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1. INTRODUCTION

The ESCAP *Inequality of Opportunity* analysis uses two new methodological tools to measure inequality in the distribution of basic services and to identify the furthest behind in the same development areas. In both methods, population groups are defined by common circumstances over which the individual has little or no direct control.

The analysis explores inequality in key areas affecting a person’s life prospects: education, women’s access to sexual or reproductive health, women’s early childbearing, child marriage, justification of violence against women, financial inclusion and Internet use, and children’s nutrition. These opportunities and barriers are covered by specific commitments outlined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

This report starts by reviewing overall inequality of opportunity levels, situating Kiribati among other countries in the Asia-Pacific region (Section 2). It then zooms into Kiribati to identify the shared circumstances of population groups that are left furthest behind in areas with significant inequality (Section 3).

1.1 The selected variables

In Kiribati, nine opportunities and two barriers are identified where significant inequality prevents people from fulfilling their potential. The variables are selected based on availability in the MICS dataset, their link to SDG indicators and their importance for overall development.

**Basic drinking water**: Clean water is not only vital for survival, but also for supporting a healthy and productive population. Access to clean water is critical for achieving gender equality and enhancing women’s empowerment, as women usually bear the brunt of collecting clean water.

**Basic sanitation**: The use of improved facilities that are not shared with other households and where excreta is safely disposed helps to maintain health and increase lifespans. Inequality in basic sanitation threatens human dignity and constitutes a major economic and health burden.

**Access to clean fuels**: Reliable and affordable energy services are fundamental to everyday life. Equality in access to clean energy increases productivity, reduces health disparities, and bolsters gender equality.

**Electricity**: Access to electricity underpins several other crucial opportunities, such as Internet use and modern medical treatment. Reliable electricity significantly reduces the burden of domestic labor and creates additional opportunities for entrepreneurship or increased secondary or higher educational attainment.

**Internet use**: ICTs are indispensable in boosting productivity and economic activity, enabling knowledge and information sharing, and broadening the delivery of services. Inequality in the use of the Internet creates deep divides that are expected to amplify as technology reshapes lives.

**Prevalence of women’s attitude towards domestic violence**: The acceptance of the use of violence to uphold certain gender roles in society can signal a broader acceptance of violence against women in intimate relationships. These gender roles include whether a woman goes out without telling her husband, whether she neglects the children, she argues with him, she refuses sex with him, or she burns the food.

**Demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods**: Use of modern contraceptive methods remains the first step towards positive sexual or reproductive health outcomes for all women. Inequality in the use of modern contraceptives renders some women more likely to experience unintended pregnancies, which can result in disability and even death. Tightly spaced births also have significant cognitive and nutritional consequences for children.
Completion of secondary and higher education: Inequality in education matters because more education often results in a better job with higher incomes and a chance to break patterns of poverty and vulnerability. Inequality in access to basic sanitation and clean fuels is also associated with inequality in educational attainment.

Stunting in children under 5 years of age: Inequality among children’s (or pregnant and nursing mothers’) nutrition levels matters because proper nutrition provides the foundation upon which developmental progress is built. As children receive poorer nutrition, they are therefore more likely to be stunted and face cognitive and developmental consequences of malnutrition in the long-term.

Bank account ownership: Owning a bank account encourages saving, enables people to obtain loans and provides a secure channel for payments in the form of remittances, government cash transfer and salaries. Inequality in access to formal financial services amplifies existing divisions in communities and societies.

1.2 Relevance in the context of COVID-19

The results of this analysis are as timely as ever. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the need to consider and address the vulnerabilities of the most marginalized segments of the population. While everyone can become infected, people living in poverty or who are otherwise disadvantaged may be less well equipped to cope with the socioeconomic impacts of this health crisis.

For example, the Internet has proved crucial for navigating the new realities brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. Access to the Internet equates access to crucial health information. It also enables connections amidst social distancing measures and helps mitigate some of its economic effects, by allowing working from home, e-commerce and e-learning. Groups with the limited access and use of the Internet may therefore cope less well with the social and economic consequences of the pandemic.

Closures of universities and other educational institutions due to the pandemic could exacerbate the gap in secondary and higher education completion. The socioeconomic disadvantages of the furthest behind groups may therefore hamper their ability to follow e-learning from their place of residence. Women might face added pressures to abandon their studies, while students in households without Internet access would likely fall further behind. Similarly, school and health clinic closures may also restrict access to sexual and reproductive health education or services among younger women.

Inequality in these areas was already concerning before the pandemic. While Kiribati has not yet experienced an outbreak within its borders, and hopefully never will, the consequences of the pandemic will reverberate globally. Its lessons must also reach citizens of all countries. This analysis will help focus the attention of the UN Country Team and the Government of Kiribati to reach the furthest behind.
2. MEASURING INEQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

What is the D-Index?

Rising inequality is a concern across the developed and developing world alike. Sustainable Development Goal 10 highlights the pressing need to reduce inequality in all its forms.

Inequality refers to the unequal distribution not only of income and wealth, but also of opportunities and services. Inequality of opportunity undermines the realization of human rights and constitutes a barrier for social mobility.

The dissimilarity index (D-Index) measures how different groups - such as women, poorer households, or rural residents - fare in terms of access to a certain opportunity, or how different groups disproportionately experience a certain barrier. Like the Gini coefficient, the D-Index ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates no inequality, and 1 indicates that the entire access to a service is reserved to a specific group of people with shared circumstances (e.g. men from urban areas).

Building the D-Index

To obtain the D-Index, inequality in access to an opportunity (or in the prevalence of a barrier) is generated by the formula:

\[
D = \frac{1}{2\bar{p}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i |p_i - \bar{p}|
\]

- \( \beta_i \) is the proportion of the group \( i \) in the sample, (sum of \( \beta_i \) equals 1)
- \( \bar{p} \) is the average access rate in the country
- \( p_i \) is the level of access of population group \( i \), and takes values from 0 to 1
- \( n \) is the number of groups defined by different circumstances

Based on the interactions between circumstances, the entire sample is divided into distinct population groups. The D-Index is therefore the weighted average of the absolute difference between distinct population groups with shared circumstances and the average access rate in the country (\( \bar{p} \)). The analysis draws on data from latest available Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) or Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS).

Which opportunities or barriers is ESCAP measuring?

### Household opportunities
- access to basic drinking water
- access to basic sanitation
- access to electricity
- access to clean fuels
- ownership of a bank account
- use of the Internet

### Individual opportunities
- completion of secondary education
- completion of higher education
- Demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods
- access to skilled birth attendance during childbirth

### Individual barriers
- prevalence of stunting, wasting and overweight in children under 5 years of age
- sexual or physical violence against women
- prevalence of early childbearing
- prevalence of child marriage
2.1 Average D-Index in Asia and the Pacific, by opportunity or barrier

Source: ESCAP calculations using data from the latest DHS and MICS for 24 countries in Asia and the Pacific.

Note: The D-Index for Internet use, sexual or physical violence against women and prevalence of stunting, wasting and overweight among children under 5 years of age reflect data from fewer than 24 countries, because some surveys did not ask these questions. The analysis has been adapted so that the D-Index of a barrier (e.g. sexual or physical violence against women) still has the same interpretation as that of an opportunity: the lower the D-index the lower the inequality. Prevalence of early childbearing and child marriage are not displayed at the regional level due to on-going data processing.
### 2.2 Average D-Index in Asia and the Pacific, by country

Source: ESCAP calculations using data from the latest DHS and MICS for 24 countries in Asia and the Pacific.

Note: Average D-Index for all countries includes access to clean fuels, basic sanitation, basic drinking water, electricity, bank account ownership, secondary education, higher education, demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods, and skilled birth attendance during childbirth. The variables Internet use, sexual or physical violence against women, and prevalence of stunting, wasting and overweight among children under 5 years of age were considered only for those countries with available data, where surveys asked the questions. Prevalence of early childbearing and child marriage are not displayed at the regional level due to ongoing data processing.
2.3 D-Index in Kiribati, by opportunity or barrier

Source: ESCAP elaboration using data from the latest MICS (2019).

Note: In general, the D-Index measures the distribution of a positive outcome. Justification of violence against women, child marriage, early childbearing, and stunting in children under 5 years of age are not positive outcomes, but rather a barrier for women’s and children’s fulfilment in life. The analysis has been adapted so that the D-Index of a barrier (e.g., prevalence of stunting) still has the same interpretation as that of an opportunity: the lower the D-Index the lower the inequality. The remaining calculations follow the same formula as for standard positively defined indicators.
3. IDENTIFYING THE FURTHEST BEHIND

The classification and regression tree (CART) methodology

The commitment to leave no one behind is enshrined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A methodological approach to identify those furthest behind in access to opportunities or those who face disproportionately higher barriers is a first step towards guaranteeing that no one is left behind.

The classification and regression tree (CART) methodology is an analytical structure that identifies population groups with distinct access levels to opportunities or occurrence of barriers. A total of nine opportunities and two barriers are considered, as shown in the next section. The analysis draws on the MICS for Kiribati in 2019. Behind the classification and regression tree methodology is an algorithm that looks at each circumstance, separates households or individuals into different groups based on significantly different access levels and stops when no “information gain” can be generated by a new partition.

3.1 Who are the furthest behind in Kiribati?

![Classification Tree Diagram]

The classification tree shows that on average, 76 per cent of households have access to clean water. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households belonging to the bottom 40 per cent of the wealth distribution, whose most educated member has lower or no education, among which only 53 per cent have access to clean water (compared to 94 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, 42 per cent of households have access to basic sanitation. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households belonging to the bottom 40 per cent of household wealth distribution whose most educated member has lower education, among which 22 per cent have access to basic sanitation (compared to 70 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, 48 per cent of households have access to electricity. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households belonging to the bottom 40 per cent of household wealth, among which only 14 per cent have access to electricity (compared to 89 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, 9 per cent of households have access to clean fuels. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households in rural areas that have a household wealth in the bottom 40 per cent, for which the rate of access to clean fuels is less than 1 per cent (compared to 18 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, 47 per cent of individuals use the Internet. The red box shows the furthest behind group: people with lower or secondary educational attainment over the age of 25 who live in households belonging to the bottom 40 per cent of wealth distribution, among whom 13 per cent use the Internet (compared to 85 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, 41 per cent of households include a member who owns a bank account. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households belonging to the bottom 40 per cent of household wealth whose most educated member has lower education, among which less than 8 per cent include a member who owns a bank account (compared to 86 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, the secondary school completion rate is 18 per cent. The red box shows the furthest behind group: men living in households where the wealth is in the bottom 40 per cent, among whom the rate of secondary school completion is 4 per cent (compared to 29 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, the rate of higher education completion is 7 per cent. The red box shows the furthest behind group: people living in households where the wealth is in the bottom 40 per cent, among whom the rate of higher education completion is 1 per cent (compared to 11 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, 70 per cent of women tolerate or condone violence against women. The red box shows the furthest behind group: women 25 years of age or older with lower or secondary educational attainment, among whom 78 per cent tolerate the use of violence against women under certain circumstances (compared to 62 per cent in the best-off group).

This indicator refers to the attitudes towards violence against women, as a proxy indicator of the level of tolerance for the use of violence against women in an intimate relationship. The indicator is constructed by analyzing the proportion of women who believe their partner is justified in beating them if: 1) they go out without telling him, 2) they neglect the children, 3) they argue with him, 4) they refuses sex with him, 5) they burn the food.
The classification tree shows that demand for family planning is satisfied with modern methods for 51 per cent of women, on average. The red box shows the furthest behind group: women under 25 years of age with fewer than two children under 5, among whom 40 per cent had their demands for family planning satisfied with modern methods (compared to 63 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, on average, the rate of stunting for children under the age of 5 is 15 per cent. The red box shows the furthest behind group: children from households with wealth in the bottom 40 per cent whose mothers have lower or secondary educational attainment, among whom the rate of stunting is 21 per cent (compared to 11 per cent in the best-off group).
3.2 Does religious affiliation matter for determining the furthest behind?

The commitment to leave no one behind is enshrined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A methodological approach to identify those furthest behind in access to opportunities or those who face disproportionately higher barriers is a first step towards guaranteeing that no one is left behind.

In Kiribati, the MICS 2019 included questions on religious affiliation. Replicating the classification and regression tree (CART) methodology to include these identities alter the composition of the furthest behind groups in several trees, including: basic drinking water; prevalence of women’s attitude towards domestic violence; demand for family planning satisfied by modern methods; electricity; Internet use; basic sanitation; and stunting in children under 5 years of age. The tree is only shown if these additional variables also form identities of the furthest behind group, and the sample size of the group is over 5 per cent of the population.

The classification tree shows that, after including religious affiliation as an additional variable, households whose members identify with the Uniting Church or as belonging to a minor religion are less likely to have access to clean drinking water when compared to other religious affiliations among poorer households. For wealthier households, religious identity does not differentiate rates of access to clean water. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households with wealth in the bottom 40 per cent, whose members identify with the Church of Latter-Day Saints, the Uniting Church, or as belonging to a minor religion, and whose most educated members has lower educational attainment. These households have a basic drinking water access rate of 53 per cent (compared with 97 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, after including religious affiliation as an additional variable, women who identify as Roman Catholics are more likely to tolerate or condone violence against women than women with other religious affiliations. This effect is consistent across a spectrum of educational attainment. The red box shows the furthest behind group: Roman Catholic women aged 25 or older with lower or secondary educational attainment, who live in households belonging to the bottom 40 per cent of household wealth. Among this group, on average, 81 per cent of women tolerate or condone violence against women (compared with 61 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, after including religious affiliation as an additional variable, women who identify as members of the Church of Latter-Day Saints or as Roman Catholics are less likely to have their demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods than women of other religious affiliations. Religious identity represents the first split in the classification tree, indicating that this is the most influential circumstance for showing which women in Kiribati are having their needs for modern family planning met and which are not. The red box shows the furthest behind group: women under the age of 25 with higher educational attainment who identify as members of the Church of Latter-Day Saints or as Roman Catholics. Among this group, only 30 per cent of women have their needs for family planning met with modern methods (compared with 70 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, after including religious affiliation as an additional variable, religious identity is an important circumstance for showing which households have access to electricity. The religious identities associated with higher or lower access to electricity can shift depending on a household’s level of wealth. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households belonging to the bottom 40 per cent of wealth whose members identify with the Uniting Church have an average rate of access to electricity of 10 per cent (compared with 89 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, after including religious affiliation as an additional variable, religious affiliation can be an influential factor for showing who uses the Internet in Kiribati when combined with household wealth. In general, individuals living in households in the bottom 40 per cent of the wealth distribution, who identify as Roman Catholics or as members of the Church of Latter-Day Saints are less likely to use the Internet than their counterparts of other religious identities. This effect is not evident for individuals living in households in the top 60 per cent of household wealth. The red box shows the furthest behind group: individuals with lower or secondary education over the age of 35 who identify as Roman Catholic or as a member of the Church of Latter-Day Saints and who live in poorer households. Among this group, only 7.5 per cent use the Internet (compared with 85 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, after including religious affiliation as an additional variable, households whose members identify as Roman Catholics tend to have lower access to basic sanitation when compared to other religious affiliations. The red box shows the furthest behind group: households with wealth in the bottom 40 per cent, who most educated member has lower educational attainment, and whose members identify as Roman Catholic or Catholic or Protestant have, on average, a 20 per cent rate of access to basic sanitation (compared with 75 per cent in the best-off group).
The classification tree shows that, after including religious affiliation as an additional variable, children under 5 years of age from families who identify as belonging to the Church of Latter-Day Saints tend to have higher rates of stunting than children from families with other religious identities. Other religious identities may also have children with high rates of stunting depending on the mother’s level of educational attainment. The red box shows the furthest behind group: children under five years of age whose mothers have a lower or secondary level of attainment, have fewer than three children under age 5, from a household with wealth in the bottom 40 per cent, and whose families identify as members of the Church of Latter-Day Saints or the Uniting Church. For these children, there is a 26 per cent rate of stunting (compared with 8 per cent in the best-off group).
4. CONCLUSION

There are many circumstances shaping access to different opportunities or the experience of a certain barrier by different groups. This analysis is restricted to those circumstances (variables) available in the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) for Kiribati. The classification and regression tree (CART) analysis used in this study only presents circumstances if they are found to significantly explain gaps in access between groups (reduce ‘entropy’ and increase ‘information gain’). Ultimately, these circumstances define the composition of the groups, but should not be interpreted as causes of a lower access.

The study has shed light on the layers of characteristics (circumstances) shared by the furthest behind group in basic drinking water, prevalence of women’s attitude towards domestic violence, demand for family planning satisfied by modern methods, electricity, Internet use, basic sanitation, bank account ownership, completion of secondary and higher education, stunting in children under 5 years of age, and access to clean fuels. The figure below summarizes the information obtained from the trees presented above, highlighting the average rate, the rate of the best-off group, as well as the rate of the furthest behind group.

The findings are of direct use for generating discussions on transformations needed to “leave no one behind” and reach the “furthest behind first” as pledged in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Considering the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, the groups that are furthest behind need to be brought into focus more urgently than ever.
4.1 How large are the gaps in access to opportunities or prevalence of barriers?

Source: ESCAP elaboration using data from the latest MICS 2019 survey.

Source: ESCAP elaboration using data from the latest MICS 2019 survey.
Summary of gaps between the best off and the furthest behind groups

Source: ESCAP elaboration using data from the latest MICS 2019 survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Sample size of reference population</th>
<th>Average rate</th>
<th>Size of best-off group</th>
<th>Rate of best-off group</th>
<th>Size of the furthest behind group</th>
<th>Rate of the furthest behind group</th>
<th>Gap in rate between the best-off and the furthest behind group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Basic drinking water</td>
<td>3071</td>
<td>79.73%</td>
<td>45.31%</td>
<td>97.33%</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>56.98%</td>
<td>40 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Violence justified against women</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>70.24%</td>
<td>24.81%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>32.59%</td>
<td>77.53%</td>
<td>15 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Demand for family planning satisfied by modern methods</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>51.09%</td>
<td>21.01%</td>
<td>62.56%</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
<td>40.28%</td>
<td>22 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>3071</td>
<td>48.35%</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>89.09%</td>
<td>46.19%</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>75 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Internet use</td>
<td>6233</td>
<td>47.49%</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
<td>84.60%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>13.14%</td>
<td>71 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Basic sanitation</td>
<td>3071</td>
<td>41.62%</td>
<td>15.04%</td>
<td>69.69%</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>22.32%</td>
<td>47 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Bank account</td>
<td>3071</td>
<td>41.30%</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>86.06%</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>78 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>4760</td>
<td>18.43%</td>
<td>30.37%</td>
<td>28.61%</td>
<td>18.38%</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>24 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Stunting in children under 5 years of age</td>
<td>2128</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>11.16%</td>
<td>26.81%</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
<td>10 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Clean fuels</td>
<td>3071</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
<td>47.68%</td>
<td>18.08%</td>
<td>43.81%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>18 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td>56.28%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>36.64%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>10 pp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of the characteristics of the furthest behind groups

Source: ESCAP elaboration using data from the latest MICS 2019 survey.

Note: B40 refers to households belonging to the bottom 40 of the wealth distribution; T60 refers to those at the top 60.
### Opportunities and barriers and their links to the SDGs

#### ANNEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities/Barriers (response variable)</th>
<th>Circumstances used to determine the furthest behind/best-off groups (independent variables)</th>
<th>Closest SDG Indicator reference</th>
<th>Related SDG indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled birth attendance</td>
<td>Wealth; Residence; Highest Education in household</td>
<td>4.1.1 Proportion of children who had an appropriately skilled birth attendant</td>
<td>4.1.1 Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to electricity</td>
<td>Wealth; Residence; Highest Education in household</td>
<td>7.1.1 Proportion of population with access to electricity</td>
<td>7.1.1 Proportion of population with access to electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to clean fuels</td>
<td>Wealth; Residence; Highest Education in household</td>
<td>7.1.2 Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology</td>
<td>7.1.2 Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of bank account (household)</td>
<td>Wealth; Residence; Highest Education in household</td>
<td>8.10.2 Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider</td>
<td>8.10.2 Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of bank account (individual)</td>
<td>Wealth; Residence; Gender</td>
<td>8.10.2 Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider</td>
<td>8.10.2 Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet use</td>
<td>Wealth; Gender; Highest Education in household; Household member</td>
<td>1.7.3 Proportion of individuals using the internet</td>
<td>1.7.3 Proportion of individuals using the internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual, physical or emotional violence</td>
<td>Wealth; Residence; Gender</td>
<td>5.2.1 Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by type of violence and by age</td>
<td>5.2.1 Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by type of violence and by age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women qualified</td>
<td>Wealth; Gender; Residence; Highest Education in household; Age group</td>
<td>5.2.1 Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by type of violence and by age</td>
<td>5.2.1 Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by type of violence and by age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey used for the analysis in this country brief was MICS 2019. Data on sexual, physical, or emotional violence were not available. Opportunities with close to universal access (skilled birth attendance) and barriers faced by very few (wasting and overweight in children under 5) were not analysed.
Gaps and limitations

The 11 indicators measuring access to household and individual opportunities or prevalence of barriers have been identified as areas where inequality jeopardizes a person’s life prospects. Each of these opportunities or barriers are covered by specific commitments outlined in the Sustainable Development Goals. The findings are of direct use for generating discussions on transformations needed to “leave no one behind” and reach the “furthest behind first” as pledged in the 2030 Agenda.

There are many variables shaping access to different opportunities or the prevalence of barriers. For example, distance from a health-care provider is an important circumstance that might shape the demand for family planning satisfied by modern methods. Similarly, distance to a banking institution may be a barrier for individuals seeking to open a bank account or conduct financial transactions. These variables are not measured in existing DHS and MICS surveys, so results have to be understood with this caveat.

Consistent with other similar studies on inequalities, this analysis does not consider inequality within groups or in households. Even with homogeneous groups, additional unobserved circumstances may affect outcomes.

The main reason for restricting age to 20-35 for secondary education and age 25-35 for higher education is to avoid: (1) skewing the results because of an older population with significantly lower education levels; and (2) including individuals that, because of their young age, could not have completed their education.

Wealth, as used in this report, is a composite index reflecting a household’s cumulative living standard, developed by the DHS and MICS researchers and combines a range of household circumstances including: a) ownership of household assets, such as TVs, radios and bicycles; b) materials used for housing; and c) type of water and sanitation facilities.

The classification and regression tree (CART) analysis only presents circumstances in the tree branches if they are found to reduce “entropy”. Ultimately, these circumstances define the composition of the groups, but should not be interpreted as “causes” of a lower opportunity or of higher barriers. There are also many other factors that could potentially impact the results, but because of data limitations have not been included.
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For further queries, please contact the Social Development Division of UN-ESCAP at escap-sdd@un.org

For thematic reports, please visit: https://www.unescap.org/our-work/social-development/poverty-and-inequality

For more information on the classification trees, please visit: https://www.socialprotection-toolbox.org/inequality
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