range of fiscal and social policy instruments. For example, reducing the tax burden for secondary earners by replacing family taxation with individual taxation, improves women’s participation in the labour force. Legislative structures can help prevent gender-biased discrimination in the workplace. Obligatory and voluntary quotas in public and private entities, targeted subsidies to female businesses, and supervisory bodies monitoring the implementation of national policies are also approaches used successfully around the world. Public-private cooperation to close economic participation gaps presents a promising approach. See Appendix G for further details on the Gender Parity Task Force model developed by the World Economic Forum.

One of the most critical pressure points often relates to the care infrastructure, due to the greater portion of unpaid work performed by women. Stronger care-related policies could therefore enhance women’s economic participation and re-balance care roles in the home. See the Box on Care Policies (page 34) for more information on global care policy approaches.

Finally, preparing for the future may also require a deliberate approach to managing upcoming workforce disruptions that may impact women and men differently. For example, our Future of Jobs Report predicted that the disruptions of the Fourth Industrial Revolution will lead to decline in some of the currently most gender equal job families—art, design, entertainment, media, and office and administrative functions. Strategic focus will therefore be needed, by both governments and businesses, to help avoid a deepening of gender divides through re-skilling and up-skilling that takes gender gaps into account.

Conclusion
The Global Gender Gap Report 2016 provides a comprehensive overview of the current state of the global gender gap and of efforts and insights to close it. The Index points to potential role models by revealing those countries that—within their region or their income group—are leaders in having divided resources more equitably between women and men than other countries have, regardless of the overall level of resources available. The Report’s detailed Country Profiles not only allow users to understand how close each country has come to the equality benchmark in each of the four dimensions examined by the Index, but also provide a snapshot of the legal and social framework within which these outcomes are produced.

The magnitude of gender gaps in countries around the world is the combined result of various socio-economic, policy and cultural variables. The Global Gender Gap Index was developed in 2006 partially to address the need for a consistent and comprehensive measure for gender equality that can track a country’s progress over time. The Index does not seek to set priorities for countries but rather to provide a comprehensive set of data and a clear method for tracking gaps on critical indicators so that countries may set priorities within their own economic, political and cultural contexts.

The Report continues to highlight the strong correlation between a country’s gender gap and its economic performance, and summarizes some of the latest research on the case for gender equality. This year, we also introduced a deeper analysis of the relationship between broader human capital development and deployment and gender parity. The Report highlights the message to policy-makers that countries that want to remain competitive and inclusive will need to make gender equality a critical part of their human capital development. In particular, learning between countries and public-private cooperation within countries will be critical elements of closing the gender gap.

We hope that the information contained in the Global Gender Gap Report series will serve as a basis for continued benchmarking by countries on their progress towards gender equality, help support the case for closing gender gaps and encourage further research on policies and practices that are effective at promoting change.

Notes
1 Following a methodology originally developed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Global Gender Gap Index estimates the average income earned by women, relative to income earned by men, in a calculation that takes into account a country’s GDP per capita (US$), the share of women and men in the labour force, and their mean nominal wages. To account for globally rising income levels, beginning with this year’s edition of the Report, the maximum income value considered in the calculation has been capped at US$75,000 per capita. This follows UNDP’s own adjustment of the methodology in line with findings by Kahneman and Deaton that suggest there is little additional gain in human well-being from annual income beyond US$75,000. In previous editions of the Global Gender Gap Index, this cap was US$40,000. Since 2011, the US$ 40,000 cap had lost some its ability to discern the level of gender-based income disparities among high-income nations such as the Nordics, the United States and the member states of the Gulf Cooperation Council. For a full overview of this year’s methodology change, refer to Appendix D. For a more detailed discussion of the assumptions behind the Estimated earned income indicator, refer to: Kahneman and Deaton, High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being, and Human Development Report 2015, UNDP; Technical Notes and UNDP, “Frequently Asked Questions: Gender Development Index (GDI),” available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/faq-page/gender-development-index-gdi (accessed October 2016).

2 This ratio is based on what is considered to be a “normal” sex ratio at birth: 1.06 males for every female born. See: Klassen and Wink, “Missing Women: Revisiting the Debate.”

3 This ratio is based on the standards used in the UNDP’s Gender-Related Development Index, which uses 87.5 years as the maximum age for women and 82.5 years as the maximum age for men.

4 A first attempt to calculate the gender gap was made by the World Economic Forum in 2005; see Lopez-Claros and Zahidil, Women’s Empowerment: Measuring the Global Gender Gap. The 2005 Index, which was attempting to capture women’s empowerment, used a “feminist” scale that rewarded women’s supremacy over men (highest score is assigned to the country with the biggest gap in favour of women).
5 As in previous editions of the Index, weights derived for the 2006 Index were used again this year to allow for comparisons over time. They may be revised in future editions to reflect the evolution of the gender gap over the past decade.

6 This is not strictly accurate in the case of the Health and Survival subindex, where the highest possible value a country can achieve is 0.9796. However, for purposes of simplicity, we will refer to this value as 1 throughout the chapter and in all tables, figures and Country Profiles.

7 Because of the special equality benchmark value of 0.9796 for the Health and Survival subindex, it is not strictly accurate that the equality benchmark for the overall Index score is 1. This value is in fact \((1 + 1 + 1 + 0.9796) / 4 = 0.9949\). However, for purposes of simplicity, we will refer to the overall equality benchmark as 1 throughout the chapter and in all tables, figures and Country Profiles.

8 Since the indicators in the subindexes are weighted by the standard deviations, the final scores for the subindexes and the overall Index are not a pure measure of the gap vis-à-vis the equality benchmark, and therefore cannot be strictly interpreted as percentage values measuring the closure of the gender gap. However, for ease of interpretation and intuitive appeal, we will be using the percentage concept as a rough interpretation of the final scores.

9 See PwC, Women in Work Index 2016.


12 See ILO and ADB, Women and Labour Markets in Asia: Rebalancing for Gender Equality.

13 See World Bank Group, Gender and Development in the Middle East and North Africa.

14 See, for example, the World Bank Group, Gender and Economic Growth Assessments for Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

15 See Chaaban and Cunningham, Measuring the Economic Gain of Investing in Girls.

16 See ILO and ADB, op. cit.


19 See Goldman Sachs Global Markets Institute, The Power of the Purse: Gender Equality and Middle-Class Spending.


24 See Galbraithe, “Are there Gender-Related Influences on Corporate Sustainability? A Study of Women on Boards”.


26 See, for example: UNCTAD, Global Assessment of Sex-Disaggregated ICT Employment Statistics: Data Availability and Challenges on Measurement and Compilation.

27 Unpaid work performed by men has been modelled as a proportion of women’s unpaid work utilizing data from the Global Gender Gap Index: 37% is the modelled global number, compared to the original number of 34% reported for OECD countries.


29 See OECD, Cooking and Caring, Building and Repairing.


31 See International Monetary Fund, Women, Work, and the Economy: Macroeconomic Gains from Gender Equity.
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