Ranking Forty-nine Countries by the Quality of Their Labor Market Policies

Clair Brown, Professor of Economics[1]
Climate and Society Center, IRLE, University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
clairbrown@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper presents the Sustainable, Shared-prosperity Policy Index (SSPI)[2], which scores and ranks forty-nine countries on their economic policies that provide wellbeing for their residents. The SSPI compares and ranks countries by their national policies across a broad range of government functions that affect national wellbeing. National policies directly affect production and distribution; hence policy choices determine the well-being of a country, now and in the future.

The SSPI divides national policies into three pillars—Sustainability, Market Structure, and Public Goods—that represent the government functions of protecting the environment, structuring markets, and delivering products and services. The three pillars are further divided into sixteen categories, which together contain over sixty policy indicators. The indicators are normalized to range from 0 to 100 with higher scores indicating better policies. The SSPI provides data across countries that compares policies in 2018. The policy observed point out where a country is relatively strong or relatively weak, and help lawmakers explore how countries can improve specific policies.

This paper focuses on policies that affect workers, employers, and the labor market, including those that regulate wages and hours; occupational health; collective bargaining; paid time off; retirement income; and income distribution. We compare countries that have strong labor market policies to the United States, and point out how specific policies can be improved. Overall, nations vary widely in their national policies, and the SSPI provides a road map of policies that create the socio-economic system that supports universal well-being.

[1] This paper draws from the work done by my SSPI research teams. I am grateful to all those involved with creating the 2018 SSPI, which include Tristan Misko, Max Strongman, Ruotong Xu, Divya Venkataraman, Aadil Jamari, Frederick Dehmel, and Dalya Deuss, who also created the tables for this paper. Earlier teams included Ekaterina Fedorova, Tai Lohrer, Sangcheol Moon, Uma Krishnaswamy, Simon Saellstroem, Ryusuke Kondo, Jeff Suzuki, McCoy Cantwell, Michelle Tan, and Minh Nguyen. The paper benefitted from comments from Steve Vogel, Matthew Potts, Steve Raphael, Kurt Bayer, Wayne Chen, Brent Dixon, Ed Dolan, Teresa Ghilarducci, Jonathan Hall, Marlene Kim, Milorad Kovacevic, Eli Lazarus, Gordon McCord, Dan Nixon, Zachary Wendling, and Laszlo Zolnai. The Institute for Labor and Employment and the Undergraduate Research Apprenticeship Program at UC Berkeley provided administrative and financial support for this research project.

[2] SSPI 2018 data are available to the public here: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gI-8oqrsAELaEZzlq_OMsYYtZq7H581YGEHWFuuGRb4/edit?gid=0#gid=0

I. Introduction

The Sustainable, Shared-Prosperity Policy Index (SSPI) integrates three Pillars (Sustainability, Market Structure, and Public Goods) that measure the system of national policies that represent the government functions of protecting the environment, structuring markets, and delivering public goods and services, respectively. Nations vary widely in their national policies to provide for the common good and support the well-being of people and the environment. Although we can point out social goals and compare country outcomes using a variety of indices, to our knowledge no policy index exists that aggregates the policies set up to guide and support these outcomes. We created the SSPI to compare national policies in a way that provides a road map of how to create the social and economy system that generates these desired goals or outcomes.

The Sustainable, Shared-Prosperity Policy Index (SSPI) structures and measures national policies across three Pillars, which are composed of 16 categories :

- Market Structure: worker engagement, worker wellbeing, inequality, taxes, financial system.
- Public Goods: education, healthcare, infrastructure, rights, public safety, and global role.
- Sustainability: ecosystem, land, energy, greenhouse gases, waste.

The 16 categories are composed of 57 policy indicators. Each indicator measures how well a national policy supports a specific social goal relative to a benchmark policy. The policy indicators, which are measured using publicly available data, are normalized (between 0 and 100) and then aggregated into the categories, which are aggregated into the three Pillars, which are aggregated into the SSPI. We present the SSPI ranking of forty-nine countries (Table 1), and then their ranking for each of the three Pillars (Table 2) for 2018.

This paper focuses on eight policies that affect how the labor market operates and impacts workers and their wellbeing, with the comparison of United States policies to the policies of five other industrialized countries (France, Germany, Japan, United Kingdom, Sweden). For description of these policies and the data source, see the Labor Market Indicator Table (Table 3).

II. Background

The goal of the SSPI is to document the policies adopted by countries to create an economy that focuses on the well-being of people and the environment. National policies (laws, regulations, provision of public goods and services) along with culture and norms structure economic and social life. (Polanyi 1957; Brown 2016)

Who is in charge of the policies that structure markets and deliver basic goods and services is simultaneously determining socioeconomic outcomes. (Vogel 1996, 2018; Fligstein 2021; Coyle 2021; Hall and Soskice 2001; Sachs 2017) A major difference across countries is the role played by the government versus the role played by the private sector, especially big business and its allies. Market rules can be set by the government for the common good (social democracy), or they can be handed off to Big Business under the guise of "free markets" (neoliberalism). When markets are not competitive and are dominated by large companies, deregulation does not increase competition. Instead deregulation replaces government rules with company policies, and power shifts from the government to the large companies. (Vogel 2019, 2020; Stiglitz 2024, Coyle 2020)

Building on the foundation provided by this prior work, SSPI policy variables can be interpreted as indicating the extent to which national markets are structured and government programs are created to support specific outcomes that improve the well-being of the people or protect the environment. High scores indicate that national policies tend to support the desired goals, while low scores indicate weak versions of these policies. Unsurprisingly, socioeconomic policies vary significantly across countries.

Widely used economic indices, such as the UN Human Development Index, SDG Index, and Social Progress Index are used to measure economic *performance or outcomes*. A policy index, such as the SSPI, differs from a performance or well-being index. To our knowledge, no other policy index that brings together a broad range of economic policies exists across countries. Some indices may exist for a specific type of policy, such as the Competition Law Index, which measures the competition laws from 1889 to 2010 across 123 countries in order to examine competition regulations.[3] In another study, the OECD funded four surveys on how regulations

[3]Anu Bradford and Adam S. Chilton, The Competitive Law Index. www.comparativecompetitionlaw.org, 2018.

are made by countries in order to examine if the management of making regulations follows good regulatory practices.[4]

III. The Data

The SSPI is calculated for forty-nine countries, which include the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Group of Twenty (G20), plus another five countries classified as 'High income' (2018) by the World Bank 2018.[5] These countries include the largest and the most industrialized economics, for which much of the policy data are available and reliable. Collectively these countries account for 90% of world GDP and approximately two-thirds of the world population.[6]

The policy indicators were selected based on data that are well-defined and reliable, plus made publicly available over time. We only used data from credible organizations with extensive data covering many countries. Objective administrative data is selected over subjective individual survey data. In order to evaluate if two policy variables represented the same information, and were thus interchangeable, correlations of the variables were compared. When indicators are highly correlated and thought to represent the same information, then the indicator with more country observations or higher quality data is used. We also used sensitivity testing to evaluate how much an indicator, or the relevant category, varied when measured by different variables.

The Market Structure pillar brings together a wide array of policies that regulate and structure how markets function. The supply side is regulated through employment policies, income security and distribution, and taxation. The demand side is supported by the financial system supporting the effective operation of markets. The five Market Structure categories are Employment, Taxation, Financial System, and Inequality.

---

[4] http://www.oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/indicators-regulatory-policy-and-governance.htm

[5] The 37 OECD countries do not include Costa Rica (joined OECD in 2021). The World Bank High Income Countries (2018) have per person incomes above $12,055.

[6] World Development Indicators, "GDP (current $)" 2019. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD. Accessed 2 Aug. 2019. "Population, total" 2019, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL. Accessed 2 Aug. 2019. In order to include more developing countries, we also collected data for an additional eighteen countries. However their data availability and reliability were spotty, which constrained their comparability with the original forty-nine countries.

Public Goods is the broadest pillar and includes government programs of the goods and services that are typically supplied by the government. What unifies the Public Goods policies is that they are largely under direct control of the national or regional government. The Public Goods pillar includes six categories: Education, Health Care, Infrastructure, Rights, Public Safety, and Global Role.

The policies in the Public Goods and Market Structure pillars do not capture the responsibility that governments have to protect the environment for people today and for future generations, which explains the role of the Sustainability pillar. The Sustainability policies relate to the regulating the use of natural resources and the externalities resulting from degradation of our ecosystems. A company's production decisions are based on its costs, which typically do not include external costs related to public health or environmental deterioration. The public ends up paying the external costs of production through health problems, air and water pollution, and extreme weather. Sustainability policies measure the extent to which governments have policies in place to protect the environment. The pillar includes four categories: Ecosystems, Land, Energy, Greenhouse Gases, and Waste.

Pillars and the categories should be thought of as policies that operate within a system, rather than as individual policies that can be analyzed separately. For example, many types of policies affect how markets operate, or the health of the environment, or the quality of life. The question is to what degree a specific policy influences quality of life or the environment within the overall socioeconomic system. For example, the Worker Wellbeing and Worker Engagement categories bring together a wide range of policies that together create the quality of jobs, including benefits, worker protection, and earnings security.

All indicators are set up so that a higher score represents a superior outcome. This is important to remember is reading the scores and rankings. Each policy indicator is normalized to a value between 0 and 100, so that the widely varying data are expressed in comparable units. Indicators are normalized based upon minimum and maximum goalposts, which represent the hypothetical minimum and maximum for the policy variable, using the following formula:

$$Normalized\ indicator\ value = \frac{(observed\ value - \min goalpost)}{(\max goalpost - \min goalpost)}$$

When possible, we used internationally established norms as goalposts for policies. For policy indicators without an established norm, the historical values observed across countries are used

as a guide for what is possible by desirable policies, while allowing for continued improvement in future years, and also by observed undesirable policies to benchmark low performance.

The SSPI, Category and Pillar scores are aggregated using the arithmetic mean with equal weighting. Our starting position was to use equal weights to calculate the mean because it is widely used and because it attenuates bias and arbitrariness. However using equal weights implies all policies are equally important. We conducted sensitivity tests on the weights used at the two levels of aggregation—pillars and categories. For alternative weighting schemes, including unequal weights or geometric average, the rankings of countries were compared to the rankings achieved under equal weighting. Our decision to use standard arithmetic means is based on the low level of sensitivity of the rankings to the aggregation method used.

IV. Comparison of Policies Across Countries

Before analyzing national labor market policies, let us summarize how the six countries compare more broadly in the overall SSPI, and in their rankings in the three Pillars.

SSPI Country Rankings

Although the U.S. is the largest economy of the six countries, their ranking in the SSPI is the lowest. The United States doesn't fare much better when the countries are compared by pillars.

SSPI: U.S. (#38), Sweden (#3), France (#9), Germany (#10), Japan (#17), and United Kingdom (#22)

Market Structure: U.S. (#40) Sweden (#3), France (#4), Germany (#13), Japan (#23), and United Kingdom (#19)

Public Goods: U.S. (#37) Sweden (#3), France (#26), Germany (#12), Japan (#10), and United Kingdom (#25)

Sustainability: U.S. (#37) Sweden (#10), France (#20), Germany (#9), Japan (#23), and United Kingdom (#18)

Countries display variation in their rankings across the three Pillars. Sweden's weakest policies are in Sustainability; France has strong policies in Market Structure; and Japan's strongest policies are on Public Goods. Germany, U.K., and U.S. rankings don't display much variation across the three pillars, with German policies stronger than the U.K. policies, which are stronger than the U.S. policies.

Labor Market Policies Across Countries

Here we look in greater detail at eight labor market policies, which are part of the Market Structure Pillar, to understand how these six countries vary in policies that affect workers and their wellbeing. (See Table 4.)

Collective Bargaining. We set the stage by looking at the proportion of workers whose terms and conditions at work are determined by collective bargaining coverage [as opposed to individual contracts]. The United States stands out with its very low collective bargaining coverage rate of only 12% of workers. Japan follows with a bargaining coverage rate of 17%, followed by the United Kingdom rate of 26%. French workers have almost complete coverage, and Sweden has 90% of workers whose wages and conditions are covered by collective bargaining. Germany falls in the middle with 56% of workers covered by collective bargaining.

Unemployment Insurance. The U.S. has the weakest scores for six of the seven other policies, with Unemployment Insurance the exception. Japan has weaker Unemployment Insurance with only 22% of unemployed workers receiving benefits compared to 28% for U.S. unemployed. Unemployment Insurance provides important earnings security, and France and Germany provide all unemployed workers with some benefits. Sweden and the U.K. fall in the middle with 60% and 56% UI coverage.

Paid Maternity Leave. The United States is known by other countries for having no paid maternity leave mandated by national policy. In 2018, thirteen states provided some paid maternity paid, with all but one linked to the UI system with its relatively low benefits.[7] For the eight countries, the average benefit of full-rate paid equivalent weeks provided to new mothers was a low 3.2 weeks in the U.S., compared to 38.7 weeks in Germany, 32.5 weeks in Sweden, and 32 weeks in Japan. France's 18 weeks and U.K.'s 11.4 weeks are comparatively lower, yet considerably higher than the U.S. average.[8]

Child Labor. The U.S. also stands out as having a children labor rate that is statistically not zero, although it is small. The other five countries have child labor rates that are statistically

[7] The U.S, 2018 data were calculated from a web site that is now updated to 2024: https://bipartisanpolicy.org/explainer/state-paid-family-leave-laws-across-the-u-s/#:~:text=Thirteen%20states%20and%20the%20District,cover%20paid%20personal%20medical%20leave. For 2018, the percent of workers with maternity benefits is here https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2019/access-to-paid-and-unpaid-family-leave-in-2018.htm, and actual benefits paid in 2018 is found in U.S. BLS report National Compensation Survey—Benefits. Most workers have access to unpaid family leave.

[8] The weeks of paid maternity leave are converted to the number of full-time weeks at full pay, so the benefit is comparable across countries. The normalized score is shown, based on goal posts of minimum 0 and maximum 52 weeks, with only the paid leave provided for the first year.

zero; then their national policy is based on the years of compulsory education, which indicates the age at which young people can legally work full time. The goal posts for child labor rates [if nonzero] are minimum 0% and maximum 10% (inverted in rankings to make a higher number indicate a stronger policy); and the goal posts are minimum 5 and maximum 12 for the years of compulsory education if child labor rate is zero.

Fatal Workplace Injuries. Workplace health and safety policies cover a wide range of important rules that cannot be described with a specific variable that is reliable and consistent across countries. In this case we use a proxy indicator that represents workplace safety. Although this proxy does not cover the full range of health and safety policies required to protect workers, fatalities represent lack of a safe workplace in its most egregious state. Unfortunately the U.S. stands out again with five reported fatal injuries per 100,000 workers, compared to 2.6 in France, and 2 in Japan, which are also relatively high compared to 1.0 in Sweden and Germany, 0.8 in U.K. The normalized values shown are based on goalposts of minimum 0 and maximum 25, which is based on observed fatalities across the forty-nine countries.

Participation in Paid Work. Access to paid labor presents the opportunities made available in a country. This reflects a wide array of policies, including discrimination and culture, which are hard to represent with a specific policy, as well as education, which is a category in the Public Goods pillar. Here the percent of prime-aged people (25 to 54 years old) who are employed is used as a proxy for national policies governing employment opportunities. All six countries score well on this policy indicator, with the U.S. of 81.7% being the lowest, and Sweden's 91.2% being the highest. The other four countries, Japan 86.6%, U.K. 86.7%, Germany 87.3%, France 87.7%, have similar rates.

Income Share Ratio [bottom 50% as proportion of top 10%]. The comparison of pay of executives to worker pay and of pay across industries is important because it represents the inequality caused by the labor market, which is a primary determinant of a country's inequality. Here national income share of the bottom 50% divided by the national income share of the top 10% of households provides a proxy for the inequality of pay. Here the ratios show a wide range of inequality across the six countries, with the U.S. again at the bottom with the bottom 50% having only 0.29 of the income going to the top 10%. Sweden has the highest ratio of 0.83, followed by France's 0.67, the U.K.'s 0.57, Germany's 0.50, and Japan 0.41. If the national goal were equity, the bottom 50% would have closer to five times the income of the top 10%. However, the country data show this isn't possible. Therefore the goal posts used to normalize

this indicator have a minimum 0.2 and maximum of 1.25. This assumes the best to be expected is the bottom 50% have total incomes that are only 25% more that the total incomes of the top 10%.

Retirement Wellbeing. Employment benefits include retirement benefits, which are based on the years of retirement and retirement income. The age of retirement reflect national policy, and the actual retirement income includes primarily what the worker receives from employment plans and from national social security plans. Here the expected years of retirement are calculated as expected years of longevity minus the national age of retirement. The actual retirement income by country is not available. As a proxy for adequate retirement income by country is the percentage of seniors (age 65 years plus) living in relative income poverty, which is converted to represent the percentage of seniors with nonpoor income. The normalization of the aggregation of these two variables provides the score for Retirement Wellbeing. Again the U.S. has the lowest score of 0.495, closely followed by Japan's 0.545. France has the highest score of 0.882, followed by Germany's 0.713, Sweden's 0.654, and the U.K. 0.638.

V. Conclusion

The Sustainable Shared-Prosperity Policy Index provides an index of the national economic policies of forty-nine countries and ranks them by the extent to which the policies support the residents' quality of life and protect the environment. This systematic policy map divides policies into three pillars (Market Structure, Public Goods, and Sustainability) that represent the government functions of structuring markets, delivering programs and services, and protecting the environment. The SSPI allows a direct comparison of countries by their scores across policies.

This paper compares the United States to five other highly developed countries (France, Germany, Japan, Sweden, United Kingdom) in eight labor market policies from the Market Structure Pillar (Collective Bargaining Coverage, Unemployment Benefits Coverage, Paid Maternity Leave, Fatal Workplace Injuries, Child labor Rate, Participation in Paid Work, Retirement Wellbeing, and Income Share Ratio). The eight labor market policies account for fifteen of the policies in the Market Structure pillar, and the six countries display a wide variation in their Market Structure rankings: Sweden ranks #3 and France #4, Germany ranks #13, the U.K. ranks #19, and Japan ranks #23. The United States ranks a low #40 (out of the forty-nine countries). In comparison of the six countries on eight labor market policies, the

United States stands out with weak scores for all eight labor market policies. The U.S. also ranks in the bottom half of the forty-nine countries for each of the eight labor market policies.

Comparison of the labor market polices shows that the inequality of earnings, which feed into the income share of the bottom 50% compared to the top 10%, is weak for all six countries. The highest ratio is Sweden's 0.83, with the bottom 50% of the households receiving even less (83%) than the income share going to the top 10%. The U.S. ratio (0.29) indicates that the share going to the bottom 50% is only 35% of Sweden's share.

We can use the policy scores to understand the weak and strong policies for each country, and how a country might improve a weak policy by learning from other countries. A comparison of France and Germany policies shows that France can increase paid maternity leave and reduce workplace fatalities, and Germany can increase collective bargaining coverage and improve retirement benefits [income and years of retirement]. Compared to France and Germany, Sweden can improve unemployment benefit coverage, the years of compulsory education, and the retirement benefits. Compared to these three countries, Japan and the U.K. can increase their collective bargaining coverage; Japan can also increase the unemployment benefit coverage, and the U.K. can increase the weeks of paid maternity leave.

In summary, the SSPI shows how you can measure and compare policies across countries, and how countries might design policies to improve the nation's quality of life. The U.S. can improve its labor market policies to improve the lives of workers, as the policies of the selected six countries demonstrate. The low ranking policies of the U.S. indicate that this reflects politics rather than market constraints, and also that employers do not voluntarily adopt specific workplace policies that improve the quality of jobs unless the policy is mandated.

References

Brown, Clair. (2016). *Buddhist Economics.* New York: Bloomsbury Press.

Coyle, Diane. (2020). *Markets, State, and People: Economics for Public Policy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fligstein, Neil. (2002)., *The Architect of Markets.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hall, Peter A. and David Soskice. (2001). *Varieties of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polanyi, Karl. (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart

Sachs, Jeffrey D. (2017). *Building the New American Economy: Smart, Fair, and Sustainable.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2024). *The Road to Freedom: Economics and the Good Society*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Vogel, Steven K. (1996) *Freer markets, more rules: Regulatory reform in advanced industrial countries.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

_____. (2018). *Marketcraft: How Governments Make Markets Work.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. "The Marketcraft Solution," paper presented at the conference A New Deal for this New Century: Making Our Economy Work for All, New York University Global Academic Center, Washington, DC.

_____. Neoliberal Ideology and the Myth of the Self-Made Entrepreneur. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3698179

Table 1: SSPI Rankings		
Rank	**Country**	**SSPI Score**
1	Denmark	0.761
2	Norway	0.758
3	Sweden	0.755
4	Austria	0.745
5	Belgium	0.734
6	Iceland	0.728
7	Finland	0.725
8	Slovenia	0.718
9	France	0.706
10	Germany	0.703
11	Netherlands	0.702
12	Luxembourg	0.700
13	Czech Republic	0.694
14	Switzerland	0.685
15	Spain	0.675
16	Latvia	0.675
17	Japan	0.671
18	Slovak Republic	0.669
19	Estonia	0.665
20	Italy	0.665
21	Lithuania	0.664
22	United Kingdom	0.663
23	Ireland	0.658
24	Hungary	0.657
25	Portugal	0.655
26	Uruguay	0.655
27	New Zealand	0.648
28	Poland	0.648
29	Australia	0.640
30	Canada	0.633
31	Singapore	0.630
32	Greece	0.629
33	Korea, Rep.	0.622
34	Argentina	0.572
35	Israel	0.571
36	Brazil	0.569
37	Chile	0.565
38	United States	0.562
39	China	0.528
40	Turkey	0.526
41	Russian Federation	0.524
42	Indonesia	0.518
43	Kuwait	0.507
44	Mexico	0.506
45	United Arab Emirates	0.501
46	Colombia	0.495
47	South Africa	0.480
48	Saudi Arabia	0.465
49	India	0.445

Table 2: SSPI Pillar Rankings

Sustainability			Market Structure			Public Goods		
Rank	**Country**	**Score**	**Rank**	**Country**	**Score**	**Rank**	**Country**	**Score**
1	Latvia	0.706	**1**	Austria	0.772	**1**	Norway	0.907
2	Norway	0.647	**2**	Denmark	0.760	**2**	Denmark	0.885
3	Hungary	0.642	**3**	Sweden	0.760	**3**	Sweden	0.884
4	Slovenia	0.641	**4**	France	0.746	**4**	Luxembourg	0.863
5	Czech Republic	0.640	**5**	Iceland	0.746	**5**	Austria	0.848
6	Lithuania	0.639	**6**	Belgium	0.739	**6**	Finland	0.848
7	Denmark	0.638	**7**	Finland	0.730	**7**	Switzerland	0.847
8	Slovak Republic	0.628	**8**	Norway	0.720	**8**	Netherlands	0.845
9	Germany	0.621	**9**	Slovenia	0.696	**9**	Belgium	0.844
10	Sweden	0.621	**10**	Netherlands	0.690	**10**	Japan	0.836
11	Belgium	0.617	**11**	Czech Republic	0.660	**11**	Iceland	0.836
12	Austria	0.614	**12**	Luxembourg	0.655	**12**	Germany	0.834
13	Poland	0.613	**13**	Germany	0.654	**13**	Portugal	0.822
14	Switzerland	0.607	**14**	Spain	0.650	**14**	Slovenia	0.815
15	Iceland	0.603	**15**	Australia	0.643	**15**	New Zealand	0.813
16	Estonia	0.602	**16**	New Zealand	0.639	**16**	Singapore	0.813
17	Finland	0.597	**17**	Italy	0.629	**17**	Canada	0.810
18	United Kingdom	0.595	**18**	Slovak Republic	0.618	**18**	Ireland	0.807
19	Ireland	0.594	**19**	United Kingdom	0.611	**19**	Australia	0.802
20	France	0.593	**20**	Uruguay	0.606	**20**	Korea, Rep.	0.801
21	Uruguay	0.593	**21**	Estonia	0.602	**21**	Spain	0.800
22	Italy	0.587	**22**	Switzerland	0.599	**22**	Lithuania	0.798
23	Japan	0.583	**23**	Japan	0.594	**23**	Estonia	0.792
24	Luxembourg	0.582	**24**	Canada	0.581	**24**	Czech Republic	0.781
25	Spain	0.576	**25**	Portugal	0.579	**25**	United Kingdom	0.781
26	Singapore	0.574	**26**	Hungary	0.576	**26**	France	0.779
27	Netherlands	0.573	**27**	Poland	0.574	**27**	Latvia	0.779
28	Brazil	0.567	**28**	Ireland	0.572	**28**	Italy	0.777
29	Portugal	0.565	**29**	Greece	0.568	**29**	Greece	0.771
30	Greece	0.549	**30**	Korea, Rep.	0.561	**30**	Uruguay	0.765
31	Colombia	0.525	**31**	Israel	0.559	**31**	Slovak Republic	0.762
32	Argentina	0.519	**32**	Lithuania	0.556	**32**	Poland	0.758
33	Indonesia	0.510	**33**	Latvia	0.539	**33**	Hungary	0.753
34	Canada	0.507	**34**	Brazil	0.524	**34**	Israel	0.736
35	Korea, Rep.	0.502	**35**	Chile	0.519	**35**	Chile	0.698
36	Russian Federation	0.499	**36**	China	0.511	**36**	Argentina	0.695
37	United States	0.497	**37**	Argentina	0.503	**37**	United States	0.692
38	New Zealand	0.493	**38**	Singapore	0.503	**38**	United Arab Emirates	0.691
39	Mexico	0.489	**39**	Russian Federation	0.499	**39**	Kuwait	0.664
40	Turkey	0.481	**40**	United States	0.497	**40**	Turkey	0.661
41	Chile	0.479	**41**	Kuwait	0.446	**41**	China	0.647
42	Australia	0.475	**42**	South Africa	0.441	**42**	Brazil	0.617
43	India	0.447	**43**	Indonesia	0.437	**43**	Indonesia	0.606
44	United Arab Emirates	0.445	**44**	Turkey	0.437	**44**	Mexico	0.594
45	South Africa	0.436	**45**	Mexico	0.434	**45**	Saudi Arabia	0.589
46	China	0.427	**46**	Colombia	0.423	**46**	Russian Federation	0.576
47	Israel	0.419	**47**	Saudi Arabia	0.411	**47**	South Africa	0.562
48	Kuwait	0.412	**48**	India	0.399	**48**	Colombia	0.536
49	Saudi Arabia	0.396	**49**	United Arab Emirates	0.366	**49**	India	0.489

Table 3: Labor Market Indicator Table

Indicator	Description	Source
Collective Bargaining Coverage	The proportion of workers whose terms and conditions at work are determined by collective bargaining [as opposed to individual contracts].	ILO
Unemployment Benefits Coverage	Percentage of unemployed receiving unemployment benefits.	ILO
Paid Maternity Leave	Paid parental leave available to mothers (full-rate equivalent) in weeks during the first year.	OECD
Child Labor Rate	Conditional scoring based on two policies: 1. If the child labor rate is statistically nonzero, a country scores between 0.00 and 0.50 based on its level of child labor. 2. If the child labor rate in a country is statistically indistinguishable from zero, a country scores between 0.50 and 1.00 based on years of compulsory education.	SDG (8.7.1)
Fatal Workplace Injuries	Number of fatal injuries per 100,000 workers.	ILO
Participation in Paid Employment	The sum of all employed workers ages 25-54 divided by the total number of people in that age group.	OECD
Retirement Wellbeing	Arithmetic average of the following measures: 1. Expected number of years in retirement 2. Percentage of individuals over the age of 65 living in relative income poverty (converted to percentage of seniors with nonpoor incomes)	OECD
Income Share Ratio	The pre-tax national income share of the bottom 50% of households divided by the pre-tax national income share of the top 10% of households.	WID

Table 4: SSPI Scores for Labor Market Policies

Indicator	France	Sweden	Germany	UK	Japan	USA
Collective Bargaining Coverage	0.99	0.90	0.56	0.26	0.17	0.12
Unemployment Benefits Coverage	1.00	0.60	1.00	0.56	0.22	0.28
Paid Maternity Leave	18.0	32.5	38.7	11.7	32.2	3.2
Child Labor Rate	0.93	0.79	1.0	0.93	0.79	0.49
Fatal Workplace Injuries	2.6	1.0	1.0	0.8	2.0	5.2
Participation in Paid Work	0.877	0.912	0.873	0.867	0.866	0.817
Retirement Wellbeing	0.88	0.65	0.71	0.64	0.55	0.50
Income Share Ratio	0.67	0.83	0.50	0.57	0.41	0.29

Note: In calculating the Pillars and SSPI scores, the normalized SSPI scores are used for all policy indicators. Above the normalized SSPI scores are shown for Child Labor Rate, and Retirement Wellbeing. In order to understand the data for the other policies, the actual proportions are shown for Collective Bargaining Coverage, Unemployment Benefits Coverage, Participation in Paid Work, and Income Share Ratio. Paid Maternity Leave is shown in full-time, full-wage weeks equivalent, and the actual number is given for Fatal Workplace Injuries.