government and social services is a major policy issue that should be tended to in order to decrease the exclusion of remote populations.

6: When we think about indicators, we always have established criteria to select these indicators, for example, policy relevance, statistical robustness, or timeliness. Indicators that are very rooted in the literature and rely on very established data infrastructure are usually suggested. However, there are needs and we will not always be able to include indicators based on strong evidence.

7: There is a huge comparability issue in indicators such as 'making ends meet', but also in the measurement of the number of persons with disabilities. This problem must be highlighted. We must rely on not only our work but also on other projects' findings to make our final recommendations.

2. Composite Indicators

2.1. Challenges

Composite indicators are being used more and more to measure the outcomes of different countries, in order to increase the accountability of policymaking and improve the quality of public debate. Among the most well-known composite indicators we have the HDI which is released yearly by the UNDP. Composite indicators can be used as a form of synthesis to understand the overall level of outcome for a specific purpose. This is a challenge because often we are measuring different types of dimensions. It's a challenge, but also an opportunity because, although “mixing apples and pears” is not devoid of consequences, we would like to framework our very multidimensional lives as a whole. Instead of having apples and pears, we can have a fruit salad. When tasting the fruit salad, it can also be said if it's good or bad as a whole; which components make up the fruit salad can be identified as well as the quality of each of the components and the way the salad is prepared. Often, in aggregate indices, we are mixing things that are input and output (i.e. mixing “apples with apple-trees”) or use aggregation procedures that have some implicit or explicit effects on the final result, with no neutral region. Therefore, for the analysis it was opted to use a different aggregation method than those that are more often used. It was decided to use the multidimensional synthetic indicator (MSI), as other methods would have lost a lot of information and have had non-perfect substitutability among dimensions. The MSI penalizes heterogeneity in achievements, but the higher the level of performance the lower the level of penalization. This means that, through the MSI procedures, the aggregate index takes into consideration unbalances among different dimensions: having very good achievement in one dimension and very bad in another one thus results in an overall value of the index that is lower than the arithmetic mean.

Unlike what happens when using geometric mean, an index aggregated through the MSI procedure does not collapse if there are components that are close to zero. The role of the function g(x) is to establish a rule to state how much and in which way unbalances in achievements in the different dimensions are penalized. If dimension 1 and dimension 2 both have an equal score, the index is the same as the average. But if one dimension moves, the formula penalizes this heterogeneity. It's not just penalizing the difference in the score, but also the level of the score. If one dimension is very high and another is very low, this will penalize you more.

What is good about this work is that it is based on a framework that is well known and accepted, the Social Scoreboard. Within this, we have three dimensions, (1) equal opportunities and access to the labor market, (2) fair working conditions, and (3) social protection and inclusion. These dimensions are divided into domains, which are further divided into sets of indicators. An indicator subset was considered by excluding a few indicators due to poor data availability, overlap and input indicators. Finally, the analysis suffered a lot from not having enough data at the NUTS-2 level.

The sigma convergence of the European Social Rights Indicator (ESRI) indicator was also assessed. From 2006 to 2015 there was an increasing divergence. After 2015 there was convergence again, and then the data stops. It would be interesting to see what the trend is after 2017. What is also interesting to unpack is the ESRI indicator, because the MSI procedure was applied to the indicators of each of the 3 domains of the social scoreboard and then the 3 domains were aggregated into one indicator. If we go back to the different pillars and observe their change over time in each country, we can observe that the situation is much less positive than the total ESRI score. Many countries had a negative change in the labor markets dimension from 2005 to 2017.

The ESRI has allowed us to highlight certain phenomena, for example, the lack of convergence, or a set of countries that had non-resilient behavior after the 2006-2008 recession. Further developments to improve the ESRI include trying other specifications of the g(x) function, a panel analysis, opening to other variables, exploring disaggregation, and extending the data set to see what happened to the ESRI after the impact of COVID-19 and inflation.

2.2. Summary of Discussion of Issues Raised

1: What is the added value of a composite indicator? Its first added value is its capacity to measure a multidimensional phenomenon in a clear and sound manner. Poverty is defined as a relative deprivation of social rights. A scoreboard cannot answer the question of whether and to which extent a person or group of persons can be qualified as being in such a state of poverty. In contrast, the ESRI provides a scale to measure the situation and to compare groups of people, countries, and progress over time. Its second added value is its focus on outcome indicators. One could make a correlation between output and ESRI, but the ESRI should not include any output. Outcomes are needed to describe the impact of policies as a degree of access to social rights. Political pressures exist to include output indicators into composite indicators, but that is the role of scoreboards, to provide such monitoring.

2: The added value of composite indicators is highly dependent on whether the composite indicator is effectively able to integrate various dimensions in a way that makes sense and also is reliable from a statistical perspective. The ESRI comes from three dimensions that are clear and consistent, and their distinctiveness is sufficient to avoid overlaps and statistical bias. The question is if there are enough dimensions to sufficiently draw a comprehensive picture of poverty as a description of access to social citizenship. It is quite normal that composite indicators are improved and completed over time. For future work, it may be worth adding a fourth dimension – integration to society – which may be the simplest way to have a consistent block. What kind of additional dimension could be added should be discussed as a group.

Another way would be to divide the third pillar, where there is a mixed concept of social protection and inclusion. Such a fourth dimension would aim to measure the capacity of individuals and households to better integrate into society and not live in isolation or insecure areas. This type of data may be a proxy to measure the impact of regional differences on national data, without regional data. A fourth dimension may be favorable, but as the Social Scoreboard only has three this might be politically difficult.

3: In the second pillar, fair working conditions, the indicator for the rate of household gross disposable income is used. It would be preferable to avoid the use of an index inside a composite indicator. It was suggested to replace it with the average disposable income of the two lowest quintiles in PPP, to represent the population in difficult situations, which is the concept of this indicator. Such an indicator also relates to the material situation of households; therefore, it should be placed in the third pillar of the ESRI instead of the second.

4: Doubts were raised on the indicator for self-reported unmet needs for two reasons. Firstly, it is redundant with the two other indicators used for healthcare, creating a risk of overlap.

Secondly, its standard deviation equals the mean, which is a signal for difficulties in comparability. Due to these doubts, it was suggested to drop this indicator from the ESRI.

5: The ESRI is primarily a tool for monitoring whether global policymaking has been effective over time. It does not specify which element of a policy to prioritize, which is an issue of political debate. It allows us to say if a country performed better than its neighbors as a result of its overall political choices.

6: The main advantage of composite indicators is that they allow measuring multi-dimensional phenomena at a uni-dimensional scale. Uni-dimensionality is desirable, because it allows us to compare situations across time or nations in a transitive way, and allows clear cut answers to questions like (1) did living conditions improve or deteriorate across time, (2) do people living in country A enjoy more social rights than those living in country B, and (3) is population subgroup x better off than population subgroup y?

7: It was advised not to use composite indexes as stand-alone measures, but rather as part of a dashboard or indicator system. Embedded in a dashboard, composite indices can be used to (a) summarize the information by providing uni-dimensionality, (b) attract the attention of the media, (c) to better communicate the collected information to the general public and policymakers, and (d) to act as a "door opener" to make use of the detailed information provided by the dashboard indicators. This is also how Amartya Sen described the function of the Human Development Index (HDI), "the HDI, which is inescapably a crude index, must not be seen as anything other than an introductory move getting people interested in the rich collection of information that is present in the Human Development Report" (UNDP, 1999).

With respect to this advice, an idea for the presentation of the ESRI may be to present a score that is an average for easy understanding as well as a score for heterogeneity (MSI minus average), on top of the ESRI score.

8: Methodological choices will always have substantial implications. For example, through the substitutability of measurement dimensions such as longevity, income, and education, we can see that these are influenced by the aggregation method used as well as the weighting procedure chosen. By using an additive aggregation method, we can arrive at a positive index value even if one of the indicators (for example life expectancy in the HDI) would be zero. This result is avoided when using a multiplicative method. The g(x) function is an interesting way of dealing with substitutability.

9: It was also advised to be aware of the existence of a trade-off between the sophistication of index construction methods and the usability as a communication device and "door opener". While more sophisticated approaches (like dynamic or objective weights) may be suitable in research and academic discourses, more simple choices (like fixed or subjective weights) are easier to communicate to laypersons. Laypersons may find it hard to interpret the g(x) function and the ESRI.

10: If in any way possible, composite indices should be based on microdata rather than aggregated data. The advantages are that this allows for disaggregation of index values by various socio-economic variables, class, age, sex, etc. and it also allows for the application of the full set of statistical analyses. However, problems frequently faced include finding a data set which includes all or at least a representative subset of indicators selected for the dashboard.

11: A sensitivity analysis should be performed, checking for the impact of specifying the g(x) function in this way compared to another.

3. Looking Forward: New Indicators for Social Citizenship

3.1. Challenges

With new indicators, we aim to broaden the picture of social citizenship and understand the lived experience of being a social citizen. Social citizenship can be understood as a collection of access points to opportunities and resources. However, one could perhaps say that that is not a full picture of what being a fully embodied social citizen means. The issue is whether autonomy and influence, the two remaining dimensions of social citizenship, are things that are inherently subjective or experiential. 'Subjective' has some overtones of arbitrariness, which should not be captured, because if the indicators were chosen correctly, the data would be completely factual. It does not mean that subjective is non-robust or non-rigorous. The idea is to get something that is workable as an indicator but exists in a non-quantitative space. The question is: are meaningful qualitative social indicators for the phenomena of autonomy and influence possible at all? Or should more work be done to create viable quantitative proxies for which data may be available? Quantitative proxies are valuable and measure things that are relevant. For example, measuring voter participation as a proxy for autonomy and influence - it indicates something about participation, although it doesn't indicate the experiential side of it.

There is value in looking beyond the quantitative. Autonomy is the ability of citizens to decide for themselves what they believe is valuable. In the realm of disability policy, autonomy is very crucial, because it's not just deciding but also effectuating decisions ('being the master of your own destiny'). Autonomy can seem vague, but in the real world, the ability to say 'I don't want this' or 'I do want that' and to have that decision respected, is an important part of the lived experience.

The term 'participation' is preferred to 'influence’ because influence is an aspect of participation. Public policy creates the conditions for citizens' participation in public deliberation and decision-making processes. Choice is the ability to effectuate your choice. Voice is the ability to be heard or 'having a seat at the table'. "Autonomy and influence are fundamental to active citizenship because they secure a bond of social belonging" (S. Ebersold, 2007). What would an indicator for a bond of social belonging look like and does it make sense? "Active Citizenship, in other words, is not merely a criterion of integration in marginalized people have access to the same resources, opportunities and sources of social recognition and respect that others do; it is also a matter of the active recognition of interdependency" (S. Ebersold, 2007). There is a difference between educational integration and educational inclusion. The distinction is that in 'integration' the child is in the mainstream classroom, compared to a child that is 'included' in the classroom participating completely and fully involved. Integration can be easily measured: is there a seat filled? Being included in the educational experience is inherently experiential. This can only be captured as the feeling of involvement, the sense of participation, or the experience of being heard.

The first challenge is therefore to understand if the dimensions of autonomy and influence are fundamentally subjective or experiential, if there are suitable proxy objective indicators, or if both are required. Do you aim to measure what is really at the root of autonomy and influence, or do you measure what's easier to measure? For example, measuring subjective well-being is 100% experiential. Objective well-being is a matter of resources and more 'measurable' things. The quality of life approach measures a mixture of both experiential and objective and can be very problematic because it measures very different levels of ontological existence.

Examples of indicators taken from the OECD Quality of Life indicators were given. The indicator for contact with others is the 'Percentage of people socializing with friends or relatives at least once a week during a usual year'. When measuring this quantitatively, we allow the person answering the question to assume their own definition of 'socializing', or what socializing means to them. When trying to measure this experientially, we would need to define what aspect of socializing we are aiming to capture. For example, can you socialize and not want to be there? Are you involved and engaged when socializing or are you just going through the motions of what socializing should mean? This goes back to participation – do you feel involved in it or are you just playing the role. In a survey, leaving out the hard part, by assuming understanding rather than describing what we mean and seeking a true understanding of what we are trying to measure, is problematic. Voting does not have any experiential aspect, you don't need to feel like you are voting. You are just doing the action of voting. In that case, voter turnout is a good measure of voting participation. But, being a social citizen has a subjective underpinning, and you need something to capture that aspect.

A few recommendations were given for the measurement of autonomy and influence. An objective measure of autonomy could be legal standing. This measures if a person is a citizen that can make choices that are respected under the law. What is left out of this measure is the sense of self-determination or the experience of being respected. These two measures are not mutually exclusive; you could have legal standing but not feel as though you are respected. The question is therefore, do you need both indicators to get a full understanding of autonomy? An objective measure of influence could be within opportunities to participate socially or politically (participation acts), for example, voting or being in a demonstration. Experientially, we could measure influence with the sense of being involved. The second challenge is the source of data for these indicators.

3.2. Summary of Discussion of Issues Raised

1: The suggested indicators above could be organized by structure or policy indicators rather than by objective and experiential. If organized this way, these indicators would then probably be structural.

2: It was challenged that qualitative indicators should be not favored over quantitative. Nor should we favor subjective versus objective indicators – it is the intention to have both. We can use reliability and validity to distinguish between better and worse indicators.

3: It was commented that it is a good point to refer to experiential indicators rather than subjective indicators. It's always a challenge to deal with social context. Even when trying to measure commuting, it's difficult to measure what's perceived as good or not good. The same goes for satisfaction with the local area, housing, etc. These indicators sometimes measure aspects that you had not thought of. The measure of satisfaction is difficult because it's related to autonomy – who are we to decide for somebody what they're satisfied with. With this in mind, it's very important to capture these experiential aspects, as well as to call them

experiential rather than subjective. Some risks come with this. Asking for unmet needs, for example, is based on the societal expectation of what should be available.
4: The point was also raised that we should not just focus on indicators for current issues but also measure future expectations and goals. For example, how likely do you think that in the future you will have unmet healthcare needs? Asking questions about the future is very difficult in surveys, but people's expectations about the future are very telling of their feelings and insecurities about the present.

5: The role of access to employment as a cross-cutting issue between autonomy and influence was discussed. Italy's and many European countries' constitutions state that its democratic architecture is rooted in labor. Access to employment is not just a means to have an income, but also a means to access dignity, participation, rights, democratic life and so on. In the real-world access to employment is seen in a reductionist way, as a means to an income. While, in terms of certain policies and indicators, the centrality of access to employment is still present. That's why so many indicators seem to focus on access to employment. Access to employment is seen as a way to conceptualize autonomy. Given the misalignment between what employment is in society versus what it was meant to be, these employment indicators do not give you enough information about autonomy.

6: It was commented that administrative data has its benefits. With administrative data, one may have access to a huge data set with large sample sizes and many data points (income, weight, height, disability benefit, blood pressure, etc.). The problem is, that the perspective of the person living that life is completely missed. It was never asked 'do you feel deprived'. If someone takes up a disability benefit, they know, but if you don't take up the disability benefit, no one asks why. Therefore, the data needs to be a mix of both, because both have benefits.

Recommendations: How the EU and national governments can further develop their social indicators

The recommendations for how the EU and national governments can further develop their social indicators are based on the work done within Work Package 3 of the EUROSHIP project. As a component of the EUROSHIP project that aims to close gaps in social citizenship in Europe, Work Package 3 specifically aims to "critically assess the adequacy and suitability of existing EU social indicators and describe developments in poverty and social exclusion across Europe". The Social Indicator Workshop that took place on April 28th, 2022 in Brussels was an opportunity to discuss the challenges confronted within EUROSHIP's Work Package 3 and to discuss the way forward for social indicator development and data improvement in Europe with a group of national and European level academic and professional stakeholders. The recommendations for the development of social indicators within the EU's Social Scoreboard can be divided into three categories, (1) Data Availability, (2) Vulnerable Groups and (3) Autonomy and Influence.

1. Data Availability

    Recommendation 1: Include social policy indicators measuring outcome
    Recommendation 2: Include social policy indicators measuring policy itself
    Recommendation 3: Present confidence intervals along with averages

Recommendation 4: Oversampling of specific population subgroups (ex: migrants) to increase the opportunity to perform analyses based on an intersectional approach

Recommendation 5: Include more quality of work indicators

2. Vulnerable Groups

Recommendation 6: Expand the set of data not focused on households as a unit of analysis to take into consideration intra-household inequalities potentially leading to the exclusion of specific targets such as the youth, single parent and childhood poverty

Recommendation 7: Address implicit exclusion of vulnerable groups as well as explicit exclusion by improving language availability and accessibility for persons with disabilities including for example visual and intellectual impairments

Recommendation 8: Measure territorial exclusion using data that already exists (ex: distance between housing and employment, average cost for transportation, average distance to social services) to address social inclusion and risk of exclusion

Recommendation 9: Measure online accessibility of government and social services

Recommendation 10: Improve child-specific indicators

Recommendation 11: Include new indicators to assess the gender gap

3. Autonomy and Influence

Recommendation 12: Determine how to measure autonomy and influence and which data sources are available for such indicators

Recommendation 13: Include a mix of quantitative and qualitative indicators for autonomy and influence

Recommendation 14: Align the understanding of employment between society and law

Implementation Plan for Indicator Development and Data Improvement in Europe

In order to implement the given recommendations to improve the European social indicators, national and EU governments should follow a few steps.

1. Complete the transition towards a concept of social citizenship as based on the three pillars (Security, Autonomy and Influence) in all European institutions. Most indicators currently focus on security. In order to implement indicators for autonomy and influence, all institutions must adopt the three pillars of social citizenship.
2. Hold a multi-stakeholder consultation with EU institutions to make the most of the existing data sources and indicators, taking into account our recommendations.
3. Based on results of the previous consultation, hold a multi-stakeholder consultation with EU institutions to create new indicators to fill the existing gaps and develop a richer toolbox to monitor the implementation of the pillar of social rights, considering our recommendations.

4. Implement new indicators and data collection based on the above recommendations and multi-stakeholder consultations.

References

Andersen, J. G. and K. Halvorsen (2002). Changing labour markets, unemployment and unemployment policies in a citizenship perspective. In J. G. Andersen et al. (eds.). Europe's new state of welfare. Unemployment, employment policies and citizenship. Bristol: Policy Press, 1-19.

Atkinson, R. (2000). Combating social exclusion in Europe: the new urban policy challenge. *Urban studies*, 37(5-6), 1037-1055.

Biggeri, M., F. Ciani, L. Ferrone, A. Gábos, M. Nannini, Zs. Tomka and I. Gy. Tóth (2022). Alternative approaches to the study of poverty and social exclusion in Europe. EUROSHIP Working Paper No. 13. Oslo: Oslo Metropolitan University. DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.19188206. Available at: https://euroship-research.eu/publications/

Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 851–864.

Ebersold, S. (2007). Affiliating Participation for Active Citizenship. Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research, 9(3-4), 237–253

Eurofound (2018), Upward convergence in the EU: Concepts, measurements and indicators, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Gábos A, Ciani F, Tomka Z, et al. (2021) State-of-the-art review of indicators and data on poverty and social exclusion. EUROSHIP Working Paper No. 1. Oslo: Oslo Metropolitan University. DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.13385951. Available at: https://euroshipresearch.eu/publications.

Johansson, S. (1973). The level of living survey: A presentation. Acta sociologica, 16(3), 211-219.
Sen, A. (1988). *The standard of living*. Cambridge University Press.

Sen, A. (2000). A decade of human development. *Journal of human development*, *1*(1), 17-23.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (1999). Human Development Report 1999: Globalization with a Human Face. New York.