EIGE
European Institute for Gender Equality

Intersecting inequalities
Gender Equality Index

KNOWLEDGE

TIME

MONEY

POWER

WORK

HEALTH

VIOLENCE

INTERSECTING INEQUALITIES

This report was developed by the research team of the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE): Davide Barbieri, Brianna Guidorzi, Hedvika Janeckova, Dr. Marre Karu, Dr. Zuzana Madarova (Comenius University in Bratislava, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences), Blandine Mollard, Dr. Jolanta Reingardė.

A particular thank you goes to EIGE colleagues for valuable contributions and comments throughout the report development: Jakub Caisl and Charlotte Dahin and to many other for consultations, editing and administrative support.

The measurement framework also gained a lot of expert advice from the Experts' Consultation Meeting held in Vilnius in November 2016, EIGE's Working group on the Gender Equality Index.

The European Institute for Gender Equality is very grateful to many other individuals such as Merle Paats, Dr Irene Riobóo Lestón and Dr. Niels Spierings who provided valuable contributions and support to the update of the Gender Equality Index.

Neither EIGE nor any person acting on behalf of EIGE is responsible for the use that might be made of the following information.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019

Print	ISBN 978-92-9470-537-2	doi:10.2839/67036	MH-02-18-295-EN-C
PDF	ISBN 978-92-9470-538-9	doi:10.2839/308776	MH-02-18-295-EN-N

© European Institute for Gender Equality, 2019

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Reuse is authorised provided the source is acknowledged, the original meaning is not distorted and EIGE is not liable for any damage caused by that use. The reuse policy of EIGE is implemented by the Commission Decision of 12 December 2011 on the reuse of Commission documents (2011/833/EU).

Intersecting inequalities

Gender Equality Index

Table of Contents

List of tables 4

Introduction 5

1. Gender equality: the importance of intersectionality 7
   - 1.1. Gender inequality in a complex society 7
   - 1.2. Scattered history of the concept of intersectionality 8

2. Theory meets practice: potential for intersectionality in EU policy . . 11
   - 2.1. Non-discrimination laws 11
   - 2.2. Policy interventions: mixed usage of intersectionality terminology 12
     - 2.2.1. Need for improved intersectionality in strategic documents on gender equality 13
     - 2.2.2. Incorporating a gender perspective in inclusion policies 13
     - 2.2.3. Looking forward: mainstreaming gender and intersectional perspective across policies 14

3. How is intersectionality measured? Methodological considerations 15
   - 3.1. Conceptualising intersectionality 15
   - 3.2. Selecting intersecting inequalities for the Gender Equality Index 15

4. Intersecting inequalities in the Gender Equality Index 19
   - 4.1. Gender and age 19
     - 4.1.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and age 19
     - 4.1.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and age 20
   - 4.2. Gender and country of birth 21
     - 4.2.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and country of birth 21
     - 4.2.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and country of birth 22
   - 4.3. Gender and dis/ability 23
     - 4.3.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and dis/ability 23
     - 4.3.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and dis/ability 25
   - 4.4. Gender and educational level 26
     - 4.4.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and educational level 26
     - 4.4.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and educational level 27

4.5. Gender and family type ... 27
4.5.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and family type ... 27
4.5.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and family type ... 28
4.6. Further intersecting inequalities in the EU ... 29
4.6.1. Sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression ... 30
4.6.2. Migrant background, ethnicity and religion ... 30
Concluding notes ... 33
References ... 35
Annexes ... 40
Annex 1. List of indicators, disaggregated by intersection and source ... 41
Annex 2. Data on intersection of gender ... 48

List of tables

Table 1. Scope of EU Anti-Discrimination Directives ... 12
Table 2. Axes of intersectionality included in the Gender Equality Index ... 16
Table 3. Adult population (15+) by household type and sex in 2014 (millions) ([22]) ... 28
Table 4. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and family composition ... 48
Table 5. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and age ... 49
Table 6. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and level of education ... 50
Table 7. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and country of birth ... 51
Table 8. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and disability ... 52

Introduction

"United in diversity" has been the motto of the European Union (EU) since the new millennium. At no other time has this been more relevant than today. Women and men living in the EU come from many different socioeconomic, educational and cultural backgrounds. They are from different countries, speak many languages, and differ in sexual orientation or gender identity. Since its inception, the Gender Equality Index has strived to reflect this diversity. The domain of intersecting inequalities has thus evolved as an integral part of the Index structure (EIGE, 2013). Intersecting inequalities capture how gender is manifested when combined with other characteristics such as age, dis/ability, migrant background, ethnicity, sexual orientation or socioeconomic background (EIGE, 2013). An intersectional perspective highlights the complexity of gender equality.

The Gender Equality Index 2013 incorporated six core domains – work, money, knowledge, power, time and health – with two additional domains of violence and intersecting inequalities. The core domains measure gender gaps in different areas of life and form the basis of the calculation of scores for Member States, while the domain of intersecting inequalities adds further detailed understanding to gender inequality by acknowledging the diversity among women and men. For instance, gender gaps in employment rates among three groups of population – foreign-born people ([1]), older people (aged 55-64) and lone parents – were calculated in Index 2013 (EIGE, 2013). This approach was further developed in Index 2015, which used the same indicator (employment rate) and illustrative social groups (EIGE, 2015a).

The Index 2017 also aimed to fully develop the conceptual and measurement framework of intersecting inequalities. Two approaches were considered for this purpose. The first would apply an intersectional analysis throughout the Gender Equality Index, to every single dimension and variable, while the second would develop a composite index of intersectional inequalities to provide a measure of the level of inequality affecting different groups of women and men. Although the second option (the composite index of intersectionality) would give a general indication of the extent of various inequalities in society, it would also hide valuable detail and information. On thorough testing of both approaches, the score in the composite index proved difficult to interpret. The first approach was therefore chosen as more transparent, practical and informative.

Limited data availability posed a challenge throughout the process. In order to be relevant to the Gender Equality Index, the intersectional analysis must apply to the same indicators within the core domains, i.e. the same strict data quality and comparability criteria should also be respected. As a result, the number of intersections available for this analysis is limited and not all indicators of the Gender Equality Index are covered. The Index 2017 includes an intersectional analysis of all of the domains (except power). It shows the various outcomes of EU and national policies for different groups of women and men, supports more holistic developments and implementation of evidence-based policy-making in the area of gender equality (EIGE, 2017b).

The first chapter of this report gives an overview of intersectionality and discusses the historical origins of intersectionality theory. Chapter two presents current representations – if any - in EU policy. The third chapter provides the theoretical and methodological framework for intersecting inequalities specifically within the context of EIGE's Gender Equality Index, with the fourth chapter going on to summarise the main findings from the Gender Equality Index 2017 for each intersectionality and domain. This chapter also outlines key potential and limitations of the intersectional analysis itself. Finally, the conclusion highlights the need for improved data collection, research and policy-making to capture intersectionality in the EU.

([1]) In the context of the Gender Equality Index, "foreign born" refers to individuals residing in a country that is not their country of birth. In subsequent editions of the Gender Equality Index, this category has been further disaggregated to distinguish whether the individual was born in a country inside or outside the EU (see Table 2 for more detail on these categories).

1. Gender equality: the importance of intersectionality

1.1. Gender inequality in a complex society

There is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives.
Audre Lorde (American writer and activist)

Gender equality refers to the equal rights, opportunities and responsibilities of women and men, girls and boys (EIGE Gender Equality Glossary and Thesaurus). It implies that the interests, needs and priorities of all individuals are taken into consideration irrespective of their gender, thereby recognising the diversity of groups of women and men, as well as individuals who do not identify as either women or men and thus go beyond the gender binary. Working toward gender equality requires acknowledging that experiences and positions in society are influenced by gender as well other social categories.

People have intersectional, layered identities deriving from social relations, history and structures of power. An intersectional analysis seeks to reveal the complexity of everyday life and expose discrimination and disadvantage that occurs as a consequence of the combination of identities and the intersection of gender with other social factors (EIGE Gender Equality Glossary and Thesaurus). In other words, an intersectional analysis can help to show how gender inequalities manifest themselves differently across societal groups (Spierings, 2012).

In a democratic and fair society, personal characteristics would not predetermine an individual's life chances or wellbeing (Platt, 2011). Yet inequalities persist that cannot be attributed to luck or the different abilities of women and men but that are, rather, socially constructed (Young, 2001). These inequalities are produced through social structures, such as the operation of global capital, international relations, monetary policies, social policies, cultural norms, and employment relationships (Grabham, 2009). Gender as a socially constructed hierarchical system of classification overlaps with other axes of power, whose effects often include systematic social exclusion, discrimination and the restriction of the life chances of certain groups of people (Young 2001).

For instance, women with disabilities are more at risk of violence and abuse than either able-bodied women or men with disabilities. Women with disabilities are an estimated 10 times more likely to be physically or sexually abused by a family member or a caregiver than women without disabilities. They also face more significant barriers to seeking help (Davaki, Marzo, Narminio and Arvanitidou, 2013; European Commission, 2016). The changing situation of Muslim women in Europe is another example, where, given the increasing islamophobia, Muslim women in the EU face three types of penalty: gender, ethnic and religious. Discrimination in education and the labour market is often related to the stigmatisation of the Muslim population, especially the clothing of Muslim women (Šeta, 2016). More than one in three Muslim women who wear a headscarf or niqab in public experience harassment, compared to less than one-quarter (23 %) of women who do not wear such clothing (FRA, 2017b).

These examples demonstrate that social groups are diverse, and that the women and men who are members of these groups have various experiences and face different challenges. It also means that intersecting factors can create experience of oppression and/or privilege – people may be marginalised in various ways, or privileged, or a little of both, depending on the situation and phase of life (Dill, McLaughlin and Nieves, 2007; Weldon, 2008). While it is generally easier for Roma men to access the labour market compared to Roma women, Roma men are disadvantaged compared to white men (FRA, 2013a; FRA and UNDP, 2012). More generally, men with high educational qualifications are the most advantaged group in the EU in terms of mean monthly earnings: they earn 19 percentage points (p.p.) more than men in general and 65 p.p. more than women with low levels of qualification (EIGE, 2017b). In other words, intersectionality is not a concept that applies solely to marginalised groups or is specific to "disadvantaged women". Rather, it is an aspect of social organisation that shapes the lives of all women and men (Weldon, 2008).

While the focus of intersectional analysis on experience and identity provides a better understanding of everyday life and identity formation, intersections need to be understood in the context of social structures too. The structural approach to intersectionality concerns "the way things work rather than who people are" (European Commission, 2016, p. 31; Chun, Lipsitz and Shin, 2013) and is not based on an

assumption of the existence of fixed categories or groups of people. This means that identities can be seen as both "a manifestation of the intersection of multiple hierarchies and a way of maintaining such hierarchies" (European Commission, 2016, p. 31).

Intersectionality is intrinsic to structural inequality, explained as "a set of reproduced social processes that reinforce one another to enable or constrain individual actions in many ways" (Young, 2001, p. 2). Social structures, such as constellations of norms, laws, institutions, and traditions, can create and delineate social positions and corresponding social groups (Collins, 1993; Weldon, 2008; Young, 1994). Inequalities are created through very different mechanisms: they may be embedded in laws and regulations that fail to account for diversity among citizens, policy measures or services which do not grant equal access to everyone, direct or indirect discrimination, and prejudices and traditions which go unquestioned but which systematically place certain groups of people in a disadvantaged position. Lifelong learning without available childcare, labour market structures reproducing gender segregation, or the lack of rural support services for women experiencing violence are everyday examples of services not ensuring equal access to all.

While acknowledging the relevance of intersectionality, gender itself remains an underlying ground of much (dis) advantage and discrimination. Not only does it refer to a set of socially constructed attributes, opportunities, roles and expectations (EIGE Gender Equality Glossary and Thesaurus), it is also a constitutive element of social relationships. As such, gender is a primary field within or by which power is articulated. It is thus a useful category of analysis (Scott, 1986).

1.2. Scattered history of the concept of intersectionality

The idea that inequality based on gender and other aspects of power are connected and mutually reinforcing long pre-dates the term "intersectionality". The concept has a long history within black feminism's intellectual and political traditions (Phoenix and Pattynama, 2006), as well as in labour-class feminism (Lykke, 2010). It cannot be particularly attributed to North America and Europe, as people in the Global South have used intersectionality as an analytical tool albeit without naming it as such (Collins and Bilge, 2016). The work of Savitribai Phule (1831-1897) from colonial India is one such example. An advocate of anti-caste ideology and women´s rights, Phule also stood for marginalised religious groups (Collins and Bilge, 2016).

The story of Sojourner Truth, the abolitionist and women's rights activist in the United States, is often said to illustrate the "pre-history" of intersectional thinking. In 1851, she delivered one of the most famous abolitionist speeches, *"Ain't I a Woman?"* (Brah and Phoenix, 2004; Smiet, 2017):

"That man over there says that women need to be helped into carriages, and lifted over ditches, and to have the best place everywhere. Nobody ever helps me into carriages, or over mud-puddles, or gives me any best place! And ain't I a woman? Look at me! Look at my arm! I have ploughed and planted, and gathered into barns, and no man could head me! And ain't I a woman? I could work as much and eat as much as a man – when I could get it – and bear the lash as well! And ain't I a woman? I have borne thirteen children, and seen most all sold off to slavery, and when I cried out with my mother's grief, none but Jesus heard me! And ain't I a woman?" (Truth, 1851 in Smiet, 2017)

In describing the experience of a black woman born into slavery, Truth challenged the ideal of femininity as it was understood at the time. By raising a simple question, she underlined those women practically and symbolically excluded from the notion of "womanhood" and thus from the women's rights movement (Smiet, 2017). As a person who suffered oppression as both a woman and a black person, "Sojourner Truth held an impassioned plea for the rights of women and blacks which considered these two struggles in their interconnection to one another" (Smiet, 2017, p. 11). While the most obvious intersection in this context relates to – gender and race, attention should also be paid to another aspect, that of economic status. Scholar Angela Davis (1983) noted that Truth differed from white middle-class women in the women's movement. By highlighting hard working conditions, corporal punishment and economic exploitation, Truth makes the overall interconnection between gender, race and class central to her story (Davis, 1983; Smiet, 2017).

Forty years after Truth's famous speech, Anna Julia Cooper re-articulated, in the first book-length black feminist text (1892), that black women are confronted with "a woman question", such as insufficient legal recognition of women as human beings, and also "a race problem" such as race segregation and discrimination, but not with "a black women's issue". In 1940, Mary Church Terrell was one of the black women taking on this issue, explicitly addressing questions of sex and race in her autobiography, where she described her position in relation to white women as well as black men (Phoenix and Pattynama, 2006). These authors thus described how gender and race intersect in ways that create different situations for black women compared to black men and white women, making clear that being a black woman is qualitatively different than simply adding gender inequality (among white people) to racial inequality.

Knowledge of diversity, the multiplicity of identities, and intersecting forms for oppression were further developed within the feminist politics of the 1960s and 1970s. Black women in the U.S. highlighted how racism economically disadvantaged black people as a group (Collins and Chepp, 2013) and how sexism further confined them to low-paid, dead-end jobs usually occupied by women. In the civil rights movement, black women experienced oppression from black men, who largely prioritised the struggle against racism at the expense of challenging gender inequality. Additionally, the women's movement focused on issues that primarily concerned white, middle-class, heterosexual women, and failing to include the concerns of black or lesbian women. For example, while the women's movement chose abortion rights as the centrepiece of the reproductive rights political platform, the issues of sterilisation practices performed on many women of colour, including black, indigenous, and Chicana women, were marginalised within the movement. The constellation of black women's experience with race, class, gender, and sexual oppression thus contributed to the development of new approaches to the analysis of social inequality (Davis, 1983; Dill, 1983; Lorde, 1984; Collins, 1993, in Collins and Chepp, 2013).

Another root of intersectionality as a discrete concept can be found in the labour-class feminism of both the US and Europe. Nina Lykke (2010) mentions the Russian women's rights advocate, Alexandra Kollontai, to illustrate that the debate on gender and class can be traced back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Women in the socialist movement challenged both the mainstream nature of the worker's movement – dominated, as it was, by men and ideas of masculinity - and the feminist movement that did not take into account class differences and power differentials between women. Developing a theory of the intersectionality of gender and class was a crucial element for the socialist feminist research that emerged at universities in many countries in the 1970s. Such research examined the differences between bourgeois, middle-class and working-class conditions for practicing gender, sexuality and family (Lykke, 2010). While the focus was on gender and class, other categories were also considered. For instance, in the early 1980s, Anthias and Yuval-Davis discussed the entanglement of gender, ethnicity and class, stressing that it was analytically impossible to prioritise one category over others or to reduce one within another (Lykke, 2010).

Theorisation of the intersection of gender and other power axes emerged across time and geography, with terms such as double or triple oppression, entangled inequalities or interferences being introduced. However, it was the critical race theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw who coined the term "intersectionality" in the late 1980s to address the fact that black women remained invisible in both feminist and anti-racist discourse. Crenshaw (1989) pointed out that theory, activism and legislation based on the single-axis framework of racism or sexism limit understanding to the experiences of members of disadvantaged groups that also benefit from some sort of privilege – white women and black men, for example. The operation of social services for survivors of gender-based violence illustrates such exclusion. Crenshaw (1991) examined the situation of women in shelters located in minority communities in Los Angeles. Here, she observed, many women seeking protection were unemployed or underemployed and many of them were poor. Aside from addressing consequences of violence, shelters needed to:

"confront the other multi-layered and routinised forms of domination that often converge in these women's lives, hindering their ability to create alternatives to the abusive relationships that brought them to shelters in the first place. Many women of colour, for example, are burdened by poverty, childcare responsibilities, and the lack of job skill. These burdens, largely the consequences of gender and class oppression, are then compounded by the racially discriminatory employment and housing practices women of colour often face, as well as by the disproportionately high unemployment among people of colour that makes battered women of colour less able to depend on the support of friends and relatives for temporary shelter." (Crenshaw, 1991, pp. 1245–1246).

Crenshaw concluded that exclusion that takes place at material as well as discursive levels cannot be solved by simply including black women within existing structures but, rather, it is necessary to recast and rethink theoretical, policy and legislative frameworks from an intersectional perspective (Cooper, 2016; Crenshaw, 1989).

Looking at the genealogy of intersectionality, the concept has been widely used to acknowledge that there is no single category of women but, rather, that women are diverse, with heterogeneous backgrounds, experiences and needs. Theories of intersectionality thus examine how gender interrelates with other axes of inequality in society. These theories – despite being diverse – offer a coherent argument, showing how single-axes approaches can lead to the political and legal erasure of multiple marginalised groups.

While gender, class and race were historically perceived as the major social divisions in intersectional research, other important systems of power have gradually been included, such as age, dis/ability, sexuality, religion, ethnicity, etc. Today, intersectional analysis of social inequality occupies a key position in social and feminist research, legal, political and human rights discourses, and it has the potential to become an equally useful tool in policy-making (Verloo, 2006; Yuval-Davis, 2006).

2. Theory meets practice: potential for intersectionality in EU policy

The demand for a more nuanced analysis of gender inequality has featured prominently in international policy processes. The Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1979, recognised diversity among women and their different experiences of the same society (Campbell, 2015). General Recommendation No. 28 on the core obligations under CEDAW declares that intersectionality is a core concept for understanding the obligations of States under the Convention (European Commission, 2016).

A major driver in acknowledging the importance of women´s diverse positioning in society in policy-making came from the World Conference for Women, held in Beijing in 1995. The resulting Beijing Platform for Action (BPfA) ([2]) saw governments affirm their commitment to "intensify efforts to ensure equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all women and girls who face multiple barriers to their empowerment and advancement because of such factors as their race, age, language, ethnicity, culture, religion, or disability, or because they are indigenous people" ([3]). Since then, consideration of co-existing, multiple or intersecting forms of inequality have taken on considerable significance in policy-making, and now constitute a key framework for implementing effective and appropriate gender equality policies.

At EU level, recognition of multiple or intersecting inequalities is enshrined in a number of policy documents and legislation promoting and advancing gender equality, social inclusion and equal treatment. These are often based on three complementary principles: non-discrimination; positive action; and mainstreaming (Rees, 1998) ([4]). If gender equality policies in the EU have always assumed a need to pay particular attention to certain categories of women, this principle is becoming more explicit, and is accompanied by a higher demand for accountability in terms of the potential to deliver results for intersecting inequalities (Lombardo and Augustin, 2012; Lombardo and Verloo, 2009).

2.1. Non-discrimination laws

The Amsterdam Treaty (1997/C 340/05) paved the way for the development of an intersectional perspective by providing a mandate to tackle discrimination on six grounds – sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age and sexual orientation. With this treaty, not only did EU legislation move beyond the two previously recognised grounds of discrimination – nationality and sex – but, for the first time, there was a commitment to tackle discrimination across inequalities (horizontally) rather than separately on the basis of each of the grounds (Kantola, 2010). The same six grounds of discrimination are addressed in the Lisbon Treaty (2007/C 364/01), which declares that the EU should aim to combat these forms of discrimination and may indeed take the appropriate action to do so. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000/C 364/01) asserts adherence to non-discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, opinions, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation. Anti-discrimination legislation is further supported by the Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC) and the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC).

The inclusion of multiple categories has strengthened anti-discrimination policies (Verloo, 2013). However, while inequality categories are mentioned together in EU policies, the relationship between them is not explicitly articulated (Lombardo and Augustin, 2012). Discrimination can take different forms: single-ground discrimination occurs where an individual is disadvantaged based on one inequality; additive multiple discrimination happens when an individual belongs to several (at least two) groups that suffer different discriminatory practices; intersectional discrimination takes place when "the indivisible combination of two or more social characteristics create a situation that is not equal to the sum of discriminations on separate grounds" (Hannett, 2003; Verloo, 2013, p. 900). However, the terms "additive discrimination" and "intersectional discrimination" are not explicitly used in policies, or they are

([2]) For more information on the Beijing Platform for Action, see: http://eige.europa.eu/beijing-platform-for-action

([3]) http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/pdf/BDPfA%20E.pdf

([4]) The financial and economic crisis challenged the threefold equilibrium between equal treatment, equal opportunity and gender mainstreaming that characterised EU gender equality policy since the 1990s (Jacquot, 2017). The focus has shifted to legislation, while the economic and coordination instruments have weakened.

used inconsistently. Policy documents often refer to "multiple discrimination" as "an umbrella term for all situations where discrimination occurs on more than one ground [...]" (European Commission, 2007, p. 9), or they use the terms "intersectional" and "multiple discrimination" interchangeably, despite the fact that they are not synonymous.

The European network of legal experts in gender equality and non-discrimination (European Commission, 2016) defines several obstacles to intersectional claims in EU anti-discrimination law. Firstly, different grounds of discrimination are found in different pieces of legislation. Secondly, the scope of these Directives differs; while one addresses the area of employment and training (the Employment Directive), another addresses education and social protection (the Racial Equality Directive), resulting in a situation where some grounds are more protected than others (see Table 1 below) (European Commission, 2016).

Table 1. Scope of EU Anti-Discrimination Directives

Ground of discrimination	Employment and vocational training	Workers' and employers' organisations	Social protection including social security	Social protection including healthcare	Social advantage	Education	Public goods and services, including housing
Racial or ethnic origin	Directive 2000/43	Directive 2000/43	Directive 2000/43	Directive 2000/43	Directive 2000/43	Directive 2000/43	Directive 2000/43
Gender	Directive 2006/54, Directive 2010/41 (self-employment)	Directive 2006/54	Directive 79/7 (statutory social security only), Directive 2006/54 (occupational social security only)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Directive 2004/113
Sexual orientation	Directive 2000/78	Directive 2000/78	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Religion or belief	Directive 2000/78	Directive 2000/78	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disability	Directive 2000/78	Directive 2000/78	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Age	Directive 2000/78	Directive 2000/78	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Intersectional discrimination in EU gender equality and non-discrimination law, p. 63

A third obstacle concerns legal justification defences ([5]) and the fact that exceptions are not the same across different grounds of discrimination. Similarly, the number of grounds of discrimination listed in legislation, and the impossibility of covering all possible reasons for inequality, represent yet another obstacle. As the list of grounds in the Treaty and Directives is exhaustive, there is no scope for courts to add new grounds by analogy. A final difficulty in non-discrimination law lies in the process of defining discrimination. Discrimination tends to be recognised when a person is, or would be, treated less favourably than another person in a similar situation. Such a comparable situation is particularly difficult to find (and define) in intersectionality cases (European Commission, 2016). These challenges, together with other aspects of development of anti-discrimination policy since the beginning of the 2000s, have contributed to a situation where taking into account multiple discrimination remains more a matter of discourse than a legal or institutional reality at the level of the EU (Jacquot, 2017; Krizsán, Skjeie and Squires, 2012; Lombardo and Verloo, 2009).

2.2. Policy interventions: mixed usage of intersectionality terminology

Non-discrimination law is, in principle, a limited policy approach that places the responsibility on an individual and is itself reactive rather than proactive in nature. While it presents an important policy tool - given that litigation gives affected individuals an opportunity to articulate their cases - it should go hand-in-hand with proactive measures to combat structural inequalities. Gender mainstreaming

([5]) Justification defence is a legal term that refers to an affirmative defence to criminal prosecution. It consists of arguing that the alleged unlawful conduct was justified or permitted.

and positive action are considered particularly important tools, with the potential to combat intersecting gender inequalities (Kantola and Nousiainen, 2012). These mechanisms ensure that the responsibility to identify injustice does not lie primarily with a self-identified complainant but, rather, with relevant power-holders who have the potential to craft systematic and forward-looking solutions.

2.2.1. Need for improved intersectionality in strategic documents on gender equality

At EU level, a framework for action to combat inequality and promote gender equality has been established in a number of strategic documents. The situation of women who are subject to multiple discrimination was acknowledged in the Framework Strategy on Gender Equality 2001-2005, as well as in the subsequent Roadmap of Equality between Women and Men 2006-2010 and the Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015. In the most recent Strategic engagement for gender equality 2016-2019, the European Commission commits to paying special attention "to the specific needs of groups facing multiple disadvantages, e.g. single parents and older, migrant, Roma and disabled women" in all of its key actions ([6]). However, save for this modest declaration, the document does not develop its commitment and recommendations for concrete initiatives are difficult to identify. Similarly, groups of people who are not mentioned may be rendered invisible; the absence of an underlying framework within which groups may be considered to deserve special attention precludes identifying other groups or developing specific redress for their disadvantages. For instance, in its 2017 *Report on equality between women and men in the EU in 2014-2015*, the European Parliament's Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality (FEMM Committee) specifically urged the European Commission to be inclusive of transgender and intersex people in the future EU Strategy for Gender Equality ([7]). The report also notes "the intersectionality between gender and other grounds for discrimination and the disproportionate impact of multiple discrimination on women", illustrating that multiple discrimination is the predominant legal terminology but that intersectional theory can be incorporated alongside it.

The EU gender policy framework increasingly recognises the costs men bear in gender unequal societies, as well as the importance of men's involvement in social change ([8]). And yet, incorporating a perspective on men as a heterogeneous social group in their own right and in relation to the lives of women, has yet to be developed. This is important, given the costs of hegemonic masculinity and the fact that gendered patterns of men's behaviour are often complicated by other social and cultural factors ([9]). For instance, scholars show that the most significant issues for men's health derive from gendered expectations, often compounded by other social factors such as race, ethnicity, class, migration status or sexual orientation (Hankivsky, 2012; Tolhurst *et al.*, 2012). Recognising the (gendered) role and position of men in combating intersectional gender inequality requires an understanding that ideals of masculinity and femininity differ between societal groups. To translate this into EU gender equality policy, more effort is required to recognise and tackle different forms and degrees of gender inequality across societies if an intersectional analysis is to be consistently incorporated and steps taken towards gender equality.

2.2.2. Incorporating a gender perspective in inclusion policies

Several targeted policy interventions and initiatives have been developed to reach disadvantaged groups or reduce the complex issues faced by certain social groups. However, these policies seldom consider intersecting inequalities. For instance, the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 does not include gender as a cross-cutting principle nor propose specific actions to combat persistent inequalities faced by women with disabilities as a particularly disadvantaged group, such as access to adequate housing, healthcare services, public transport or decision-making institutions. An intersectional perspective is also lacking in the List of Actions by the European Commission to advance LGBTI Equality 2016–2019. While the List refers to Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights – covering discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity – it does not acknowledge the possibility of multiple or intersectional discrimination for LBGTI persons based on other factors, such as class or ethnicity.

Similarly, the 2011 EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020 lacks an intersectional approach (Mirga-Kruszelnicka, 2017). It is worth noting, however, that the framework makes reference to the

([6]) https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/eu-policy/strategic-engagement-gender-equality-2016-2019_en

([7]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bREPORT%2bA8-2017-0046%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

([8]) See http://ec.europa.eu/justice/events/role-of-men/index_en.htm

([9]) According to the EIGE Gender Equality Glossary and Thesaurus, hegemonic masculinity is understood as a "cultural norm that continuously connects men to power and economic achievements".

European Commission's 10 Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion, one of which is "awareness of the gender dimension". Under this fifth principle, the Commission calls on policy makers and programme implementers to pay attention to the issue of multiple discrimination, to address Roma women's specific needs in the design, implementation and evaluation of policies and activities, and to ensure their political participation and a leading role in consultation bodies or monitoring committees. Such documents created momentum for further discussion on Roma issues. In its *Report on gender aspects of the European Framework of National Roma Inclusion Strategies*, the FEMM Committee used the terminology "multiple and intersectional discrimination" with respect to the situation of Roma women. This represents one of the only documents on Roma where the terminology of intersectionality was explicitly used (D'Agostino, 2015). The Council Recommendations on effective Roma integration measures in the Member States did not refer to intersectionality but acknowledged multiple discrimination faced by Roma women, and twice called for special attention to be paid to the gender dimension within policy measures. These documents constituted a formal recognition of gender awareness as a horizontal policy measure, although this has not materialised in subsequent annual assessment reports on the implementation of the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies (D'Agostino, 2016).

2.2.3. Looking forward: mainstreaming gender and intersectional perspective across policies

Although the EU has committed to mainstreaming a gender perspective in all policies, implementation of this commitment remains a challenge (Verloo, 2013; Walby, 2009). It has been argued that the implementation of intersectional or equality mainstreaming is "an ambition with simultaneously great potential in terms of content but low potential in terms of changes of realisation" (Verloo 2013, pp. 904-905; Lombardo and Augustin, 2012; Verloo, 2006). The European Pillar of Social Rights provides an opportunity not only to declare but to implement these principles ([10]). Gender equality and equal opportunities constitute key principles of the Pillar, covering equality of treatment and opportunities regardless of gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, across the areas of employment, social protection, education and access to public goods and services. The Pillar provides an opportunity to explicitly articulate and address intersectional inequality in its actions, as well as to mainstream both gender and an intersectional perspective in the broader policy field.

The United Nation's 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) mainstream gender across objectives and indicators, representing significant progress since the previous Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Stuart and Woodroffe, 2016). The SDG outcome document contains multiple references to the inclusion of all people regardless of gender, disability, age, ethnicity, race, and "other status" (United Nations, 2015). Notwithstanding such progress, countries' legislative processes and policies need to be supported by adequate economic and coordination instruments (Jacquot, 2017). This type of support is necessary if there is to be a real shift from theory to practice.

Systematic knowledge – particularly in the form of statistical evidence – on the situation of social groups' standings at intersections of axes of power is an integral part of moving from theory to practice. Such knowledge allows the root causes of intersecting inequalities to be studied, and progress on tackling inequalities to be tracked. For an intersectional approach to be successfully reflected in public policies, D'Agostino (2015) identifies the following elements:

- a clear definition of intersectionality;
- a structural understanding of inequality;
- a transformative approach to intersectionality;
- inclusion of a wide range of inequality categories;
- explicit mention of certain inequalities;
- awareness of privileges of more advantaged groups;
- avoidance of the stigmatisation of specific groups;
- consultation of civil society during the policy-making process (D'Agostino, 2015).

([10]) https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/deeper-and-fairer-economic-and-monetary-union/european-pillar-social-rights/european-pillar-social-rights-20-principles_en

3. How is intersectionality measured? Methodological considerations

3.1. Conceptualising intersectionality

One of the most vibrant discussions within the literature on intersectionality concerns the articulation of social divisions among people. Social divisions and the corresponding social groups are assumed to be created and delineated by social structures, such as the constellation of norms and laws, institutions and traditions (Collins, 1993; Weldon, 2008; Young, 1994). However, ways of approaching these social divisions vary. McCall's (2005) seminal overview summarises the operationalisation of social divisions into three complementary approaches: *anticategorical*, *intracategorical* and *intercategorical complexity*.

"Anticategorical complexity" views the world as too complex to create fixed categories and seeks to deconstruct analytical categories. "Intracategorical complexity" takes more of a middle ground, interrogating the boundary-making and boundary-defining processes but acknowledging the stable and even durable relationships that social categories represent. The approach often zeroes in on one group at a particular intersection in society (e.g. EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies). Finally, "intercategorical complexity" (also referred to as "categorical approach") "begins with the observation that there are relationships of inequality among already constituted social groups, as imperfect and ever-changing as they are, and takes those relationships as the centre of analysis. The main task of the categorical approach is to explicate those relationships and doing so requires the provisional use of categories" (McCall, 2005, p. 1785). In other words, it accepts that in society people structure the world by grouping individuals, and that comparing groups can facilitate understanding of such processes of inequality and marginalisation.

It is important to acknowledge that these analytical categories, like social identities or social groups, are dynamic, changeable and interlinked (Lykke, 2010). The process of creating categories is influenced by political interest, statistical (data) possibilities, and current knowledge, among other things. For instance, migrant populations, depending on the categorisation in the host country, may consist of people with very different origins, but also different gender and ethnic, racial or religious backgrounds. Further analysis is needed, therefore, to shed more light on the composition and characteristics of the groups, as well as the general context. However, in order to describe the situation of different segments of society, categorisation is inevitable. As concluded by Platt (2011), while recognising that categories are fluid and dynamic, it is necessary to "fix" them temporarily to be able to analyse complex inequalities in society. Thus, categorisation permits policy-making to be responsive to the needs of different - often marginalised - groups of the population.

The Gender Equality Index adopts the categorical approach. In general, the Index facilitates a view of the different situations of women and men in various areas of life and their comparison over time. Including an intersectional perspective allows for further understanding of the challenges experienced by different groups of women and men. Spierings (2012) points out that categorical intersectionality can further quantitative research by realising that comparing women and men means comparing averages. The variances within these groups should not, therefore, be ignored. At the same time, categorical intersectionality can help to show how gender inequality manifests differently across societal groups (Spierings, 2012).

3.2. Selecting intersecting inequalities for the Gender Equality Index

Determining the categories that should be part of intersectional analysis itself merits discussion. Evidence shows that there are many axes of inequality (or categories of difference) which can intersect with gender (depending on the domain of life, the life stage, or specific country). As noted earlier, gender, class, race and ethnicity were historically perceived to be the major social divisions within intersectionality research, with other axes of power gradually included, such as age, dis/ability, sexual orientation and gender identity, religion, etc. EU anti-discrimination legislation considers six grounds: sex, racial or ethnic origin, sexual orientation, religion or belief, disability and age.

In the most recent strategic document for gender equality, the European Commission identifies single parents, older, migrant and Roma women, and women with disabilities as groups facing multiple disadvantage and thus requiring special attention from policy makers. Many of these intersectionalities were considered from a statistical point of view for the Index.

Data for an intersectional analysis must comply with the quality criteria defined for the Gender Equality Index (EIGE, 2017c). A review of the main international and European data sources highlighted a lack of data when it comes to disaggregating by sex and other intersecting categories, which is partly explained by very small sample sizes. EIGE's analysis in the domain of intersecting inequalities is necessarily limited in scope for the following reasons:

- data do not allow for all of the key groups identified in the literature and policy review to be covered (as listed above);
- data do not allow for all variables and domains of inequality to be covered, as per the core Index;
- in most cases, data do not allow for intersections of more than two dimensions to be investigated (e.g. gender and one of the following: educational level and family type; gender, migrant status and family type) at Member State level.

The first stage in the process of selecting intersecting inequalities for the Index involved a theoretical overview of intersectionality to identify possible intersections (alongside social-demographic characteristics) that would be relevant from the point of view of the Index. Grounds of discrimination covered in the EU policies were identified and the different axes of power mentioned in gender equality policies were considered. Based on theoretical considerations, policy overview, previous research and data availability, five intersections were selected for analysis in the Gender Equality Index: age, country of birth, dis/ability, family type and education (see Table 2 below).

Table 2. Axes of intersectionality included in the Gender Equality Index

Intersection	Groups
Age (years)	1. 15/16-24 2. 25-49 3. 50-64 4. 65+
Country of birth	1. National born 2. Foreign born 2.1. EU Born 2.2. Non-EU born
Dis/ability	1. With disabilities 2. Without disabilities
Family type	1. Single 2. Lone parent 3. Couple without children 4. Couple with children
Level of education	1. Low education 2. Medium education 3. High education

In view of the quality and comparability requirements, the selection of categories intersecting with gender was limited, as was analysis of the domains, sub-domains and variables of the Index. Additionally, the level of detail and the intersections analysed varied across the domains, depending on data availability. An intersectional analysis of the following variables was not possible with the data available:

- all of the variables within the domain of power (due to the lack of data on the social-demographic characteristics - other than gender - of the decision-makers, the domain of power is excluded from the intersectional analysis);
- duration of working life (within the domain of work);
- tertiary students in the fields of education, health and welfare, humanities and the arts (within the domain of knowledge);
- life expectancy in absolute value at birth (domain of health);
- healthy life years in absolute value at birth (domain of health).

For the Gender Equality Index 2017, the intersectional analysis was done at EU-28 level, covering either 2014 or 2015, depending on the data available and microdata analysis (using EU SILC (Statistics on Income and Living Conditions)

and EU LFS (Labour Force Survey) 2014, EQLS (European Quality of Life Survey) 2015; EWCS (European Working Conditions Survey) 2016). Data available at Member State level are published on the web pageof the Gender Equality Index ([11]).

An intersectional analysis was carried out at variable level. Once variables were disaggregated by gender, they were then analysed one intersection at a time (e.g. gender and age; gender and educational attainment, etc.). As a result, within each intersectionality it is possible to analyse gender gaps within sub-groups (for instance, whether for women and men with low educational qualifications, various gender gaps are smaller/greater than among women and men with high educational qualifications). It is also possible to compare the situation of all sub-groups of women and/or men across a single variable (for example, comparing the likelihood of women or men who are single, in a couple or in a couple with children to spend an hour cooking and doing housework daily). These varying gender gaps and outcomes within and across sub-populations illustrate how gender interacts with other characteristics to create complex inequalities. Significantly from a policy perspective, it enables identification of the groups of women and men who are least/most disadvantaged and the areas where more targeted policy measures are needed. It also highlights some of the factors that place certain groups at an advantage. The following chapter discusses the results of intersectional analysis in the Gender Equality Index 2017.

([11]) https://eige.europa.eu/gender-equality-index

4. Intersecting inequalities in the Gender Equality Index

Intersectionality has been an evolving element of the conceptual framework of the Gender Equality Index since its inception (EIGE, 2013). While the Gender Equality Index measures gender gaps in areas relevant to EU policy, it is clear that better policy making and a thorough understanding of gender inequality demands that diversity among women and men be taken into account. Effective and non-exclusionary policy measures and social interventions require systemic social inequalities to be examined and considered, together with their causes and consequences.

This chapter introduces the intersectionalities and summarises the main findings of the analysis for the Gender Equality Index 2017. It acknowledges further intersections that could not be included in the Index but which are nevertheless relevant in examining the current situation in the EU, and offers important insights for data improvements. It should be noted that the domain of intersecting inequalities is not factored into the overall composite indicator of the Index but, rather, complements the six core domains and adds a cross-cutting perspective that unmasks some of the differences among women and men (EIGE, 2017b, 2017c).

4.1. Gender and age

4.1.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and age

The meaning and manifestation of gender inequality is different for women and men or girls and boys, depending on their ages. An industrial society in which production is given priority over reproduction and formal economy over domestic labour contributes to ageist and sexist prejudice (Ginn, 1993). The "ageing society" is often described as a problem or even a threat, conjuring up negative connotations in society. This is an example of structural ageism, which further contributes to biased attitudes towards older people. The double standard applied to ageing sees it more detrimental to the social status of women than men. Due to these structural inequalities, more older women than men are at risk of poverty or higher prevalence of economic and psychological violence (EIGE, 2017b, 2017a). While older men can more often counter ageism through intellectual and career achievement and possession of financial resources, these attributes are less valued or prevalent in elderly women, who suffer greater exclusion from mainstream public life (Ginn, 1993).

The situations of elderly women and men are usually the main focus of discussions on the intersection of gender and age, with young people's challenges often invisible in the debate. However, girls and boys - as well as young women and men - face gender inequalities specific to their age and generation. For example, gender stereotypes impact young people's decisions about their future study and work, contribute to gender segregation in education and the labour market, and narrow the life choices of girls and boys (EIGE, 2018a, 2018b). Widespread use of digital technologies exacerbates stereotypical gender norms: for girls, this can mean stronger pressure on physical appearance and weight, and for boys, it can lead to internalisation of "toxic masculinity" related to repression of emotions and the objectification and sexualisation of women (EIGE, 2019).

Differences between people, behaviours or social outcomes in different age categories may be difficult to disentangle because of the so called Age-Period-Cohort problem (Yang and Land, 2013). Age effects relate to the consequences of growing older; period effects are the implications of influences that vary through time but affect all age groups simultaneously; and cohort effects relate to the fact of being born at different times (Glenn, 2007). A birth cohort is a group of people born in the same year or years and therefore experiencing the same historical events at the same ages (*ibid*., p. 2).

Platt (2011) outlines that, when age refers to processes or experiences that are directly related to age (ageing, lifecycle effects), the focus moves to life stages of individuals – when people get older they are more likely to be married, divorced, or widowed. They are also likely to have had labour market experience, to have experienced health issues, to have children and grandchildren, etc. The life experience is then impacted not only by the particular life-stage a person is in, but also by experiences accumulated over time. In terms of lifecycle effects, it is possible to think about cumulative gender inequalities and their consequences. For example, as women are often expected

to take care of family members, their employment path is more often interrupted and they earn less than men. This is reflected later on in the gender pension gap (to the detriment of women), resulting in higher risk of poverty and social exclusion among elderly women (EIGE, 2014, 2015b, 2016).

If age differences refer to cohort, period or a combination of both, the focus shifts to factors that affect women and men because of time in which they were born (relative to other cohorts), as well as the historical period they live in, which impacts people of all ages – economic crises, scientific breakthroughs, natural disasters, etc. These contexts can impact women and men differently, for instance the more limited access of women to education, the labour market and decision-making in the past may still impact the situation of older women today (Platt, 2011). Generational effects are evident, for instance in relation to educational achievement. Although in previous generations, men held higher qualifications, today it is young women who are predominantly better educated (EIGE, 2017b). Proponents of the life course perspective thus argue that an understanding of the present circumstances of elderly people must take into account the major social and psychological forces that have operated throughout the course of their lives (Achenbaum, 2005).

4.1.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and age

Measurement

Where possible, the situation of women and men in four age groups was analysed:

- 15/16-24: youth;
- 25-49: main working population and fertile age;
- 50-64: more mature workers, likely to be in the "empty nest" life stage (the period in which grown children no longer live at home);
- 65+: broadly speaking, the retired population.

In some cases, a more detailed analysis was needed and other age groups were also examined.

WORK: In general, women are less likely than men to be involved in paid work in the EU, and that difference increases with age. The full-time equivalent (FTE) employment rate of women pre-retirement (aged 50-64) is just 44 %, with a gender gap as high as 19 p.p. This might be a manifestation of the combination of age and gender bias faced by elderly women who were expected to take care of family members during their working lives. Quality of work is also impacted by the intersection of gender and age, with around half of young women (51 %) and young men (54 %) aged 15-24 agreeing that their job offers good prospects for career advancement, although prospects decrease and diverge with age. The highest gender gap in such an indicator is seen among older people, to the detriment of women.

MONEY: In most Member States, retirement pensions are based on the principle of continuous full-time paid employment, which generally privileges men. In addition, in recent years, pension reforms have introduced longer periods of gainful employment as criteria to qualify for pension benefits. Considering that women's life courses often involve periods of unpaid care work and working lives that are on average five years shorter than those of their male peers, they face a greater risk of poverty in old age. The tendency for men to receive higher pensions than women is observed in all Member States, with the gender pension gap standing at 37 % in the EU in 2016 (European Commission, 2018). Unequal access to financial resources in old age is reflected in the income for specific groups of women and men, with the gender gap for those over 65 years of age being the highest among all age groups (12 p.p., compared to 4 p.p. for the general population). The poverty rate of women aged 50–64 (15 %) is the lowest among all age groups but increases with age, reaching 18 % for those aged 75 and over.

TIME: Most EU policy efforts to improve work-life balance focus predominantly on addressing women's under-representation in employment due to care responsibilities. The data, however, also reveal a significant gender gap in care activities among young women and men aged 15-24, which is important because this is the age group most likely to be engaged in education and training. However, educational institutions and national policies often fail to recognise barriers faced by young people with care responsibilities, many of whom are not as independent and mobile as policy makers assume (Brooks, 2012). In view of the inadequate attention paid to this group, young people with care responsibilities may face barriers in accessing education and training opportunities, or, once in education, they may encounter further challenges in reconciling their education and care responsibilities, which can in turn influence their educational attainment. Given that five times as many young women as men aged 15-24 are engaged in care work, the lack of policy focus on this group has particularly gendered consequences, which are likely to affect the opportunities of these young women in the next stage of their lives.

HEALTH: There are differences in perceptions of health among different age groups, with younger people being more likely than older people to assess their health as good or very good. Only half of women and men in the pre-retirement age (50-64 years) assess their health as good or very good, posing a challenge for active ageing policies. Gender and age intersect and create different health situations for ageing women and ageing men; women live longer than men, although they are less likely to assess their health as good or very good. This might be related to the fact that elderly women experience a high risk of poverty and social exclusion.

4.2. Gender and country of birth

4.2.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and country of birth

Gender as a social factor influences who migrates, to which destination and for what reasons. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) defines "migrant" as any person who is moving or has moved across an international border or within a State away from his/her habitual place of residence (IOM, n.d.). Migration impacts the networks migrating people use, as well as resources available in destination countries or relations with country of origin (IOM, n.d.). The opportunities and risks faced by migrants, as well as their experiences of migration, are shaped by their gender and often vary between groups. "The roles, expectations, relationships and power dynamics associated with being a man, woman, boy or girl, and whether one identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and/or intersex (LGBTI), significantly affect all aspects of the migration process, and can also be affected in new ways by migration" (IOM, n.d.).

Migration is not a new phenomenon in Europe. The patterns and scale of migration to and within Europe have varied over time and between countries and have impacted the size and structure of the current population of Europe (Eurostat, 2011). Despite its historical roots, discussions of migration often narrow the issue to the recent increases in immigrants and refugees coming to the EU since 2015. At the beginning of 2017, there were 36.9 million people born outside the EU living across the EU-28, and 20.4 million people living in a Member State other than the one in which they were born. For gender distribution, in 2016, there were slightly more men and boys immigrating to the EU than women and girls (55 % and 45 %, respectively) ([12]), across all countries of origin.

At the pre-migration stage, systemic (macro) factors, such as the state of the national economy, and individual (micro) factors, such as gender-specific stages in the life cycle, influence the decision and opportunity to migrate (Boyd and Grieco, 2003). The situation differs where people are forced to migrate and need to flee their country of origin and seek international protection. The specific challenges faced by migrant women were discussed widely after 2015, such as the risk of physical and sexual violence, human trafficking or unmet hygiene and medical needs (European Parliament, 2016; Oxfam, 2016). One of the gender-related challenges observed relates to the construction of an image of women migrants and refugees as a helpless and indistinguishable mass (Oxfam, 2016). On the opposite end of the spectrum is an image of presumably aggressive and dangerous migrant men coming from different cultural backgrounds and with very different values (Yılmaz, 2015). Constructions of femininity and masculinity are thus exploited to fuel fear and hatred against migrating people, especially those coming from outside the EU. At the same time, discussions about migrant and "European" populations influence conceptualisations of gender, as well as ideals of femininity and masculinity (Yılmaz 2015). Consequently, constructions of gender and race/ethnicity/religion are inevitably intertwined.

Once in the receiving country, migrant women and men often face further practical issues, such as official recognition of their education or work-related documents. Migrant women may find it particularly difficult to enter the labour market. Many migrant women who have followed their partners may have difficulty learning the main language of the country, particularly if they remain at home doing unpaid work (FRA, 2013b). Women born outside of the EU who are working in the EU are more likely than migrant men or native-born women to feel that they are overqualified for their job (Eurostat, 2017b). The intersection of gender and country of birth also manifests itself in the quality of work, evidenced by the fact that nearly one in three non-EU born women and one in four non-EU born men work in precarious jobs in the EU (EIGE, 2017d). This suggests that gender inequalities and gender discrimination differ based on (perceptions of) people´s cultural, national or migration background. This is also true of other environments and services, such as healthcare and education.

([12]) EIGE's calculations from Eurostat: Immigration by age and sex [migr_imm8]. All ages considered.

Migration can be categorised in terms of country of origin (i.e. from an EU country or from outside the EU) or in terms of reasons to migrate, such as labour migration, asylum, family reunification, student migration, etc. In recent years, international movements of people have been increasingly understood as "mixed migration flows", to account for the fact that most migrants do not fit any particular label or legal category and that migration is increasingly triggered by multiple factors. This suggests that the category of migrant covers individuals coming from very different environments, with a variety of races and ethnicities, religions and beliefs, gender and sexual identities. It also covers individuals born outside their country of residence (first-generation migrants) and women and men born in their country of residence but whose parents or grandparents were born elsewhere (second and third-generation migrants).

Social constructions of the concept of migrant background (as well as race, ethnicity or religion) can be traced in recent years. Yılmaz (2015) documented how the image of immigrant workers (as an economic category) has turn into Muslim immigrants (as a cultural category) in public and political discourse. While immigrants were previously defined - and defined themselves – primarily in terms of economic position, they are now defined (or self-identify) chiefly in terms of ethnicity, nationality and religion. The dichotomy between "us" (the "nation") and "them" (Muslim immigrants) has become an intrinsic feature of European political discourse, where Muslim immigrants and their "ascribed cultural values" are often described as incompatible with European values, including gender equality (Yılmaz, 2015). Certain groups of the population are thus constructed as a threat through imagined homogeneous "cultural practices" and values. As a result, people with migrant backgrounds, or those from ethnic minorities, often face systemic disadvantage and discrimination.

The intersection of gender and race/ethnicity/religion has a long history in intersectional theory. However, no comparative statistics for Member States are available, as none of the Europe-wide surveys collect data on race or ethnicity. The same is true for different migrant generations across Member States. The only available dimension that covers some of the diversity of the population is country of birth and (partially) citizenship. Interpreting findings from these data is difficult: migrant status may refer to different segments of the population, varying across countries and by migration patterns. Another limitation is that such indicators cover only first-generation migrants.

4.2.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and country of birth

Measurement

The variable of country of birth is used in the Index as a proxy for migrant background. Three categories are distinguished, where possible: 1. National born: born in the reporting country; 2. EU born: born in the EU, but not in the reporting country; and 3. Non-EU born: born in any country outside of the EU. Where further disaggregation was not possible, only two intersections were analysed (national-born and foreign born) without differentiating between EU born and non-EU born people:

Limited data are available on country of birth. An EU average for these three categories is not calculated based on EU-28 but, rather, on a smaller number of EU countries. For instance, in EU SILC data, this three-pronged disaggregation is available for only 23 countries (data are not available for Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Malta and Slovenia). Data are similarly missing in the EU LFS.

While using country of birth as a proxy for migration background allows for comparison over time and across countries, it is not without limitations. Analysis remains very general, as the group of people born outside of their country of residence are far from homogenous, representing different regions, continents, ethnic and racial backgrounds, socioeconomic status and religious affiliations. More in-depth analysis on the specific characteristics and barriers faced by migrant women and men at Member State level would support better implementation of policy and monitoring of policy effectiveness.

MONEY: Women and men born outside the EU are twice as likely to be at risk of poverty (36 % for women and 38 % for men) than national-born people, highlighting the effect of the migration process on women's and men's likelihood of achieving economic independence. This is despite the fact that non-EU born people are slightly more likely to be higher educated than national-born people and their employment rate is nearly equal. The earnings gap between women and men born outside of the EU is smaller than among national-born people, although the earnings are lower overall for those born outside of the EU. This is different for EU-born people (who have migrated within the EU), whose mean earnings are higher than for national-born people.

TIME: The distribution of care responsibilities between women and men varies according to a range of factors, including country of birth. When compared to the national-born population, EU born women and men who have moved within the EU share care responsibilities more equally. At the same time, close to half (46 %) of women born outside of the EU spend at least one hour a day providing unpaid care to their families (compared to 28 % of men). This is also reflected in the fact that, within the EU, non-EU born people have high inactivity rates (39 % of non-EU born women and 20 % of non-EU born men were inactive in 2015). Low women´s employment rates among this group have economic consequences for families, reflected in higher poverty rates (EIGE, 2016). The differences in the division of care among women and men born outside of the EU can be caused by the different life situation of people, social-demographic differences between these groups (e.g. age composition and share of fertile age people among the groups, average number of children, employment rate) or cultural norms.

VIOLENCE: Across all forms of violence, women who indicate that they are non-citizens ([13]) have experienced higher levels of violence. This is most marked for psychological violence, with a prevalence 11 p.p. higher for non-citizen women (54 %) compared to women with the country's citizenship (43 %) (EIGE, 2017a; FRA, 2014).

4.3. Gender and dis/ability

4.3.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and dis/ability

Women with disabilities have historically been neglected in the gender equality and disability literature, in policy-making, and by the disability and feminist movements. There is an assumption that the experience of men with disabilities is representative of the experience of disability in general (European Parliament, 2017). However, a gender perspective reveals that this is not the case. For instance, while all people with disabilities are more likely to live in poverty, women with disabilities are likely to be poorer than men with disabilities, are less likely to be employed, and (in general) to have lower income from employment. Women with disabilities are also less likely to access rehabilitation compared to men with disabilities, and are more likely to experience sexual violence in relationships and in institutions (European Parliament, 2017).

In 2016, one in four people in the EU reported long-standing limitations in their usual activities due to health problems (Eurostat, 2017a), a proxy which is used in the Index to conceptualise disability. This means that they feel limited in performing everyday activities, such as studying at school, occupational activities, housekeeping or participating in leisure activities for six months or longer. The share of people reporting long-standing limitations ranged from 16 % in Cyprus to 33 % in Portugal. Women were more likely than men to report long-standing limitations in all EU Member States, with the largest gender gaps in Romania, Portugal, the Netherlands, Lithuania, Latvia, Finland, Norway and Iceland (all in excess of 8 p.p.), and the smallest gaps in Germany and Cyprus (less than 1 p.p.). These reported long-standing limitations tended to decrease as income increased, indicating a complex relationship between disability and poverty. Almost one-third (30 %) of the poorest (i.e. the 20 % of the population with the lowest income) in the EU reported long-standing limitations in usual activities, compared to almost 17 % of the richest (i.e. the 20 % of the population with the highest income) (Eurostat, 2017a) ([14]).

([13]) The survey conducted by the Fundamental Rights Agency asked respondents if they held citizenship of the country in which they live.

([14]) The data are derived from EU statistics on income and living conditions (EU SILC). This measure is based on self-reported long-standing limitations due to health problems for at least the last six months. EU SILC covers all individuals aged 16+ and living in private households.

It is important to understand disability – like gender or race - as a socially created phenomenon. Even though disability was framed for a long time in predominantly medical terms (Barnes, 1996), it can be seen as a culturally constructed narrative of the body. Unlike the medical model, a social model of disability highlights that the principal cause of the disadvantage experienced by people with disabilities is not the impairment itself but, rather, restrictive social and environmental factors (Barnes, 1996). In this way, disability represents a complex system of constraints imposed upon people with impairments by a discriminatory society. This ideological rather than biological process influences the formation of culture and legitimises an unequal distribution of resources in society (Garland-Thomson, 2011). The issue is potentially compounded for members of the LGBTQI communities, black people, ethnic minorities and women with disabilities (Barnes, 1996).

The social model of disability is critiqued for insufficiently linking "the social relational nature of impairment and illness" (Owens, 2015). Schiek (2016) notes that "advocates of a "pure" social model tend to highlight certain categories of disability, in particular the visible lack of a limb…or certain sensual capacities, such as vision or speech", typically evoking an image of a "virtuous individual, mainly ayoung male wheelchair user, who is otherwise 'fit and never ill', while the majority of wheelchair users are women over 60 suffering from long-term illness" (Schiek, 2016, p. 48). This is not to suggest that one impairment deserves more attention than another but, rather, to illustrate that people with disabilities do not form a homogenous group with uniform needs and concerns. This acknowledgement is essential in taking an intersectional approach to disability.

People with disabilities are often represented as without gender, as asexual individuals, thus it has been assumed that gender has little importance for them (Chakravarti, 2015). "Yet, the image of disability may be intensified by gender – for women, a sense of intensified passivity and helplessness, for men a corrupted masculinity generated by enforced dependence. Moreover, these images have real consequences in terms of education, employment, living arrangements, personal relationships, victimisation, and abuse that in turn reinforce the images in the public sphere. The gendered experience of disability reveals sustained patterns of difference between men and women" (Chakravarti, 2015, p. 28).

Firstly, gender roles, expectations and stereotypes impact women and men with disabilities differently. For example, women with disabilities not only face the challenge of entering the labour market (due to limited job opportunities) but may also be impacted by limited access to childcare or work-life balance policies. Gendered social norms "contribute to the stigmatisation of women with disabilities as undervalued, undesirable, asexual and dependent, and give thus rise to abuse" (European Parliament, 2017, p. 25). Secondly, the prevalence of impairments of women and men differ, causing a range of difficulties and challenges. According to the United Nations health agency, depression is the leading cause of disability worldwide. The World Health Organization (WHO) predicts that unipolar depression will be the second leading cause of global disability burden by 2020, and the illness is twice as common in women (WHO, n.d.). At the same time, the prevalence rate for alcohol dependence is more than twice as high among men than women (Wittchen *et al.*, 2011). Thirdly, women are more likely to report a disability than men. Due to the longer life expectancy of women and the higher prevalence of disability in old age, the numbers of elderly women with disability are much higher than those of elderly men. As a result, older women represent a large share of the total population of women with disabilities (European Parliament, 2017).

4.3.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and dis/ability

Measurement

Estimates of the numbers of women and men with disabilities vary, depending on the definition and measurement. EU law does not have a harmonised definition(s) of "disability" or "persons with disabilities". Each Member States has its own definition and surveys also have different ways of measuring disability (European Parliament, 2017).

The Gender Equality Index used "limitations in everyday life" as a proxy for disability. Unfortunately, accounting for disability in an intersectional analysis is not always possible, due to data availability. There is no information or proxy for disability in any of the EU Labour Force Survey (LFS), European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) or Structure of Earnings Survey (SES), for example. EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) and European Quality of Life Surveys (EQLS) were used as data sources and data related to the Index indicators was used wherever possible. The questions differ slightly in these surveys but were expected to be comparable ([15]). The data covers people living in private households only, excluding those in institutions.

WORK: Labour market participation is significantly lower among women and men with disabilities compared to those without disabilities. The FTE employment rate for women with disabilities is 19 %, compared to 28 % for men with disabilities. The disability gap is partially attributed to the fact that there are greater numbers of older people who have difficulty with everyday activities. Nevertheless, even in the working age population (20-64 years old), gender differences persist: 45 % of working age women with disabilities are economically inactive, compared to 35 % of men in the same situation. Low labour market participation, low work intensity, and discrimination are among the main underlying factors that result in a higher risk of poverty and social exclusion among people with disabilities compared to the general population (EIGE, 2016).

MONEY: People with disabilities would be at significant risk of monetary poverty without social protection systems ([16]). In 2015, in the EU-28, half of working age women and men with disabilities (on average) would be at risk of poverty if they were to depend entirely on their own and their household's income from earnings (i.e. poverty before social transfers) ([17]). The situation would be even more severe for those of retirement age, as 90 % of both women and men with disabilities aged 65 and over would be at risk of poverty without social protection. Due to the social protection system (pensions and other benefits), the actual poverty rate of people with disabilities is lessened. In spite of that, 23 % of working age women with disabilities and 25 % of working age men with disabilities live at risk of monetary poverty. For older women and men with disabilities it accounts for 17 % and 13 %, respectively ([18]).

KNOWLEDGE: Examining educational attainment through the intersection of gender and disability reveals that the lowest proportion of those with tertiary education is women with disabilities (13 %), compared to 24 % for women in the general population. By contrast, the highest percentage of tertiary graduates is among women without disabilities (29 %). The gender gap in educational attainment among people with disabilities is 4 p.p., to the advantage of men. Such low educational attainment can be partially explained by the fact that the older population (which is less likely to have attained higher education in general) represents a large share of people with disabilities. The disability gap is also observed in younger generations: less than one-third of persons with disabilities aged 30-34 have completed tertiary education, compared to 43 % for people without disabilities in the same age group (European Commission, 2017).

HEALTH: When compared with other social groups, people with disabilities most often experience unmet medical needs. The situation is better for those people with disabilities who are already of retirement age (65+), compared to working age people with disabilities. In 2014, 15 % of working-age people with disabilities had unmet needs for medical examination, compared to 11 % of older women and 9 % of older men with disabilities.

VIOLENCE: In the FRA survey on violence against women (2014), 16 % of respondents reported experiencing bad or very bad health, limitations in their everyday activities, and considered themselves as disabled or belonging to a minority in their country in terms of disability. At the time of the survey, across the EU-28, this corresponded to 31 million women. The survey results show that women who have health problems or a disability indicate a higher prevalence of various forms of violence than able-bodied women who do not have similar health problems. The difference in lifetime prevalence is 13 p.p. for all types of sexual and physical violence (EIGE, 2017a). Women with disabilities were particularly exposed to violence from a current or former partner (34 % of respondents with some form of disability), compared to 22 % of respondents in general (EIGE, 2017a).

4.4. Gender and educational level

4.4.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and educational level

The manifestation of gender inequality among people with different levels of qualification is complex, as it is necessarily linked with age or closely related to socioeconomic background. Women have struggled to earn their right to education (Whitehead, 1999), with education systems struggling even now with challenges such as gender segregation, prevalence of gender stereotypes or a lack of gender competence (EIGE, forthcoming). The intersection of gender and educational level, however, surpasses the physical environment of the school or educational attainment.

([15]) EU SILC: HS.3 For at least the past six months, to what extent have you been limited because of a health problem in activities people usually do? EQLS: Q50 (Q44) Are you limited in your daily activities by this physical or mental health problem, illness or disability?

([16]) According to Eurostat (2018), "People are considered at risk of monetary poverty when their equivalised disposable income (after social transfers) is below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold. This is set at 60 % of the national median equivalised disposable income after social transfers."

([17]) Eurostat, hlth_dpe030.

([18]) Eurostat, hlth_dpe020.

Educational level has effects stretching over the life course: women and men with different levels of qualification face different challenges in access to employment, good working conditions or fair income. For instance, almost every second woman and every fifth man with low qualifications in the EU works in a precarious job (EIGE, 2017d).

Currently, almost 23 % of the EU population aged 20-64 have low levels of qualification (less than primary, primary or lower secondary education), although the proportion of low-educated people is decreasing with each new generation ([19]). The gender balance in educational attainment has reversed in a single generation: while historically more women than men had lower levels of qualification (cohort aged 55-64), today, among the young population (20-24), more men than women stop at low levels of education. Among older persons, women are over-represented as their life expectancy is longer. As a result, the share of older women with low qualifications is higher than that of low-qualified older men (EIGE, 2017d).

EIGE´s research (EIGE, 2017d) shows that people with low levels of qualification face a higher risk of detachment from the labour market, poverty and social exclusion. Due to structural inequalities and persisting gender stereotypes, women with low educational attainment face additional challenges. Half of low-qualified women aged 15-64 in the EU are out of the labour market (in a situation of economic inactivity) compared to 27 % of men. Additionally, 9 % of women and 14 % of men with low levels of qualification are unemployed, compared to 6 % of women and 5% of men with high levels of qualification. Over six million low-qualified women and two million low-qualified men across the EU have never had a job (EIGE, 2017d).

Gender is an important factor in determining quality of working conditions and level of income for people with different levels of qualification. Among people with low levels of education, 36 % of women and 16 % of men are in the lowest income bracket. While women with low levels of qualification face the highest risk of precariousness (in terms of low pay, short working hours – up to 10 hours per week, and low job security) throughout their lives, after the age of 30 women with a medium level of education are more likely to work in precarious work than low-educated men. In the pre-retirement age group (60-64), women with a high level of qualification face a similar risk of precariousness to that of men with low educational attainment (EIGE, 2017d). In summary, while level of qualification is not a historically established category of intersectionality, its relevance is well-supported by the data.

4.4.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and educational level

Measurement

The intersection of gender and education is measured via EU policy priorities and statistical evidence of gendered challenges of women and men with low levels of qualification. Three standard levels of education are used: 1. Low level of education (ISCED 0-2); 2. Medium level of education (ISCED 3-4); and 3. High level of education (ISCED 5-8)([20])

WORK: The intersection of gender with educational attainment, age, disability and family type affects access to the labour market. The lower the educational level, the lower the FTE employment rate for both women and men and the higher the gender gap. Labour market participation of women with low levels of qualification is only half that of low-qualified men (17 % and 34 %, respectively for EU-28 in 2015, expressed in FTE Employment Rate).

KNOWLEDGE: Lifelong learning, as highlighted in the Europe 2020 Strategy, is understood as the acquisition and development of skills throughout the life course. It is of particular importance for people with low levels of qualification. Currently, among those aged 15 and over, only 15 % of women with low educational levels participate in education and training, compared to 21 % of women with higher levels of qualification. Participation of men with low and high educational attainment is almost the same. Special policy attention needs to be given to addressing gender gaps in educational attainment among those with low qualifications (where the gap favours men) and among those with high levels of qualifications (where the gap favours women). Among the working age population (aged 25-64), the differences are even more pronounced. While just 4 % of women and men with low levels of qualification participate in education and training, participation is five times higher for women who have completed

([19]) Eurostat, edat_lfs_9901.

([20]) The categories are taken from UNESCO's International Standard Classification of Education, 2011 edition. ISCED (0-2) refers to education up to lower secondary education, ISCED (3-4) refers to education up to post-secondary non-tertiary education, and ISCED (5-8) refers to tertiary education. http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf

tertiary education (21 %) and four times higher for men with tertiary education (17 %).

TIME: Women and men with high levels of qualification are more likely to be involved in leisure activities, men more so than women. 37 % of highly educated women and 43 % of men do sports or are involved in cultural or leisure activities, compared to 20 % of women and 21 % of men with low levels of education.

HEALTH: The health of women and men depends greatly on their education and economic situation - the higher the educational achievement or income, the better health outcomes are. The gender gap is largest for those with the lowest qualifications – 81 % of women and 80 % of men with high educational attainment perceive their health to be good or very good, while just 48 % of women and 60 % of men with low educational attainment feel healthy. This puts women with low levels of educational attainment in particularly poor situations regarding health, compared to both women with high levels of education and men with low levels of education.

4.5. Gender and family type

4.5.1. Theoretical and empirical considerations on gender and family type

Families and households ([21]) are key realms of social reproduction, a process that has been historically highly gender segregated. Social reproduction is understood as the emotional, sexual and affective services required to maintain family, including biological reproduction. It also encompasses various forms of care, social provision and voluntary work for the purpose of meeting the needs of family members (unpaid production of goods and services at home) and the community. Broadly speaking, social reproduction refers to the reproduction of culture and ideology which continually solidify dominant social relations (Rai, 2013). These care acts are mostly undertaken by women but remained unacknowledged as work. All production and exchange rest on these unpaid activities, making the family and household relevant categories for political economy analysis (Rai, 2013). The gendered character of social production means that family formation affects women's and men's lives differently. While for women with children, having a partner does not significantly affect their labour market participation, the employment of men living in a couple with children is much higher compared to lone fathers. Statistics show that having children translates into a financial penalty for women but an earnings boost for men (EIGE, 2017b).

Family forms and household structures have been changing over time and they also vary between regions, socioeconomic backgrounds and generations. Access to education, a source of income, the right to divorce, permissible forms of sexuality and the emergence of new models of femininity and masculinity have supported the emergence of a wider range of life options and family forms (Razavi, 2013). As a general rule in Europe, the convention of marriage followed by childbearing is shifting to alternative paths, such as cohabitation and births outside wedlock (Razavi, 2013). It is therefore important to reflect these changes in the data collection, research and policy-making.

The intersection of gender and family type manifests itself in several measurable factors: gender distribution of care and domestic work in a household, struggle to balance family and work, different working conditions of women and men, and gender gap in income. In the labour market,

Table 3. Adult population (15+) by household type and sex in 2014 (millions) ([22])

Household type	Women	Men	% of women
Single adults	39.6	31.3	56 %
Lone parents	8.5	1.5	85 %
Adults in couples without children	53.3	53.7	50 %
Adults in couples with children	43.9	44.5	50 %

Source: EIGE calculation from EU-LFS 2014 microdata

([21]) The concept of the household can be understood as residence groups in which "members' skills, capacities, and resources are combined for purpose of production, reproduction, and consumption" (Goody, 1972, in Razavi, 2013, p. 291). The term family accounts for "a more extended network of kinship relations that people may activate selectively" (Razavi, 2013, p. 291). In everyday life, these two concepts often overlap but are not synonymous: household units may include individuals who are not part of family, and family members can live in different households.

([22]) Note that the population counts exclude dependent children aged 15 and 24 living with their parents.

the fact that women typically take parental leave and are therefore absent from work for longer periods of time may contribute to discrimination against all women as potential mothers. This might be reflected when applying for a job and negotiating salary and working conditions. Having more children is associated with working fewer hours in the labour market, although reasons for part-time work for women and men differ significantly. While women are more bound by care responsibilities, men take up part-time work when they cannot find full-time positions (Miani and Hoorens, 2014). One-parent families are also penalised, with just under half of all lone parents in the EU living at risk of poverty and social exclusion. Women are particularly affected, as they make up almost 85 % of all one-parent families in the EU (EIGE, 2016). Across the board, women seem to be penalised for motherhood in terms of income, which in the long-run negatively affects their pensions (Angelov, Johansson and Lindahl, 2016). As a result, elderly women face a higher risk of poverty and social exclusion.

4.5.2. Findings from the Gender Equality Index on gender and family type

Measurement

Four family types were analysed in the Gender Equality Index: 1. Single (one-person household); 2. Lone parent (one-parent family); 3. Couple without children; and 4. Couple with children. These family types are based on the relationships between the members of households, i.e. a couple is defined as two adults living in the same household and declaring themselves to be in a relationship (whether married or not). Children are only those economically dependent household members (i.e. aged below 18 or up until 24 years, if in education) who are declared to be children or stepchildren of the couple or one parent (in case of a one-parent household). These family types differ from the types of household usually considered in quantitative analyses, which are based on the composition of the household, i.e. counting adult and dependent household members, irrespective of their actual relationship. Not all possible types of family were considered in the analysis – families with different mixed compositions were excluded, for clarity of interpretation. The source used for the domain of health behaviour (European Health Interview Survey) did not permit any disaggregation in relation to this intersection.

WORK: Family formation affects women's and men's participation in paid work differently. Lone mothers participate in the labour market at the same rate as women with children living in a couple (55 % and 56 % FTE employment rate, respectively) which suggests that being partnered does not affect the labour market participation of women with children in any significant way. By contrast, the participation of lone fathers in the labour market is much lower compared to the participation of men in a couple with children. The gender gap in the FTE employment rate among couples with children is 28 p.p. in favour of men, the gender gap among one-parent families is 11 p.p. in the same direction. These gender gaps - which are even more pronounced in respect of unpaid domestic work - may be addressed by improved work-life balance measures.

MONEY: A single man earns on average 14 % more per month than a single woman, with the gap widening among couples and even further where there are children present. This amounts to a gap of 30 % among people in a couple without dependent children, and is much higher with the presence of a dependent child or children – both among people living in a couple (38 %) and among lone parents (40 %). It is interesting to note that family formation means higher monthly earnings for men, which is not the case for women, even when men raise children as a lone father. This may be partly explained by the fact that lone fathers' earnings are the highest across all groups.

For women, family formation – i.e. every family type other than being single - involves lower earnings. While lone fathers tend to earn more than single men, in the case of women, lone mothers earn less than single women each month, which places lone mothers and their children at significant risk of poverty. As a result, gender gaps in earnings vary across family types due to both the decrease in women's earnings and the increase in men's earnings that come with family formation. Single women are the highest earners among all groups of women. Women living in a couple with no children earn 91 % of a single woman's earnings, falling to 82 % for women in a couple with children and 85 % for lone mothers. These figures support the notion that having children rewards men but results in a financial penalty for women. These effects are often referred to as the "motherhood pay gap" and "fatherhood premium" (International Labour Organization, 2015).

TIME: Most care work is done by younger people in the age group 25-49, for the obvious reason that this is the most likely age group to have children. As many as 61 % of women in this age group spend at least one hour per day caring for or educating a child or another dependent person, compared to 39 % of men. Even in cases where

they live in a couple and have children, men report significantly less time spent doing these care activities than women do (85 % and 67 %, respectively, in 2016). A similar difference can be seen in the case of lone parents, where only 38 % of lone fathers spend an hour per day caring for their children. This may be partially explained by the fact that lone fathers more often have older children than lone mothers do (until 18 years of age, or 24, if they are still in education). Also, the 16 % of women and 10 % of men living in a couple, who do not have any children but have regular care responsibilities, may be caring, for instance, for their parents, adult children, relatives or friends who have care needs, or their own partners in the later stages of their lives.

HEALTH: Across the EU, the share of people stating that they have unmet medical or dental needs is relatively small. However, 12 % of lone mothers had unmet medical needs in 2014 and 14 % had unmet dental needs (compared to 7 % and 10 % of lone fathers, and to 5 % and 6 % of women overall). Some Member States have a very high share of lone mothers reporting unmet medical needs – Greece (30 %), Latvia (27 %), France (19 %), Estonia (18 %) and Poland (17 %). Access to dental care for lone mothers is even more limited than general medical care, with one-third of lone mothers reporting unmet dental needs in Greece (34 %), followed by Portugal (30 %) and Latvia (29 %).

4.6. Further intersecting inequalities in the EU

A lack of availability of data which meet quality and comparability standards limits the variety of social groups included and examined in the Gender Equality Index. While categories of age, dis/ability, country of birth, family type and educational attainment enabled a more detailed picture of the challenges faced by women and men in the EU, other social groups are in need of attention from researchers and policy makers.

Unfortunately, EU-wide data that are regularly collected and comparable are not available for the social groups included in the EU anti-discrimination legislation: racial or ethnic origin, sexual orientation, and religion or belief. For race and ethnicity, in particular, there are historical and contemporary debates across the EU among civil society members, government and the public on the merits of data collection (Open Foundations Society, 2014). Despite this, 75 % of Europeans are in favour of providing personal information about ethnicity in the census as a means of combating discrimination (Special Eurobarometer 263, 2007). The majority of equality bodies in the EU also support data collection on ethnic origin (Open Foundations Society, 2014). For example, the European Network against Racism (ENAR) endorses data collection, stating, "We know that if we're not counted, we don't count!" (ENAR, n.d.). This report asserts that various intersectionalities have proven to be important analytical categories in identifying social divisions, and further research is needed on how best to reflect and operationalise intersectionalities in current data collection, research and policy-making.

4.6.1. Sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression [23]

FRA's EU-wide surveys confirm discrimination against gays, lesbians, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex people (LGBTQI) in different areas of life. One-third of the survey respondents (93,000 persons across the EU and Croatia) say that they have felt discriminated against in at least one of the following areas in the 12 months preceding the 2012 survey because of being LGBT: housing, healthcare, education, social services, and access to goods and services [24] (FRA, 2014).

Transgender respondents indicate more frequent challenges and discrimination than lesbian, gay and bisexual respondents. For instance, transgender respondents are the most likely of all LGBTQI subgroups to say that they felt personally discriminated against in the past year because of being LGBTQI, particularly in the areas of employment and healthcare (FRA, 2014).

[23] Based on the Yogyakarta Principles on the application of international human rights law to sexual orientation and gender identity (Council of Europe, UN and FRA), the following terms have been used in the report: Sexual orientation refers to "each person's capacity for profound emotional, affectional and sexual attraction to, and intimate and sexual relations with, individuals of a different gender or the same gender or more than one gender" (International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), 2007). Sexual orientation covers identity, conduct and relating to other persons (FRA, 2014). Gender identity refers to "each person's deeply felt internal and individual experience of gender, which may or may not correspond with the sex assigned at birth, including the personal sense of the body (which may involve, if freely chosen, modification of bodily appearance or function by medical, surgical or other means) and other expressions of gender, including dress, speech and mannerisms" (ICJ, 2007). Gender expression refers, to "persons' manifestation of their gender identity, for example through 'masculine', 'feminine' or 'gender-variant' behaviour, clothing, haircut, voice or body characteristics" (FRA, 2014, p. 8).

[24] The FRA 2014 survey utilised the terminology "LGBT", thus the term is used here.

The results also confirm the need for an intersectional perspective (sexual orientation and gender): lesbian and bisexual women, as well as transgender people, are more likely than gay and bisexual men to have been discriminated against on the basis of their gender in the 12 months preceding the survey. In addition, women respondents are much more likely to say that the last such attack they experienced was of a sexual nature (FRA, 2014).

4.6.2. Migrant background, ethnicity and religion

Along with other small-scale pieces of research, EU-wide surveys on migrants and minorities (EU-MIDIS I and EU-MIDIS II) illustrate the need to distinguish race, ethnicity, migrant background and religion or faith as categories of analysis, and the importance of looking at their intersection with gender. EU-MIDIS II found that Roma respondents and respondents with Sub-Saharan or North-African backgrounds (in particular second-generation migrants) experience higher rates of discrimination, harassment and violence motivated by hatred. Women and men, the young and the old, immigrants and descendants of immigrants have different experiences (FRA, 2017a). For instance, one out of five second-generation respondents (20 %) felt discriminated against because of their religion or religious beliefs, compared to one out of eight first-generation immigrants (12 %). This shows that characteristics such as gender, age or socialisation patterns (first and second-generation) may also affect discrimination experiences and must be taken into account when designing legal and policy responses (FRA, 2017a).

Roma respondents and people with North African backgrounds are particularly affected by discrimination in employment (FRA, 2017a). Previous research has shown that the Roma population faces significant challenges in education and the labour market, with gender gaps evident in both areas. Roma women are much less likely to be economically active, with looking after small children often given as their reason for not seeking paid work (EIGE, 2016). 80 % of Roma people live at the monetary poverty level, every third Roma person lives in housing without tap water, every fourth Roma person and every third Roma child live in a household that faced hunger at least once in the previous month (FRA, 2018). It has been confirmed that despite years of inclusion efforts, about one in three Roma surveyed in 2016 had experienced some form of harassment, such as offensive or threatening comments, threats of violence, offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, offensive or threatening behaviour via digital technologies. In addition, 4 % experienced physical violence motivated by anti-Gypsyism, of whom just 3 % reported this to any organisation (FRA, 2018).

Nearly one in three Muslim respondents reported facing discrimination when applying for a job (FRA, 2017b). One in four Muslim respondents (first and second-generation migrants) experienced harassment due to ethnic or immigrant background. Individuals' names, skin colour or physical appearance prompted discrimination when looking for housing, work or receiving healthcare. Visible religious symbols, such as traditional or religious clothing, often lead to discrimination, harassment or police stops. Muslim women feel particularly discriminated against because of their clothing: 35 % of women and 4 % of men who looked for work mentioned clothing as a reason for discrimination; 22 % of women and 7 % of men mentioned such discrimination when at work (FRA, 2017b).

EU-MIDIS II suggests that the prevalence of hate-motivated harassment and violence is similar for women and men; however, their experiences may differ. Incidents against women more often involve somebody they encounter in their everyday lives (such as an acquaintance or neighbour), which makes some of the incidents particularly difficult to report. Women also more frequently indicated that they did not report an incident of hate-motivated violence because they were afraid of intimidation or retaliation from the perpetrators (FRA, 2017a).

Concluding notes

The Gender Equality Index 2017 develops the domain of intersecting inequalities to a greater extent than previous editions of the Index. This report is an important accompaniment to the Index, as it explores theoretical and methodological considerations of intersectionality and points to increasing acknowledgement of intersectionality within policy-making. The history of intersectional theory building (including an exploration of black feminism dating back to the abolitionist movement in the United States and socialist class movements in Europe) was first reviewed in order to situate intersecting inequalities broadly within global feminist discourse. The theoretical framework within this report aims to take an inclusive approach to intersecting inequalities.

The report explains (from a methodological perspective) why certain intersectionalities were selected for analysis within the Gender Equality Index while others were excluded. Given the currently available data, the Index is able to analyse how gender intersects with various factors – including age, education, family composition, country of birth and/ or (dis)ability - to produce very different outcomes for women and men across the EU. These represent a select number of intersections, with other important intersections (such as sexuality, ethnicity, nationality and religion) omitted as a result of the limited availability of high-quality, EU-wide comparative data. Nor were statistical analyses of the Roma minority, or a more detailed approach to migrant backgrounds, or different disabilities possible. While the intersectional analysis of the Index uncovers inequalities between different groups of women and men across various intersectionalities, it also underscores the need for improvements and harmonisation of data in the EU. The majority of data provide information about the adult population or population starting from age 15/16, despite the fact that inequalities start much earlier. Many issues could be analysed taking into account children's perspectives. Girls and boys with migrant background or with disabilities, for example, may have different and unique experiences compared to other young people.

The inequalities uncovered by the intersectional analysis within this report are particularly significant from a policy perspective, and the Index presents a useful tool for policy makers. The Amsterdam Treaty represented a shift toward an intersectional approach, as it recognised discrimination on six grounds—sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age and sexual orientation. However, most gender equality documents do not refer explicitly to intersectionality, the terminology varies, and the extent to which a cross-cutting gender and intersectional perspective is incorporated differs. The 10 Common Basic Principles of Roma Inclusion and the Council Recommendations on effective Roma integration measures in the Member States offer good examples of an intersectional perspective on inclusion strategies.

The Index illustrates that an intersectional approach to data analysis and policy-making is essential. Regular collection of comparative data, disaggregated by a number of intersectionalities, could improve understanding of the specific situation of different social groups in the EU and thus support effective and inclusive policy-making.

References

Achenbaum, A. W. (2005), 'Ageing and Changing: International Historical Perspectives on Ageing', in Johnson, M. L. (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Age and Ageing*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 21-29.

Angelov, N., Johansson, P. and Lindahl, E. (2016), 'Parenthood and the Gender Gap in Pay', *Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 34(3), pp. 545–579, available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/684851.

Barnes, C. (1996), 'Institutional Discrimination against Disabled People and the Campaign for Anti-discrimination Legislation', in Taylor, D. (ed) *Critical Social Policy. A Reader,* Sage, London, pp. 95-112.

Boyd, M. and Grieco, E. (2003), 'Women and Migration: Incorporating Gender into International Migration Theory', *Migration Information Source*, available at: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/women-and-migration-incorporating-gender-international-migration-theory.

Brah, A. and Phoenix, A. (2004), 'Ain't I A Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol. 5(3), pp. 75–86.

Brooks, R. (2012), 'Student-parents and higher education: a cross-national comparison', *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 27(3), pp. 423–439, available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2011.613598.

Campbell, M. (2015), 'CEDAW and Women's Intersecting Identities: A Pioneering New Approach to Intersectional Discrimination', *Revista Direito GV*, Vol. 11(2), pp. 479–504, available at: https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-2432201521.

Chakravarti, U. (2015), 'A Gendered Perspective of Disability', in Asha, H. (ed) *Disability, Gender, and the Trajectories of Power,* Sage, New Delhi, pp. 23-41.

Chun, J. J., Lipsitz, G. and Shin, Y. (2013), 'Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 38(4), pp. 917–940, available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/669575.

Collins, P. H. (1993), 'Toward a New Vision: Race, Class, and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection', *Race, Sex & Class*, Vol. 1(1), pp. 25-45.

Collins, P. H. and Bilge, S. (2016), *Intersectionality,* Polity Press, Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA.

Collins, P. H. and Chepp, V. (2013), 'Intersectionality', in Waylen, G., Celis, K., Kantola, J. and Weldon, S.L. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics,* Oxford University Press, New York.

Cooper, B. (2016), 'Intersectionality', in Disch, L. and Hawkesworth, M. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory,* Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 385-406.

Crenshaw, K. (1989), 'Demarginalising the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, Vol. 140, pp. 139-167.

Crenshaw, K. (1991), 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Colour', *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 43(6), p. 1241, available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

D'Agostino, S. (2015), 'Consolidated Criteria for Assessing Intersectionality Operationalisation in European Equality Policies: The Case of Roma Women', *Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*, Vol. 2(1–2), pp. 95-110.

D'Agostino, S. (2016), 'Five Years of EU Roma Integration Policies: Vanishing Gender Awareness?' Policy Brief, Institute for European Studies, available at: https://www.ies.be/node/3716

Davaki, K., Marzo, C., Narminio, E. and Arvanitidou, M. (2013), *Discrimination Generated by the Intersection of Gender and Disability,* Brussels, Directorate-General for Internal Policies Policy Department on Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, European Parliament, available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2013/493006/IPOL-FEMM_ET(2013)493006_EN.pdf

Davis, A. (1993), *Women, Race and Class,* Random House, New York.

Dill, B. T., McLaughlin, A. E. and Nieves, A. D. (2007), 'Future directions of feminist research: Intersectionality', in *Handbook of feminist research,* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 629–637.

European Commission (ed.) (2007), *Tackling multiple discrimination: practices, policies and laws,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

European Commission (2016), *Intersectional discrimination in EU gender equality and non-discrimination law,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, available at: http://bookshop.europa.eu/uri?target=EUB:NOTICE:DS0116393:3A:HTML

European Commission (2017), Commission Staff Working Document, *Progress report in the implementation of the European Disability Strategy (2010-2020), SWD(2017) 29 final.*

European Commission (2018), *2018 Report on equality between women and men in the EU,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, available at: http://publications.europa.eu/publication/manifestation_identifier/PUB_DSAU18001ENN

EIGE (forthcoming), *Gender-related challenges in EU education systems*, European Institute for Gender Equality, Vilnius.

EIGE (2019), *Gender equality and youth: opportunities and risks of digitalisation,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

EIGE (n.d.), Gender Equality Glossary and Thesaurus, available at: https://eige.europa.eu/rdc/thesaurus?lang=en

EIGE (ed) (2013), *Gender equality index: report,* European Institute for Gender Equality, Luxembourg.

EIGE (2014), *Gender equality and economic independence: part-time work and self-employment. Review of the Implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action in the EU Member States,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, available at: http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/MH0414228ENC.pdf

EIGE (2015a), *Gender Equality Index 2015. Measuring gender equality in the European Union 2005-2012,* European Institute for Gender Equality, Vilnius, available at: http://eige.europa.eu/rdc/eige-publications/gender-equality-index-2015-measuring-gender-equality-european-union-2005-2012-report

EIGE (2015b), *Gender gap in pensions in the EU: research note to the Latvian presidency,* European Institute for Gender Equality, Vilnius.

EIGE (2016), *Poverty, gender and intersecting inequalities in the EU. Review of the implementation of Area A, Women and Poverty of the Beijing Platform for Action,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

EIGE (2017a), *Gender equality index 2017: measurement framework of violence against women,* European Institute for Gender Equality, Vilnius), available at: http://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2839/652585

EIGE (2017b), *Gender equality index 2017. Measuring gender equality in the European Union 2005-2015,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, available at: http://eige.europa.eu/rdc/eige-publications/gender-equality-index-2017-measuring-gender-equality-european-union-2005-2015-report

EIGE (2017c), *Gender Equality Index 2017: methodological report,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

EIGE (2017d), *Gender, skills and precarious work in the EU research note,* European Institute for Gender Equality, Vilnius.

European Parliament (2016), *Report on the situation of women refugees and asylum seekers in the EU*, (2015/2325(INI)), Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality.

European Parliament (2017), *Discrimination and Access to Employment for Female Workers with Disabilities,* Brussels, Directorate General for Internal Policies, Policy Department A: Economic and Scientific Policy, European Parliament.

European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (2013a), *Analysis of FRA Roma survey results by gender*, available at: http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/analysis-fra-roma-survey-results-gender

European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (ed.) (2013b), *Inequalities and multiple discrimination in access to and quality of healthcare,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (2014), *European Union lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender survey. Main results,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (2017a), *Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. Main results,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (ed.) (2017b), *Second European Union minorities and discrimination survey. Muslims: selected findings,* Publications Offices of the European Union, Luxembourg.

European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (2018), *Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. Roma – Selected findings,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

European Union Fundamental Rights Agency and the UN Development Programme (eds.) (2012), *The situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States: survey results at a glance,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Eurostat (2011), *Migrants in Europe. A statistical portrait of the first and second generation,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Eurostat (2017a), Functional and activity limitations statistics, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Functional_and_activity_limitations_statistics

Eurostat (2017b), *Migrant integration,* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/8787947/KS-05-17-100-EN-N.pdf/f6c45af2-6c4f-4ca0-b547-d25e6ef9c359

Eurostat (n.d.), Migration and migrant population statistics, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics#Migrant_population:_almost_22_million_non-EU_citizens_living_in_the_EU

Garland-Thomson, R. (2011), 'Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory', in Hall, K.Q. (ed.) *Feminist Disability Studies,* Indiana University Press, Bloomington, pp. 13-47.

Ginn, J. (1993), 'Grey power: age-based organisations' response to structured inequalities', *Critical Social Policy*, Vol. 13(38), pp. 23-47, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/026101839301303802

Glenn, N. D. (2007), 'Age, Period, And Cohort Effects' in Ritzer, G. (ed.) *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology,* UK, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Oxford, available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosa022

Grabham, E. (2009) (ed.) *Intersectionality and beyond: law, power and the politics of location,* Routledge-Cavendish, Abingdon, Oxon and New York, NY.

Hankivsky, O. (2012), 'Women's health, men's health, and gender and health: Implications of intersectionality', *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 74(11), pp. 1712-1720, available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.11.029

Hannett, S. (2003), 'Equality at the Intersections: The Legislative and Judicial Failure to Tackle Multiple Discrimination', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, Vol. 23(1), pp. 65-86, available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/23.1.65

International Labour Organization (2015), *The motherhood pay gap: a review of the issues, theory and international evidence*, available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—dgreports/—dcomm/—publ/documents/ publication/wcms_348041.pdf

International Organization for Migration (n.d.), *Gender and migration*, available at: https://www.iom.int/gender-and-migration

International Organization for Migration (n.d.), *IOM definition of 'migrant'*, available at: https://www.iom.int/who-is-a-migrant

Jacquot, S. (2017), 'A Policy in Crisis. The Dismantling of the EU Gender Equality Policy', in Kantola, J. and Lombardo, E. (eds.) *Gender and the Economic Crisis in Europe. Politics, Institutions and Intersectionality,* Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 27-48.

Kantola, J. (2010), *Gender and the European Union,* Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingtoke, Hampshire, New York.

Kantola, J. and Nousiainen, K. (2012), 'The European Union: Initiator of a New European Anti-Discrimination Regime?' in *Institutionalising Intersectionality,* Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 33-58.

Krizsán, A., Skjeie, H. and Squires, J. (eds.) (2012), *Institutionalizing intersectionality the changing nature of European equality regimes,* Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York, available at: http://www.palgraveconnect.com/doifinder/10.1057/9781137031068

Lombardo, E. and Augustin, L. R. (2012), 'Framing Gender Intersections in the European Union: What Implications for the Quality of Intersectionality in Policies?' *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, Vol. 19(4), pp. 482-512, available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxr001

Lombardo, E. and Verloo, M. (2009), 'Institutionalising Intersectionality in the European Union?' *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 11(4), pp. 478-495, available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740903237442

Lykke, N. (2010), *Feminist studies: a guide to intersectional theory, methodology and writing,* Routledge, New York.

McCall, L. (2005), 'The Complexity of Intersectionality', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 30(3), pp. 1771-1800, available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/426800

Mirga-Kruszelnicka, A. (2017), *Revisiting the EU Roma Framework: Assessing the European Dimension for the Post-2020 Future*, Open Society European Policy Institute, available at: https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/revisiting-eu-roma-framework-20170607.pdf

Oxfam (2016), *Gender Analysis. The Situation of Refugees and Migrants in Greece*, available at: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/oxfam_gender_analysis_september2016.pdf

Phoenix, A. and Pattynama, P. (2006), 'Intersectionality', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 13(3), pp. 187-192, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065751

Platt, L. (2011), *Understanding inequalities: stratification and difference,* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Rai, S. M. (2013), 'Gender and (International) Political Economy', in Waylen, G., Celis, K., Kantola, J. and Weldon, S.L. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics,* Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 263-288.

Razavi, S. (2013), 'Households, Families, and Social Reproduction', in Waylen, G., Celis, K., Kantola, J. and Weldon, S.L. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics,* Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 289-312.

Rees, T. L. (1998), *Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union: Education, Training and Labour Market Policies,* Routledge.

Schiek, D. (2016), 'Intersectionality and the Notion of Disability in EU Discrimination Law', *Common Market Law Review*, Vol. 53(1), pp. 35-63.

Šeta, Đ. (2016), *Forgotten Women: the impact of Islamophobia on Muslim women,* Brussels, European Network Against Racism, available at: http://www.enar-eu.org/IMG/pdf/20095_forgottenwomenpublication_v5_1_.pdf

Smiet, K. (2017), *Travelling Truths. Sojourner Truth, Intersectionality, and Feminist Scholarship* (Dr.), Radboud University, Nijmegen.

Spierings, N. (2012), 'The inclusion of quantitative techniques and diversity in the mainstream of feminist research', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 19(3), pp. 331-347, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506812443621

Stuart, E. and Woodroffe, J. (2016), 'Leaving no-one behind: can the Sustainable Development Goals succeed where the Millennium Development Goals lacked?', *Gender & Development*, Vol. 24(1), pp. 69-81.

Tolhurst, R., Leach, B., Price, J., Robinson, J., Ettore, E., Scott-Samuel, A. and Theobald, S. (2012), 'Intersectionality and gender mainstreaming in international health: Using a feminist participatory action research process to analyse voices and debates from the global south and north', *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 74(11), pp. 1825-1832, available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.08.025

United Nations (2015), *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld

Verloo, M. (2006), 'Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 13(3), pp. 211-228, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065753

Verloo, M. (2013), 'Intersectional and Cross-Movement Politics and Policies: Reflections on Current Practices and Debates', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 38(4), pp. 893-915, available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/669572

Walby, S. (2009), 'Beyond the politics of location: the power of argument in gender equality politics', in Verloo, M., Lombardo, E. and Meier, P. (eds.) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking,* Routledge, London, pp. 36-51.

Weldon, S. L. (2008), 'Intersectionality', in Goertz, G. and Mazur, A.G. (eds.) *Politics, Gender, and Concepts,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 193-218, available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755910.009

Whitehead, B. J. (ed.) (1999), *Women´s Education in Early Modern Europe. A history, 1500-1800,* Garland Publishing, New York and London.

World Health Organization (n.d.), *Gender and women's mental health*, available at: http://www.who.int/mental_health/prevention/genderwomen/en/

Wittchen, H. U., Jacobi, F., Rehm, J., Gustavsson, A., Svensson, M., Jönsson, B. and Steinhausen, H-C. (2011), 'The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010', *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, Vol. 21(9), pp. 655-679, available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2011.07.018

Yang, Y. and Land, K. C. (2013), *Age-period-cohort analysis: new models, methods, and empirical applications,* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Yılmaz, F. (2015), 'From immigrant worker to Muslim immigrant: Challenges for feminism', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 22(1), pp. 37-52, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506814532803

Young, I. M. (1994), 'Gender as Seriality: Thinking about Women as a Social Collective', *Signs*, Vol. 19(3), pp. 713-738.

Young, I. M. (2001), 'Equality of Whom? Social Groups and Judgments of Injustice', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 9(1), pp. 1-18, available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9760.00115

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006), 'Intersectionality and Feminist Politics', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 13(3), pp. 193-209, available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065752

Annexes

Annex 1. List of indicators, disaggregated by intersection and source

A	Available
N/A	Not available

Notes: For the calculation of the Index, indicators 28a and 28b were merged into one variable. The same was done for 29a and 29b

For the category "country of birth", please note the breakdown National born/Non-national born is available for all variables, but some variables go into more detail, with "Non-national born" being further broken down into "EU born" and "Non-EU born". These two latter are a sub-set of Non-national born

GENDER EQUALITY INDEX					Family type				Age				Education			Country of birth				Disability	
Domain	Sub-domain	N	Variable	Source and notes	Single	Lone parent	Couple without children	Couple with children	15/16-24	25-49	50-64	65+	Low educated	Medium educated	High educated	Native born	Foreign born	EU born	Non-EU born	With disabilities	Without disabilities
Work	Participation	1	FTE employment rate (%, 15+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU-LFS, 2014; * Disability: EU SILC, 2014	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	A*	A*
Work	Participation	2	Duration of working life (years, 15+ population)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Work	Segregation and quality of work	3	Employed people in education, human health and social work activities (%, 15+ employed)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU-LFS, 2014; * Disability: EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born are based on EU-26, (data on DE and MT missing)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A*	A*
Work	Segregation and quality of work	4	Ability to take an hour or two off during working hours to take care of personal or family matters (%,15+ workers)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EWCS, 2015	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	A	A
Work	Segregation and quality of work	5	Career Prospects Index (points, 0-100)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EWCS, 2015	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	A	A

GENDER EQUALITY INDEX					Family type				Age				Education			Country of birth				Disability	
Domain	Sub-domain	N	Variable	Source and notes	Single	Lone parent	Couple without children	Couple with children	15/16-24	25-49	50-64	65+	Low edu-cated	Medium edu-cated	High edu-cated	Native born	For-eign born	EU born	Non-EU born	With disa-bilities	Without disa-bilities
Money	Financial resources	6	Mean monthly earnings (PPS, working population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born are based on EU-23, (data on DE, EE, LV, MT and SI missing)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A	A
		7	Mean equivalised net income (PPS, 16+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born: Eurostat, ilc_di16, 2015 (+18 population), EU-28 estimated by Eurostat *** Couple with/without children: figures for women and men are equal, as data on income allow calculations only on family base	A	A	A ***	A ***	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A	A
	Economic situation	8	Not at-risk-of-poverty, ≥60% of median income (%,16+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born: Eurostat, ilc_li31, 2015 (+18 population), low reliability *** Couple with/without children: figures for women and men are equal, as data on income allow calculations only on family base	A	A	A ***	A ***	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A	A
		9	Income distribution S20/S80 (16+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born are based on EU-23, (data on DE, EE, LV, MT and SI missing) *** Couple with/without children: figures for women and men are equal, as data on income allow calculations only on family base	A	A	A ***	A ***	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A	A

GENDER EQUALITY INDEX					Family type				Age				Education			Country of birth				Disability	
Domain	Sub-domain	N	Variable	Source and notes	Single	Lone parent	Couple without children	Couple with children	15/16-24	25-49	50-64	65+	Low edu-cated	Medium edu-cated	High edu-cated	Native born	For-eign born	EU born	Non-EU born	With disa-bilities	Without disa-bilities
Knowl-edge	Attain-ment and participa-tion	10	Graduates of tertiary education (%, 15+ popula-tion)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU-LFS, 2014; * Disability: EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born: Eurostat, edat_lfs_9912, 2015 (15-74 population)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A	A	A**	A**	A*	A*
		11	People participating in formal or non-formal education and training (15+ popula-tion)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU-LFS, 2014; ** EU born and non-EU born: Eurostat, trng_lfs_13, 2015 (18-74 population)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	N/A	N/A
	Segrega-tion	12	Tertiary students in education, health and welfare, humanities and arts (tertiary students)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

GENDER EQUALITY INDEX					Family type				Age				Education			Country of birth				Disability	
Domain	Sub-domain	N	Variable	Source and notes	Single	Lone parent	Couple without children	Couple with children	15/16-24	25-49	50-64	65+	Low educated	Medium educated	High educated	Native born	Foreign born	EU born	Non-EU born	With disabilities	Without disabilities
Time	Care activities	13	People caring for and educating their children or grandchildren, elderly or people with disabilities, every day (%, 18+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, Eurofound, EQLS, 2016	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
		14	People doing cooking and/or housework, every day (%, 18+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, Eurofound, EQLS, 2016	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	Social activities	15	Workers doing sporting, cultural or leisure activities outside of their home, at least daily or several times a week (%, 15+ workers)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, Eurofound, EWCS, 2015	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	A	A
		16	Workers involved in voluntary or charitable activities, at least once a month (%, 15+ workers)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, Eurofound, EWCS, 2015	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	A	A

GENDER EQUALITY INDEX					Family type				Age				Education			Country of birth				Disability	
Domain	Sub-domain	N	Variable	Source and notes	Single	Lone parent	Couple without children	Couple with children	15/16-24	25-49	50-64	65+	Low educated	Medium educated	High educated	Native born	Foreign born	EU born	Non-EU born	With disabilities	Without disabilities
Power	Political	17	Share of ministers (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		18	Share of members of parliament (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		19	Share of members of regional assemblies (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economic	20	Share of members of boards in largest quoted companies, supervisory board or board of directors (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		21	Share of board members of central bank (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Social	22	Share of board members of research funding organisations (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		23	Share of board members in publicly owned broadcasting organisations (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		24	Share of members of highest decision-making body of the national Olympic sporting organisations (% F, M)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

GENDER EQUALITY INDEX					Family type				Age				Education			Country of birth				Disability	
Domain	Sub-domain	N	Variable	Source and notes	Single	Lone parent	Couple without children	Couple with children	15/16-24	25-49	50-64	65+	Low educated	Medium educated	High educated	Native born	Foreign born	EU born	Non-EU born	With disabilities	Without disabilities
Health	Status	25	Self-perceived health, good or very good (%, 16+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born are based on EU-23, (data on DE, EE, LV, MT and SI missing)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A	A
		26	Life expectancy at birth (years)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		27	Healthy life years at birth (years)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Behaviour	28a	Population who don't smoke (%, 15+ population)	Eurostat, hlth_ehis_sk1e **** Age range available 15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65-75, 75+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A ****	A ****	A ****	A ****	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		28b	Population not involved in harmful drinking (%, 15+ population)	Eurostat, hlth_ehis_al3e EU-28 estimated by Eurostat **** Age range available 15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65-75, 75+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A ****	A ****	A ****	A ****	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		29a	Population doing physical activities (%, 15+ population)	Eurostat, hlth_ehis_pe2e EU-28 estimated by Eurostat **** Age range available 15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65-75, 75+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A ****	A ****	A ****	A ****	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		29b	Population consuming fruit and vegetables (%, 15+ population)	Eurostat, hlth_ehis_fv3e **** Age range available 15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65-75, 75+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A ****	A ****	A ****	A ****	A	A	A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Access	30	Population without unmet needs for medical examination (%, 16+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born are based on EU-23, (data on DE, EE, LV, MT and SI missing)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A	A
		31	Population without unmet needs for dental examination (%, 16+ population)	Source: EIGE calculation with microdata, EU SILC, 2014 ** EU born and non-EU born are based on EU-23, (data on DE, EE, LV, MT and SI missing)	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A**	A**	A	A

Annex 2. Data on intersection of gender

Table 4. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and family composition

N	INDICATOR	Family type							
		Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
		Single	Single	Lone parent	Lone parent	Couple without children	Couple without children	Couple with children	Couple with children
1	FTE employment rate (%, 15+ population)	27.4	49.6	54.6	66.5	33.7	39.9	56.2	83.7
3	Employed people in education, human health and social work activities (%, 15+ employed)	31.7	10.7	33.4	11.7	30.7	9.6	32.9	8.5
4	Ability to take an hour or two off during working hours to take care of personal or family matters (%,15+ workers)	21.3	28.4	20.0	29.7	23.5	27.8	22.3	26.3
5	Career Prospects Index (points, 0-100)	60.6	61.9	63.7	60.3	63.1	63.9	64.3	66.5
6	Mean monthly earnings (PPS, working population)	2,167	2,525	1,838	3,080	1,977	2,812	1,780	2,864
7	Mean equivalised net income (PPS, 16+ population)	15,461	18,081	13,333	16,816	21,809	21,809	18,114	18,114
8	Not at-risk-of-poverty, ≥60% of median income (%,16+ population)	75.2	75.7	66.6	76.8	90.1	90.1	84.4	84.4
9	Income distribution S20/S80 (16+ population)	21.7	15.3	25.6	14.6	21.8	21.8	22.7	22.7
10	Graduates of tertiary education (%, 15+ population)	21.2	25.3	27.8	27.6	22.8	26.1	36.9	32.6
11	People participating in formal or non-formal education and training (15+ population)	11.3	12.8	15.9	20.4	9.1	6.6	12.7	11.2
13	People caring for and educating their children or grandchildren, elderly or people with disabilities, every day (%, 18+ population)	7.5	3.6	75.6	37.8	16.0	10.1	85.3	67.0
14	People doing cooking and/or housework, every day (%, 18+ population)	74.7	56.7	88.6	63.4	81.7	32.3	91.9	31.7
15	Workers doing sporting, cultural or leisure activities outside of their home, at least daily or several times a week (%, 15+ workers)	31.7	34.5	25.6	38.9	28.0	27.2	25.7	29.5
16	Workers involved in voluntary or charitable activities, at least once a month (%, 15+ workers)	14.1	11.4	10.0	16.9	12.0	12.5	13.6	12.7
25	Self-perceived health, good or very good (%, 16+ population)	47.8	61.5	70.0	76.3	57.1	57.8	82.7	82.5
30	Population without unmet needs for medical examination (%, 16+ population)	90.3	91.7	88.1	92.7	94.1	94.0	94.0	93.1
31	Population without unmet needs for dental examination (%, 16+ population)	91.2	90.3	86.0	89.7	94.2	93.8	92.3	91.2

Table 5. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and age

N	INDICATOR	Age							
		Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
		15/16-24	15/16-24	25-49	25-49	50-64	50-64	65+	65+
1	FTE employment rate (%, 15+ population)	22.6	28.1	60.9	78.8	44.4	62.5	1.8	4.8
3	Employed people in education, human health and social work activities (%, 15+ employed)	22.8	6.2	29.5	7.7	35.4	10.3	23.8	10.4
4	Ability to take an hour or two off during working hours to take care of personal or family matters (%,15+ workers)	22.9	24.5	21.1	24.2	24.0	30.5	52.0	59.7
5	Career Prospects Index (points, 0-100)	61.6	63.4	64.0	65.1	60.8	62.3	51.9	53.8
6	Mean monthly earnings (PPS, working population)	1,259	1,449	1,782	2,468	1,902	2,894	1,351	2,641
7	Mean equivalised net income (PPS, 16+ population)	15,816	16,326	17,704	18,230	19,299	19,892	16,416	18,584
8	Not at-risk-of-poverty, ≥60% of median income (%,16+ population)	75.4	77.7	82.8	84.1	84.7	84.3	84.3	88.8
9	Income distribution S20/S80 (16+ population)	19.6	19.9	20.7	20.6	19.5	18.1	25.3	24.5
10	Graduates of tertiary education (%, 15+ population)	11.1	7.6	36.4	30.4	21.0	23.2	9.9	18.8
11	People participating in formal or non-formal education and training (15+ population)	67.1	63.5	13.9	12.1	7.8	5.9	3.2	2.0
13	People caring for and educating their children or grandchildren, elderly or people with disabilities, every day (%, 18+ population)	15.4	3.1	60.8	38.9	27.0	20.4	17.3	12.1
14	People doing cooking and/or housework, every day (%, 18+ population)	42.0	20.7	81.6	34.2	84.2	35.5	81.1	37.9
15	Workers doing sporting, cultural or leisure activities outside of their home, at least daily or several times a week (%, 15+ workers)	39.0	56.0	27.6	33.2	25.3	25.1	20.9	15.8
16	Workers involved in voluntary or charitable activities, at least once a month (%, 15+ workers)	9.5	9.1	11.6	9.8	13.5	14.0	21.3	20.4
25	Self-perceived health, good or very good (%, 16+ population)	91.9	93.2	80.7	83.2	56.4	59.8	33.7	40.3
30	Population without unmet needs for medical examination (%, 16+ population)	96.2	96.8	93.1	93.3	91.7	92.2	92.1	93.7
31	Population without unmet needs for dental examination (%, 16+ population)	95.6	95.5	91.6	91.6	90.9	90.8	92.8	93.5

N	INDICATOR	Age											
		Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
		15/16-24	15/16-24	25-34	25-34	35-44	35-44	45-64	45-64	65-74	65-74	75+	75+
28a	Population who don't smoke (%, 15+ population)	79.5	73.4	73.9	60.9	76.1	65.1	77.0	69.5	89.7	83.3	96.1	91.6
28b	Population not involved in harmful drinking (%, 15+ population)	79.5	68.9	84.6	63.4	87.5	70.4	88.4	71.5	91.3	79.4	94.4	85.5
29a	Population doing physical activities (%, 15+ population)	37.4	55.9	28.0	41.8	25.2	33.8	27.8	31.2	23.6	31.2	11.8	21.0
29b	Population consuming fruit and vegetables (%, 15+ population)	13.3	9.2	15.9	9.7	16.2	9.7	18.9	10.9	20.7	15.3	15.5	14.5

Table 6. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and level of education

N	INDICATOR	Level of education					
		Women	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**
		Low educated	Low educated	Medium educated	Medium educated	High educated	High educated
1	FTE employment rate (%, 15+ population)	16.8	34.1	43.8	60.0	63.0	70.5
3	Employed people in education, human health and social work activities (%, 15+ employed)	18.6	3.5	25.6	4.8	42.5	17.6
4	Ability to take an hour or two off during working hours to take care of personal or family matters (%,15+ workers)	35.0	37.5	21.9	25.3	23.4	31.1
5	Career Prospects Index (points, 0-100)	51.1	51.0	60.9	62.4	66.8	68.2
6	Mean monthly earnings (PPS, working population)	1,206	1,830	1,522	2,130	2,334	3,486
7	Mean equivalised net income (PPS, 16+ population)	14,099	14,767	17,050	17,121	23,552	25,698
8	Not at-risk-of-poverty, ≥60% of median income (%,16+ population)	74.6	75.9	84.4	85.6	92.0	92.3
9	Income distribution S20/S80 (16+ population)	23.4	22.1	23.0	23.7	21.6	20.6
10	Graduates of tertiary education (%, 15+ population)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11	People participating in formal or non-formal education and training (15+ population)	14.7	18.1	15.8	13.9	21.4	16.9
13	People caring for and educating their children or grandchildren, elderly or people with disabilities, every day (%, 18+ population)	33.6	23.8	38.3	24.3	42.5	27.1
14	People doing cooking and/or housework, every day (%, 18+ population)	81.5	31.8	78.3	33.6	74.9	37.3
15	Workers doing sporting, cultural or leisure activities outside of their home, at least daily or several times a week (%, 15+ workers)	19.6	20.9	23.2	27.9	36.5	42.6
16	Workers involved in voluntary or charitable activities, at least once a month (%, 15+ workers)	4.0	3.0	10.3	9.1	16.7	17.5
25	Self-perceived health, good or very good (%, 16+ population)	48.4	60.5	68.6	71.0	81.1	80.2
30	Population without unmet needs for medical examination (%, 16+ population)	91.4	92.4	93.0	93.4	94.6	95.3
31	Population without unmet needs for dental examination (%, 16+ population)	89.4	89.2	93.1	92.8	94.6	95.2
28a	Population who don't smoke (%, 15+ population)	83.0	69.9	76.4	67.8	83.7	78.8
28b	Population not involved in harmful drinking (%, 15+ population)	91.6	78.9	85.3	68.6	86.7	69.3
29a	Population doing physical activities (%, 15+ population)	18.0	28.8	26.7	34.3	35.7	45.5
29b	Population consuming fruit and vegetables (%, 15+ population)	13.8	10.1	15.9	9.9	23.6	14.1

Table 7. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and country of birth

N	INDICATOR	Country of birth							
		Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
		Native born	Native born	Foreign born	Foreign born	EU born	EU born	Non-EU born	Non-EU born
1	FTE employment rate (%, 15+ population)	38.3	53.2	35.8	55.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Employed people in education, human health and social work activities (%, 15+ employed)	31.0	8.4	26.9	8.0	23.9	7.4	28.3	9.0
4	Ability to take an hour or two off during working hours to take care of personal or family matters (%,15+ workers)	22.7	27.4	24.0	26.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	Career Prospects Index (points, 0-100)	62.7	63.9	61.6	61.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	Mean monthly earnings (PPS, working population)	1,774	2,490	1,751	2,538	1,832	2,600	1,704	2,249
7	Mean equivalised net income (PPS, 16+ population)	17,579	18,593	17,441	17,275	19,444	20,106	16,726	16,614
8	Not at-risk-of-poverty, ≥60% of median income (%,16+ population)	83.9	85.3	73.3	75.1	74.8	78.3	63.6	61.9
9	Income distribution S20/S80 (16+ population)	21.6	20.8	17.7	18.2	17.6	17.1	16.2	17.0
10	Graduates of tertiary education (%, 15+ population)	23.2	23.0	25.9	26.5	33.6	30.3	28.8	27.3
11	People participating in formal or non-formal education and training (15+ population)	16.9	16.1	14.9	14.1	14.5	12.5	16.3	14.5
13	People caring for and educating their children or grandchildren, elderly or people with disabilities, every day (%, 18+ population)	36.8	24.2	43.3	28.3	38.2	29.0	46.2	28.0
14	People doing cooking and/or housework, every day (%, 18+ population)	78.4	33.9	81.8	32.6	83.9	31.6	80.6	33.1
15	Workers doing sporting, cultural or leisure activities outside of their home, at least daily or several times a week (%, 15+ workers)	27.7	32.0	26.1	31.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
16	Workers involved in voluntary or charitable activities, at least once a month (%, 15+ workers)	12.5	11.6	9.5	8.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
25	Self-perceived health, good or very good (%, 16+ population)	64.2	69.8	66.8	71.9	73.2	77.1	69.5	74.3
30	Population without unmet needs for medical examination (%, 16+ population)	92.9	93.6	92.5	93.0	93.4	94.4	92.3	93.1
31	Population without unmet needs for dental examination (%, 16+ population)	92.3	92.5	90.5	90.4	90.2	90.1	88.5	88.5

Table 8. Gender Equality Index data disaggregated by gender and disability

N	INDICATOR	Disability			
		Women	Men	Women	Men
		With disabilities	With disabilities	Without disabilities	Without disabilities
1	FTE employment rate (%, 15+ population)	18.8	28.1	46.6	61.9
3	Employed people in education, human health and social work activities (%, 15+ employed)	32.9	9.6	30.5	8.7
4	Ability to take an hour or two off during working hours to take care of personal or family matters (%,15+ workers)	24.7	29.2	22.6	27.2
5	Career Prospects Index (points, 0-100)	59.4	58.3	63.0	64.3
6	Mean monthly earnings (PPS, working population)	1,680	2,330	1,767	2,493
7	Mean equivalised net income (PPS, 16+ population)	15,589	16,528	18,227	19,033
8	Not at-risk-of-poverty, ≥60% of median income (%,16+ population)	79.4	81.0	83.8	85.0
9	Income distribution S20/S80 (16+ population)	22.9	22.1	20.2	19.7
10	Graduates of tertiary education (%, 15+ population)	12.9	16.9	28.7	27.3
11	People participating in formal or non-formal education and training (15+ population)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13	People caring for and educating their children or grandchildren, elderly or people with disabilities, every day (%, 18+ population)	28.8	20.4	40.1	25.6
14	People doing cooking and/or housework, every day (%, 18+ population)	78.8	41.4	78.7	32.2
15	Workers doing sporting, cultural or leisure activities outside of their home, at least daily or several times a week (%, 15+ workers)	26.7	27.0	27.7	32.5
16	Workers involved in voluntary or charitable activities, at least once a month (%, 15+ workers)	16.1	16.1	11.8	10.9
25	Self-perceived health, good or very good (%, 16+ population)	19.0	21.4	84.1	86.4
30	Population without unmet needs for medical examination (%, 16+ population)	86.8	87.0	95.4	95.7
	Population without unmet needs for dental examination (%, 16+ population)	87.7	87.6	94.0	93.8

HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:

- one copy:
  via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu);
- more than one copy or posters/maps:
  from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
  from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
  by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or
  calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

  (*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Priced publications:

- via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu).

http://eige.europa.eu