

1 SWPER Global: A survey-based women's empowerment index
2 expanded from Africa to all low- and middle-income countries
3

4 **Authors:**

5 *Fernanda Ewerling*^{1,2}

6 *Anita Raj*³

7 *Cesar G. Victora*^{1,2}

8 *Franciele Hellwig*^{1,2}

9 *Carolina V. N. Coll*^{1,2}

10 *Aluisio J. D. Barros*^{1,2}

11

12 **Affiliations:**

13 ¹International Center for Equity in Health, Federal University of Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil

14 ²Postgraduate Program in Epidemiology, Federal University of Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil

15 ³Center on Gender Equity and Health, University of California San Diego, US

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 ***Corresponding author - abarros@equidade.org**

1 Abstract

2 Introduction

3 In 2017, a survey-based women's empowerment index (SWPER) was proposed for African countries,
4 including three domains: social independence, decision making and attitude to violence. External
5 validity and predictive value of the SWPER has been demonstrated in terms of coverage of maternal
6 and child interventions and use of modern contraception. To determine its value for global monitoring,
7 we explored the applicability of the SWPER in national health surveys from low- and middle- income
8 countries (LMICs) in other world regions.

9 Methods

10 We used data from the latest Demographic and Health Survey for 62 LMICs since 2000. 14 pre-selected
11 questions (items) were considered during the validation process. Content adaptations included the
12 exclusion of women's working status and recategorization of the decision-making related items. We
13 compared the loading patterns obtained from principal components analysis performed for each
14 country separately with those obtained in a pooled dataset with all countries combined. Country
15 rankings based on the score of each SWPER domain were correlated with their rankings in the Gender
16 Development Index (GDI) and the Gender Inequality Index (GII) for external validation.

17 Results

18 Consistency regarding item loadings for the three SWPER empowerment domains was observed for
19 most countries. Correlations between the scores generated for each country and global score
20 obtained from the combined data were 0.89 or higher for all countries. Correlations between the
21 country rankings according to SWPER and GDI were, respectively, 0.74, 0.72 and 0.67 for social
22 independence, decision-making, and attitude to violence domains. The correlations were equal to
23 0.81, 0.67, and 0.44, respectively, with GII.

24 Conclusion

25 The indicator we propose, named SWPER Global, is a suitable common measure of women's
26 empowerment for LMICs, addressing the need for a single consistent survey-based indicator of
27 women's empowerment that allows for tracking of progress over time and across countries at the
28 individual and country levels.

29

1 Summary

2 What is already known?

- 3 • Although survey-based women’s empowerment indicators have been used in the literature,
4 until 2017 there was no indicator proposed for use in a large set of countries that would be
5 comparable between and within countries.
- 6 • In 2017, we proposed the Survey-based Women’s emPowERment indicator (SWPER,
7 pronounced as “super”), to be used in African countries, that encompasses three well
8 recognized domains of women’s empowerment (attitude to violence, social independence
9 and decision making).
- 10 • The external validity and predictive value of the SWPER has been demonstrated in terms of
11 coverage of maternal and child interventions and use of modern contraception.
- 12 • Validation of the index was restricted to African countries, and a common measure to allow
13 comparisons across low and middle-income countries (LMICs) from all world regions was still
14 lacking.

15 What are the new findings?

- 16 • We show that the SWPER Global may serve as a valid common measure of women’s
17 empowerment among LMICs, as consistent patterns were obtained for most countries and
18 world regions.
- 19 • The SWPER Global index addresses the need for a single cross-cultural standardized survey-
20 based indicator of women’s empowerment in the context of LMICs that enables
21 comparability between countries and over time and subgroup analyses, extending previously
22 proposed indicators such as the Gender Development Index which is limited to the country-
23 level

24 What do the new findings imply?

- 25 • The SWPER Global index enables the study of how women’s empowerment is linked to
26 developmental and health outcomes, allowing for broad comparisons across countries and
27 world regions.
- 28 • As a comprehensive cross-cultural standard tool, it also contributes to the monitoring and
29 accountability of country progress over time in advancing gender equality and women’s
30 empowerment.
- 31 • The new tool may help target and prioritize policy and advocacy efforts toward SDG 5
32 (achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls) at the regional and country
33 levels.

1 Introduction

2 Empowerment is a complex and multidimensional construct, often defined both as a process and an
3 outcome, by which individuals gain power over their lives and decisions (1). To be empowered, women
4 must not only have key assets (such as education and health) and access to opportunities (such as
5 employment), but also have the agency (i.e., perceived and actual self-efficacy and decision-making
6 control) to move from making planned choices to achieving one's self-determined goals (2,3). At the
7 individual level, empowerment involves women utilizing their assets, opportunities, and agency for
8 making purposive choices and engaging in behaviors to alter life circumstances. This may include
9 engagement in positive behaviors and action towards health and economic development (4–6). The
10 Millennium Development Goals raised the women's empowerment agenda in the recent past, by
11 recognizing its importance for health as well as development, yet gender inequalities persist (7,8).
12 Women's Human Development Index is, on average, 6% lower than that of men, with the widest gaps
13 observed in the poorest countries. Much of the gap is due to women's lower educational attainment,
14 economic participation and income (7,9). In 2015, the fifth Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) called
15 for "achievement of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls" as a vital goal for
16 accelerating sustainable development. However, there is no consensus on how to measure women's
17 empowerment and an internationally standardized indicator is still unavailable, which precludes
18 accountability in low-and middle-income countries (LMICs) (10).

19 In the recent years, some measures that capture gender inequalities in key socioeconomic and health
20 indicators (e.g., Gender Development Index, Global Gender Gap Index (7)), gender discrimination and
21 gender-related risks for women such as maternal mortality or adolescent motherhood (e.g., Social
22 Institutions and Gender Index (11), and the Gender Inequality Index (8)), or women's general
23 wellbeing including safety from violence such as the Women, Peace and Security Index (12), have
24 been proposed in the literature. However, most of these indices rely on national-level aggregate data
25 and cannot be disaggregated by region or population subgroups, limiting within-country comparisons.
26 Consideration of subgroups is very important to account for intersectionality, as it is known that
27 socially marginalized women, including those who are poorer, rural, less educated or reside in fragile
28 states, face greater risks to their health, well-being and even survival (13,14). Intersectionality is often
29 ignored (15). A few individual-level measures were also proposed (10,16,17), but most of these tools
30 were specifically designed for a given country or region, or a particular sector such as the Women's
31 Empowerment in Agriculture Index, which has a particular focus on women who are working in
32 agriculture (18,19).

1 In the context of LMICs, national Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) are a reliable source of
2 individual level information on socioeconomic characteristics, health, and development indicators
3 and, since 1999, have been incorporating questions on women’s empowerment that potentially
4 allows for comparisons within and between countries using an intersectional lens.

5 In 2017, a survey-based women’s empowerment index (SWPER) was developed and validated using
6 DHS data from 34 African countries (10). SWPER captures three empowerment domains indicative of
7 assets and agency:

- 8 1) Social independence: mainly composed by preconditions that enable women to achieve their
9 goals (schooling attainment, access to information, age at pivotal life events and spousal
10 asset differentials and access to information).
- 11 2) Decision-making: the extent of the woman’s participation is household decisions, which may
12 also be considered a measure of instrumental agency.
- 13 3) Attitudes to violence: closely related to the concept of intrinsic agency, as a proxy for the
14 woman’s incorporation of gender norms related to wife-beating acceptability.

15 The development of the SWPER used a similar conceptual framework further recently proposed by
16 Miedema *et al* (16), which describes three domains of empowerment: enabling conditions,
17 instrumental agency and intrinsic agency. Enabling conditions are considered preconditions that allow
18 women to gain more power (20), and these correspond to the asset and opportunity constructs
19 commonly focused upon in development economists’ definitions of empowerment (2,4). Instrumental
20 agency is the woman’s ability to make choices in the household, at family-level (16). Intrinsic agency
21 – or power within – is the process by which one develops a critical consciousness of one’s own
22 aspirations, capabilities, and rights (16,21,22), and can be viewed as an asset and opportunity
23 regarding safety of the environment or as a proxy for agency as safety would allow for greater ability
24 to act on choice (16).

25 The SWPER uses individual-level data, allowing for assessing associations between empowerment and
26 several health interventions and outcomes (10). The SWPER also allows within-country and between-
27 country comparisons, as well as time trend analyses. The items used to calculate the SWPER are
28 available for over 60 countries with a DHS. The external validity and predictive value of the African
29 SWPER has been demonstrated in terms of coverage of maternal and child interventions and use of
30 modern contraception (10). The SWPER attracted interest from the academic community and
31 international agencies. In July 2018, a workshop with experts on women’s empowerment was held in

- 1 Washington, DC, co-organized by PAHO and the Countdown to 2030 (23,24) to allow a comprehensive
- 2 debate on definitions of women’s empowerment and the expansion of SWPER beyond Sub-Saharan
- 3 Africa, especially in respect to the Latin American context (see Panel 1 for details). Feedback from the
- 4 workshop prompted us to develop and test a global version of the SWPER that would allow its use in
- 5 all LMICs.

In July 2018, an expert workshop was held in Washington, DC, bringing together a panel of experts with the aim of discussing how to best adapt the SWPER for use in Latin America and other world regions (<https://equidade.org/news/123/expert-group-workshop-on-women-39-s-empowerment-in-the-lac-region>). The workshop was co-organized by PAHO/WHO and the Countdown to 2030 and counted with the participation of over 20 experts from multilateral organizations and universities (participants will be listed in the acknowledgements upon their agreement).

A series of suggestions for improving the indicator were made, notably:

- (1) Exclude the woman’s working status item, which was considered too simplistic to indicate whether or not work was empowering women, given that women may work because they are forced to work due to circumstance, and may not even be paid for this work;
- (2) For the questions on who decides on health care utilization and household expenses, give equal weight to joint decisions (with the partner or another person) and woman’s deciding alone;
- (3) Add items related to sexual and reproductive autonomy, decision-making on the use of the woman’s income, ownership of house or land; and access to technology, such as mobile phones; and
- (4) Include unpartnered women to allow the assessment of empowerment in this group.

The currently proposed version of the SWPER Global incorporates the first two recommendations. Given the constraints of the data currently available in surveys and the need for a readily available measure of women’s empowerment, the latter two recommendations were not incorporated at this time. We acknowledge these limitations and commit to continue our efforts to refine the indicator in the future.

Panel 1. Summary of the recommendations from the expert workshop held in Washington, DC, to discuss the adaptation of the SWPER for LMICs in Latin America and other world regions.

1

2 Methods

3 We used data from the latest available DHS since 2000 for all available countries. For Mozambique,
4 data from the 2011 survey was used because the 2015 survey lacked information on partner's age and
5 education. Six countries with a DHS were dropped because not all necessary items were available
6 (Colombia, Turkey, Vietnam, Jordan, Yemen and Congo Brazzaville). Thus, 62 countries – 34 of which
7 were already included in the SWPER for Africa (10) – were included in the analyses (Table 1), with a
8 total sample of 662,835 partnered women.

9 Content validity

10 The SWPER Global was developed using similar methods to what was done for the SWPER for Africa.
11 In that case, we used 15 items available in DHS surveys (see Table 2) and the scores were derived
12 through principal components analyses (PCA) using surveys from 34 African countries (10). We
13 obtained an indicator with three domains: (1) attitude to violence, based on five questions asking the
14 women's opinion on whether a husband beating the wife is justified in specific situations; (2) social
15 independence, comprising access to information, educational attainment, age at marriage and first
16 child, and differences in age and education to the cohabiting partner; and (3) decision-making, based
17 on questions related to who makes decisions in the household (in regard to the respondent's health
18 care, large purchases and to visits to family or relatives) and to the women's work.

19 Considering the expert workshop recommendations (Panel 1), we excluded the item that indicates
20 whether the woman worked in the last year and changed the categorization of the decision-making
21 related variables, so that equal weights were given for joint decisions (with the partner or another
22 person) and woman's sole decision (See Table 2 for details).

23 Construct validity

24 Following a similar methodology used for Africa (10), we used PCA to identify the empowerment
25 domains and estimate the items loadings for each of the 62 countries separately, after applying
26 varimax rotation. We then applied the same strategy to a pooled dataset combining all countries, to
27 derive a single indicator. The patterns emerged were compared in terms of items with loadings of 0.3
28 or higher in each empowerment domain across countries to check for consistency, and Pearson
29 correlation coefficients between the scores derived for each individual country and global scores
30 derived from the combined data for each empowerment domain of the indicator were estimated. By

1 doing so, we aimed to evaluate whether these two approaches would present consistent estimates of
2 individual empowerment levels.

3 External validity

4 To assess the external validity of the SWPER for this extended set of LMICs, Spearman correlation
5 coefficients were calculated between the resulting pooled score and two widely used indices: the
6 Gender Development Index (GDI) and the Gender Inequality Index (GII) (8). In this case, Spearman
7 correlation was used because we were interested in the correlation between the ranking of the
8 countries using these different measures, rather than the correlation between the scores.

9 The equations to calculate the SWPER Global are provided in the Supplementary materials with a step-
10 by-step explanation. To allow researchers to choose the reference population and standardize the
11 SWPER scores according to the world region they consider more suitable for a given study, we also
12 calculated the means and standard deviations of the SWPER Global domains for each world region
13 additionally to the scores estimated for all countries together (Table S2 in the web appendix). With
14 that, a researcher interested in India, for example, could choose South Asia or the SWPER Global (all
15 countries together) as reference population to standardize the SWPER scores. In the Results section
16 below, we used the global mean for LMICs and standard deviation to standardize the scores. Based
17 on the distribution of scores, we also proposed a categorization of the SWPER domains in three
18 groups: low, medium and high empowerment level. For the social independence domain, for which
19 the distribution to a normal curve, the scores were divided into terciles. In contrast, the attitude to
20 violence and decision-making domains present multimodal distributions, which were considered to
21 define the cut-offs (see Figure S1 and Table S3 in the web appendix).

22 All analyses were performed using the statistical software Stata (StataCorp. 2017. Stata Statistical
23 Software: Release 15.1. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC). The calculation of average scores at
24 country level took into account the surveys' sample design. DHS are public sources of information and
25 ethical approval has already been obtained from each country by the time of the survey conduction.

26 Results

27 The same three domains identified in the SWPER for Africa were observed in the global analyses:
28 attitude to violence, social independence and decision making. The cross-country consistency among
29 items composing each domain of the SWPER Global can be assessed through Table 1, where we
30 present items with a loading of 0.3 or more (henceforth referred to as high loadings). All countries
31 presented the exact same pattern of items identified in the attitude to violence domain, which

1 included all the questions related to the woman's opinion on whether a husband is justified in beating
2 the wife in five different circumstances. Items composing the decision-making domain was also
3 consistent across countries with higher loadings for the three questions related to the women's
4 involvement in household decisions, with only four countries presenting high-loading items that were
5 not related to participation in household decisions. Three of them were from Latin America (Honduras
6 and Peru, that also included woman's education; and Guatemala, that included education and
7 frequency of reading newspaper or magazine) and one from Europe & Central Asia (Tajikistan, that
8 also included woman's education and education difference between the woman and her husband).
9 For the social independence domain, a greater variability in the patterns of items identified was
10 observed. Countries from Africa and South Asia were the most stable in terms of the patterns for this
11 domain (composed by the frequency of reading newspaper/magazine, women's education, age the
12 first birth, age at first cohabitation, and age and education differentials in relation to the partner). In
13 the other four regions of the world, most countries presented low loadings for the frequency of
14 reading newspapers or magazines. Education showed low loadings in only five countries (Azerbaijan,
15 Tajikistan, Afghanistan, Cambodia and Honduras). The items related to pivotal events (age at first birth
16 and at first cohabitation) presented high loadings in all countries. Age differentials to the partner had
17 high loadings in three Europe and Central Asia countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Moldova) and
18 education differentials to the partner in 12 out of the 62 countries, but without a clear pattern.

19 In Table 3 we present the correlations between the three SWPER domain scores calculated separately
20 using principal component analyses in each country, and the global scores calculated using the pooled
21 data. Cells are colored from yellow to dark green cells showing the strength of the correlations. Even
22 though the item patterns presented in Table 1 were not entirely consistent for some countries (i.e. all
23 items presenting loading ≥ 0.3 in the same empowerment domain), the correlations between the
24 country-specific and the SWPER Global scores were very high, equaling 0.89 or more. All countries
25 presented correlations greater than 0.91 for all three SWPER domains, except for Gabon and Liberia
26 where the correlations for social independence were 0.89 and 0.90, respectively.

27 Figure 1 shows scatter plots of the country ranks for the three SWPER domains against the country
28 ranks for the GDI and the GII, providing evidence on the external validity of the SWPER. The correlation
29 coefficients with the GDI (upper graphs) were 0.74, 0.72 and 0.67 for social independence, decision-
30 making and attitude to violence, respectively. In the lower graphs, the SWPER rankings are plotted
31 against the GII rankings. In this case, the Pearson correlations were 0.81, 0.67 and 0.44, respectively.
32 Figure 1 shows that Latin America & Caribbean and Europe & Central Asia tend to present higher ranks

1 in all empowerment domains while West & Central Africa, Eastern & Southern Africa and some
2 countries from South Asia presented the lowest rankings.

3 Generally, Europe & Central Asia and Latin America & Caribbean show the higher mean scores in the
4 three empowerment domains (Table 4). The African regions and South Asia presented the lower mean
5 scores, with West & Central Africa showing the lowest average scores in all three empowerment
6 domains. East Asia and Pacific presented high mean scores for social independence and decision
7 making but scored below the average for attitude to violence.

8 Conclusion

9 We explored whether a slightly modified version of the original SWPER, previously validated for
10 African countries (10), could be used as an indicator of women's empowerment across LMICs. 14 items
11 identified from the previous version, that allow the assessment of empowerment in three dimensions
12 (attitude to violence, social independence, and decision-making), were pre-selected for the SWPER
13 Global validation process. The PCA analysis, showed consistency across countries in terms of patterns
14 of components retained and item loadings for the attitude to violence and decision-making domains.
15 For the social independence domain, we found more variability in terms of the item loadings. In
16 particular, women's education had low loadings in regions with higher educational levels, and
17 therefore less variability in educational levels. Notwithstanding, the correlation between the country-
18 specific and the SWPER Global scores were above 0.89 for all three empowerment domains in all 62
19 countries included in the analysis.

20 Two important changes from the previous version of the SWPER were made based on the workshop
21 held with experts on women's empowerment. The first was to remove the women's working status
22 as it was agreed that there are many reasons why women work, which are not necessarily related to
23 their own choices. Also, work may not be empowering, depending on the working conditions, and on
24 whether or not women are formally employed, are entitled to maternity leave, are paid for their work,
25 and are able to decide what to do with their earnings. Our preliminary analyses (results not shown)
26 showed that in several countries the work item had negative loadings in the PCA, suggesting that
27 working could be indicative of lower empowerment levels. This inconsistent behavior has also been
28 demonstrated in the literature. For example, women who were working and paid in cash in Egypt were
29 at lower risk of experiencing intimate partner violence, while in India, Peru and Iran their risk was
30 higher (25,26). The second change in the SWPER Global was to give equal weights to women's
31 involvement in household decisions, whether they were taken only by the women or jointly with her
32 the partner. In the original version of the SWPER, a decision made by the woman alone was given a

1 higher score than a joint decision with the partner. However, there was consensus among experts that
2 joint decisions on household issues such as purchases and visits to family or friends were thought to
3 be a potential reflection of gender equality (27). These content modifications were essential to refine
4 and expand the index to a global context including all LMICs.

5 Our findings show the SWPER Global is a suitable common measure of women's empowerment for
6 LMICs, addressing the need for a single consistent survey-based indicator of women's empowerment
7 that allows to track progress over time and across countries at the individual and country levels. The
8 external validity assessment showed overall strong correlations between country rankings in the
9 SWPER Global with their rankings in the GDI and the GII which capture distinct aspects of gender
10 inequalities at the country level. Construct validity of the SWPER was also previously assessed at the
11 individual level, through its positive association with modern contraceptive use, institutional delivery,
12 stunting (10) and, more recently, with child developmental outcomes (28) and neonatal, infant and
13 under-5 mortality (29). In the current manuscript, although we chose not to present associations
14 between the SWPER Global with health outcomes, additional analyses performed show its positive
15 associations with the coverage of reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health interventions in
16 LMICs (30), reassuring its potential to widen the research on the effects of women's empowerment
17 on health interventions and outcomes.

18 After the first version of the SWPER was published in 2017, other similar measures of women's
19 empowerment in the context of Africa have been proposed in the literature. In 2018, Asaolu et al.
20 (31), using DHS from nineteen countries across Sub-Saharan Africa, identified attitude towards
21 violence, labor force participation, education, and access to health care as valid domains of
22 empowerment although some variations between sub-regions were observed (e.g. in East Africa
23 education was surprisingly not a relevant component of women's empowerment) (31). Also in 2018,
24 Miedema et al. (16) tested the cross-national invariance of women's empowerment using DHS data
25 from five countries in East Africa and identified three domains of women's empowerment capturing
26 women's human/social assets, attitudes related to wife abuse, and women's participation decision
27 applicable across countries, very similar to what was presented in the original SWPER paper (10).
28 These other efforts highlight the importance of the topic and how different approaches can lead to
29 different but similar results. Also, how diverse priorities also lead to different approaches. In our case,
30 we compromised on country specificity to obtain an indicator that allows for comparative analysis and
31 monitoring across a large array of countries.

1 The development of a global common measure of women’s empowerment, however, represents a
2 huge challenge, given its complex and multidimensional constructs as well as their variability across
3 different societies with contextually specific gender vulnerabilities. As a result, the SWPER Global has
4 limitations, some already previously recognized and discussed in our previous publication (32).
5 Empowerment is not primarily an outcome, but a process that includes critical consciousness,
6 aspiration, voice, choice, and change (33,34); and as such, there are elements enabling or limiting it
7 that have not been considered in the SWPER (32). Decision-making assesses control but not choice,
8 nor risk for sanctions or backlash based on choices made. Inclusion of aspects such as personal
9 ownership of assets, economic participation, and opportunities and participation in governance
10 processes were also pointed in the expert workshop as important measures of empowerment that
11 are not captured by the SWPER. Some of these items are not available in DHS surveys and would
12 require different data sources. However, there is a growing number of measures related to assets,
13 opportunity and agency that are being added to DHS with potential to be incorporated in future
14 updates of the SWPER Global. These include mobile phone ownership, internet access, bank accounts,
15 and decision-making on how to spend personal earnings. As these are only available for a few recent
16 surveys, their inclusion in the SWPER at this point would markedly reduce the number of countries for
17 which the index could be calculated. Also, more items are needed to capture additional domains of
18 women’s empowerment, especially in contexts with higher socioeconomic development, including
19 (but not being restricted to) economic empowerment, power relations outside marriage including
20 political engagement or influence, social and occupational leadership and positioning, and freedom of
21 movement and safety at the individual level.

22 Another important limitation is that the index is limited to women married or in a union and therefore
23 leaves out sizeable groups of women in some countries (Table S4 in the supplementary material).
24 African and Asian countries tend to have higher proportions of married adolescent girls, which may
25 affect comparisons of empowerment levels across world regions and require age-stratified analyses.
26 The development and validation of a measure that includes both partnered and unpartnered women,
27 however, would require a very different approach, which is beyond the scope of the proposed
28 indicator based on national health surveys for which most of the relevant information are only
29 available for women that are married or in a union. Lastly, it is important to note that due to data
30 availability, the countries included in our analysis represent 48% of all LMICs, ranging from over 70%
31 of the countries from South Asia, West and Central Africa and Eastern and Southern Africa to 14% of
32 the countries from Middle East and North Africa (Table S5 in the supplementary material). Given the
33 little difference found in the behavior of the SWPER between the original version for Africa and the

1 current, including all available LMICs, it is unlikely that the inclusion of more countries would lead to
2 relevant changes to the indicator we proposed.

3 Acknowledging the current limitations of the SWPER Global, particularly in light of the
4 recommendations from the expert workshop, efforts must continue to improve the indicator.
5 Nevertheless, the SWPER Global is a pioneer indicator of women's empowerment based on individual-
6 level survey data from LMICs, which enables comparability between countries from all world regions
7 and over time. It represents an advance over other global gender and development indices by
8 including a domain on attitudes towards violence against women, a prevalent form of human rights
9 violation as well as an important universally recognized aspects of gender inequality worldwide. Use
10 of the SWPER Global will contribute to monitoring the progress towards SDG5, in terms of gender
11 equality and empowerment at the national and sub-national levels. It also allows quantification of the
12 role of empowerment in terms of health, nutrition and developmental outcomes of women and
13 children worldwide.

14 [Contributors](#)

15 FE conducted the analysis and drafted the manuscript. AR, CV, FH and CC contributed to the writing
16 of the manuscript and to the critical revision of the analysis. AB originally proposed the idea of the
17 indicator, advised on the analysis, and contributed to the writing and revision the manuscript. All
18 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

19 [License](#)

20 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of
21 all authors, an exclusive license on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this
22 article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ and any other BMJ PGL products and sublicenses such use
23 and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our license.

24 This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the terms of the Creative Commons
25 Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt and build upon this
26 work, for commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited. See:
27 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.

28

29 [Competing interests](#)

30 The authors declare they have no conflict of interests

1 [Data availability statement](#)

2 All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information.

3 The data used in this manuscript are publicly available, anonymised, and geographically scrambled

4 to ensure confidentiality. More information on DHS can be found at

5 <https://dhsprogram.com/>, where survey datasets can be downloaded.

6 [Acknowledgements](#)

7 We would like to thank the Pan American Health Organization and the Countdown to 2030 Initiative

8 for co organizing a workshop with experts in women’s empowerment and gender inequalities to

9 discuss the applicability of the SWPER in other world regions and, more specifically, in Latin America

10 and Caribbean countries. We are also very grateful for the valuable contributions of all the

11 participants, whom we wish to acknowledge by name. However, we are still in the process of

12 obtaining the written consent, so the names will be included later on.

13 [Role of funding source](#)

14 The funders of the study had no role in the data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the paper.

15 The corresponding author had full access to all the data and had the final responsibility for the decision

16 to submit the paper for publication.

17 [Ethics committee approval](#)

18 This paper works specifically with Demographic and Health Surveys data, for which the ethical

19 responsibility is entirely of the institutions that conducted the surveys in each country, eliminating the

20 requirement of this study’s ethical approval.

21

1 References

- 2 1. Eerdewijk A Van, Newton J, Tyszler M, Wong F, Vaast C. White Paper : A Conceptual Model of
3 Women and Girls’ Empowerment. Amsterdam; 2016.
- 4 2. Kabeer N. Gender equality and women’s empowerment: A critical analysis of the third
5 Millennium Development Goal. *Gend Dev*. 2005;13(1):13–24.
- 6 3. Nations U, Programme D. UNDP gender equality strategy 2014-2017. 2017;
- 7 4. Alsop R, Bertelsen M, Holland J. Empowerment in Practice [Internet]. Washington, DC: The
8 World Bank; 2005. 371 p. Available from:
9 <http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/book/10.1596/978-0-8213-6450-5>
- 10 5. Zimmerman MA. Psychological empowerment: Issues and illustrations. *Am J Community*
11 *Psychol*. 1995;23(5):581–99.
- 12 6. Bandura A. Human agency in social cognitive theory. *Am Psychol*. 1989;44(9):1175.
- 13 7. World Economic Forum. The Global Gender Gap Report. World Economic Forum. Geneva;
14 2017.
- 15 8. United Nations Development Programme. Human Development Report 2016, Human
16 Development for Everyone. United Nations Development Programme. New York; 2016. 193
17 p.
- 18 9. UN. Human Development Indices and Indicators. 2018 Statistical Update. United Nations Dev
19 Program. 2018;27(4):123.
- 20 10. Ewerling F, Lynch JW, Victora CG, van Eerdewijk A, Tyszler M, Barros AJDD. The SWPER index
21 for women’s empowerment in Africa: development and validation of an index based on
22 survey data. *Lancet Glob Heal* [Internet]. 2017 Sep;5(9):e916–23. Available from:
23 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2214109X17302929>
- 24 11. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Social Institutions Gender
25 Index: Methodological Background Paper. 2014;
- 26 12. Georgetown Institute for Women P and S and PRIO. Women, peace and security index
27 2017/18: Tracking sustainable peace through inclusion, justice, and security for women.
28 2017.
- 29 13. Hay K, McDougal L, Percival V, Henry S, Klugman J, Wurie H, et al. Disrupting gender norms in
30 health systems: making the case for change. *Lancet* (London, England). 2019
31 Jun;393(10190):2535–49.
- 32 14. Heise L, Greene ME, Opper N, Stavropoulou M, Harper C, Nascimento M, et al. Gender
33 inequality and restrictive gender norms: framing the challenges to health. *Lancet*. 2019;
- 34 15. Bauer GR. Incorporating intersectionality theory into population health research

- 1 methodology: challenges and the potential to advance health equity. Soc Sci Med.
2 2014;110:10–7.
- 3 16. Miedema SS, Haardörfer R, Girard AW, Yount KM. Women’s empowerment in East Africa:
4 Development of a cross-country comparable measure. World Dev [Internet]. 2018;110:453–
5 64. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.05.031>
- 6 17. Upadhyay UD, Karasek D. Women’s empowerment and ideal family size: An examination of
7 DHS empowerment measures in Sub-Saharan Africa. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health.
8 2012;38(2):78–89.
- 9 18. Arch R, IFPRI. Women ’ S Empowerment in Agriculture Index. Agriculture [Internet].
10 2012;(December):12. Available from:
11 http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/weai_brochure.pdf
- 12 19. House QE, Vaz A, Alkire S, Meinzen-Dick R, Peterman A, Quisumbing AR, et al. Oxford Poverty
13 & Human Development Initiative (OPHI) Oxford Department of International Development
14 The Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index. The Women’s Empowerment in
15 Agriculture Index. 2013.
- 16 20. Kishor S. Empowerment of Women in Egypt and Links to the Survival and Health of Their
17 Infants. International Union for the Scientific Study of Population; 1997.
- 18 21. Batliwala S. The meaning of women’s empowerment: New concepts from action. Popul
19 policies reconsidered Heal Empower rights. 1994;17.
- 20 22. Kabeer N. Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women’s
21 empowerment. Dev Change. 1999;30(3):435–64.
- 22 23. Pan American Health Organization. Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) website.
23 24. Countdown to 2030. Countdown to 2030 website.
- 24 25. Vyas S, Watts C. How does economic empowerment affect women’s risk of intimate partner
25 violence in low and middle income countries? A systematic review of published evidence. J
26 Int Dev. 2009;
- 27 26. Paul S. Women’s labour force participation and domestic violence: Evidence from India. J
28 South Asian Dev. 2016;11(2):224–50.
- 29 27. Osamor PE, Grady C. Autonomy and couples’ joint decision-making in healthcare. BMC Med
30 Ethics. 2018 Jan;19(1):3.
- 31 28. Ewerling F, Lynch J, Mittinty M, Raj A, Victora CG, Coll CVN, et al. The Impact of Women’s
32 Empowerment on Their Children’s Early Development in 26 African Countries. J Glob Health.
33 2020;
- 34 29. Doku DT, Bhutta ZA, Neupane S. Associations of women’s empowerment with neonatal,

- 1 infant and under-5 mortality in low-and /middle-income countries: meta-analysis of
2 individual participant data from 59 countries. *BMJ Glob Heal*. 2020;5(1):1–11.
- 3 30. WHO. 2019 Global Monitoring Report: Primary health care on the road to universal health
4 coverage. 2019;
- 5 31. Asaolu IO, Alaofè H, Gunn JKL, Adu AK, Monroy AJ, Ehiri JE, et al. Measuring women’s
6 empowerment in Sub-Saharan Africa: Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analyses of the
7 demographic and health surveys. *Front Psychol*. 2018;9(JUN).
- 8 32. Raj A. Gender Empowerment Index: a choice of progress or perfection. *Lancet Glob Heal*
9 [Internet]. 2017;5(17):9–10. Available from:
10 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2214109X17303005>
- 11 33. Kabeer N. Between affiliation and autonomy: navigating pathways of women’s
12 empowerment and gender justice in rural Bangladesh. *Dev Change*. 2011;42(2):499–528.
- 13 34. Klugman J, Tyson L. Leave no one behind: a call to action for gender equality and women’s
14 economic empowerment. Rep UN Secr Gen. 2016;

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Table 1. Composition patterns of the items that compose the SWPER domains with loadings' equal or above 0.3.

World Region	Country	ISO code	Survey Year	Domains														
				Attitude to violence					Social independence					Decision-making				
				Items (key to item names below) ^a														
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	6	7	11	12
POOLED DATASET				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	X
SOUTH ASIA	Afghanistan	AFG	2015	x	x	x	x	x			x	x				x	x	X
	Bangladesh	BGD	2014	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	India	IND	2015	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	X
	Maldives	MDV	2009	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x	x	X
	Nepal	NPL	2016	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	X
	Pakistan	PAK	2012	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
EAST ASIA & PACIFIC	Cambodia	KHM	2014	x	x	x	x	x			x	x				x	x	X
	Indonesia	IDN	2012	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Myanmar	MMR	2015	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x	x	X
	Philippines	PHL	2017	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x	x	X
	Timor-Leste	TLS	2016	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x	x	X
EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA	Albania	ALB	2008	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x	x	X
	Armenia	ARM	2015	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x	x	X
	Azerbaijan	AZE	2006	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x			x	x	X
	Kyrgyzstan	KGZ	2012	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x	X
	Moldova	MDA	2005	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x	x	X
	Tajikistan	TJK	2012	x	x	x	x	x			x	x			x	x	x	X
	Ukraine	UKR	2007	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x	x	X

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA	Egypt	EGY	2014	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Morocco	MAR	2003	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
WEST & CENTRAL AFRICA	Benin	BEN	2011	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Burkina Faso	BFA	2010	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Cameroon	CMR	2011	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Chad	TCD	2014	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Congo DR	COD	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Cote d'Ivoire	CIV	2011	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Gabon	GAB	2012	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Gambia	GMB	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Ghana	GHA	2014	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Guinea	GIN	2012	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Liberia	LBR	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Mali	MLI	2012	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Niger	NER	2012	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Nigeria	NGA	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Sao Tome & Principe	STP	2008	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Senegal	SEN	2017	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Sierra Leone	SLE	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Togo	TGO	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

EASTERN & SOUTHERN AFRICA	Angola	AGO	2015	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	X	
	Burundi	BDI	2016	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	X
	Comoros	COM	2012	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Ethiopia	ETH	2016	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Kenya	KEN	2014	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Lesotho	LBN	2014	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Madagascar	MDG	2008	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Malawi	MWI	2015	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Mozambique	MOZ	2011	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Namibia	NAM	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	X
	Rwanda	RWA	2014	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	X
	Eswatini	SWZ	2006	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Tanzania	TZA	2015	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	X
	Uganda	UGA	2016	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	X
	Zambia	ZMB	2013	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
Zimbabwe	ZWE	2015	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X	
LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN	Bolivia	BOL	2008	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	X
	Dominican Republic	DOM	2013	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	X
	Guatemala	GTM	2014	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	X
	Guyana	GUY	2009	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	X
	Haiti	HTI	2016	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	X
	Honduras	HND	2011	x	x	x	x	x				x	x			x	x	x	X
	Nicaragua	NIC	2001	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	X
Peru	PER	2016	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x		x		x	x	X	

Note: Some items are repeated in the table because they presented a loading equal or above 0.3 in different domains across the countries.

^a Key to items numbers: Beating justified if: (1) wife goes out without telling husband; (2) wife neglects the children; (3) wife argues with husband; (4) wife refuses to have sex with husband; (5) wife burns the food. Item (6) frequency of reading newspaper or magazine; (7) woman's education; (8) age at 1st birth; (9) age at 1st cohabitation; (10) age difference: woman's minus husband's age; (11) education difference: woman's minus husband's years of schooling; (12) woman's work. Who usually decides on: (13) respondent's healthcare; (14) large household purchases; (15) visits to family or relatives.

Table 2. Items used in each domain of the African-oriented survey-based women’s empowerment (SWPER) index and the changes made in the global version of the index, according to gender experts’ recommendations.

Item (v)	Code or unit	Changes
Attitude to violence domain		
1. Beating justified if wife goes out without telling husband	Yes = -1; DK=0; No=1	No changes
2. Beating justified if wife neglects the children	Yes = -1; DK=0; No=1	No changes
3. Beating justified if wife argues with husband	Yes = -1; DK=0; No=1	No changes
4. Beating justified if wife refuses to have sex with husband	Yes = -1; DK=0; No=1	No changes
5. Beating justified if wife burns the food	Yes = -1; DK=0; No=1	No changes
Social independence domain		
6. Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine	Not at all=0; <once a week=1; ≥once a week=2	No changes
7. Woman education in completed years of schooling	Years	No changes
8. Age of woman at first birth*	Years	No changes
9. Age at first cohabitation	Years	No changes
10. Age difference: woman’s minus husband’s age	Years	No changes
11. Education difference: woman’s minus husband’s years of schooling	Years	No changes
Decision-making domain		
12. Who usually decides on respondent's health care	Husband or other alone= -1; joint decision=0; respondent alone=1	Husband or other alone= -1; Joint decision or respondent alone=1
13. Who usually decides on large household purchases	Husband or other alone= -1; joint decision=0; respondent alone=1	Husband or other alone= -1; Joint decision or respondent alone=1
14. Who usually decides on visits to family or relatives	Husband or other alone= -1; joint decision=0; respondent alone=1	Husband or other alone= -1; Joint decision or respondent alone=1
X. Respondent worked in last 12 months	No = 0; In the past year = 1; Have a job, but on leave last 7 days = 2; Currently working = 2	Item excluded

* This item age at first birth was imputed for those women who had not had a child, please see section 1.1 in the Supplementary material for details.

Table 3. Pearson correlation between the country-specific women’s empowerment measure and the SWPER global index for each domain. Cells are colored from yellow ($r < 0.900$), light green ($r = 0.900$ to < 0.950), medium green (0.950 to < 0.990), dark green (≥ 0.990).

World region	Country	Year	Pearson's correlation (r)		
			Attitude to violence	Social Independence	Decision Making
SOUTH ASIA	Afghanistan	2015	0.9923	0.9545	0.982
	Bangladesh	2014	0.9968	0.9898	0.9936
	India	2015	0.9983	0.9935	0.994
	Maldives	2009	0.9976	0.9819	0.9687
	Nepal	2016	0.9872	0.9896	0.9911
	Pakistan	2012	0.9996	0.9966	0.995
EAST ASIA & PACIFIC	Cambodia	2014	0.9901	0.9776	0.9685
	Indonesia	2012	0.9918	0.993	0.9928
	Myanmar	2015	0.9864	0.993	0.9636
	Philippines	2017	0.9753	0.9911	0.9862
	Timor-Leste	2016	0.9942	0.9933	0.9813
EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA	Albania	2008	0.9959	0.9807	0.9743
	Armenia	2015	0.9846	0.9821	0.9848
	Azerbaijan	2006	0.9884	0.9752	0.996
	Kyrgyzstan	2012	0.9971	0.962	0.992
	Moldova	2005	0.9908	0.9726	0.9579
	Tajikistan	2012	0.9994	0.9807	0.9974
	Ukraine	2007	0.967	0.989	0.9737
MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA	Egypt	2014	0.9978	0.9943	0.9955
	Morocco	2003	0.99	0.9981	0.9955
WEST & CENTRAL AFRICA	Benin	2011	0.9977	0.9569	0.9968
	Burkina Faso	2010	0.9991	0.9784	0.9758
	Cameroon	2011	0.9992	0.9938	0.9965
	Chad	2014	0.9934	0.9677	0.9778
	Congo DR	2013	0.9964	0.9898	0.9972
	Cote d’Ivoire	2011	0.9989	0.9526	0.9956
	Gabon	2012	0.9973	0.8895	0.9901
	Gambia	2013	0.9986	0.9858	0.9857
	Ghana	2014	0.9986	0.9906	0.9979
	Guinea	2012	0.9887	0.9639	0.995
	Liberia	2013	0.999	0.8959	0.9944
	Mali	2012	0.9966	0.9463	0.9943
	Niger	2012	0.9991	0.9479	0.9944
	Nigeria	2013	0.9988	0.9938	0.9971
	São Tome & Principe	2008	0.9955	0.9649	0.9955
	Senegal	2017	0.9988	0.9772	0.9821
Sierra Leone	2013	0.9985	0.9246	0.9956	







	Togo	2013	0.9983	0.984	0.9913
EASTERN & SOUTHERN AFRICA	Angola	2015	0.9981	0.9264	0.9786
	Burundi	2016	0.9996	0.992	0.9936
	Comoros	2012	0.9949	0.9876	0.9844
	Eswatini	2006	0.989	0.9684	0.987
	Ethiopia	2016	0.9991	0.9896	0.9976
	Kenya	2014	0.9989	0.9962	0.9948
	Lesotho	2014	0.9976	0.9945	0.9837
	Madagascar	2008	0.9928	0.9906	0.9734
	Malawi	2015	0.9962	0.9944	0.997
	Mozambique	2011	0.9954	0.9895	0.9833
	Namibia	2013	0.9966	0.9202	0.9932
	Rwanda	2014	0.999	0.9992	0.9883
	Tanzania	2015	0.9979	0.9754	0.9969
	Uganda	2016	0.9995	0.9822	0.9835
	Zambia	2013	0.9992	0.9899	0.9903
	Zimbabwe	2015	0.999	0.9893	0.9918
LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN	Bolivia	2008	0.9897	0.9938	0.9683
	Dominican Republic	2013	0.9414	0.9946	0.9883
	Guatemala	2014	0.9877	0.9675	0.919
	Guyana	2009	0.9967	0.9702	0.9927
	Haiti	2016	0.9929	0.9853	0.9683
	Honduras	2011	0.9927	0.9711	0.9242
	Nicaragua	2001	0.9939	0.995	0.9897
	Peru	2016	0.9643	0.9904	0.9372

Table 4. Mean and standard error of the SWPER global scores in each domain according to the world region.

Region	Number of countries	Attitude to violence		Social Independence		Decision-making	
		Mean	Std. error	Mean	Std. error	Mean	Std. error
South Asia	6	0.007	0.184	-0.155	0.149	0.072	0.139
East Asia & Pacific	5	-0.016	0.266	0.440	0.106	0.774	0.063
Europe & Central Asia	7	0.209	0.181	0.809	0.064	0.672	0.164
Middle East & North Africa	2	-0.281	0.455	0.140	0.149	0.161	0.247
West & Central Africa	18	-0.288	0.122	-0.403	0.071	-0.260	0.111
Eastern & Southern Africa	16	0.078	0.087	-0.006	0.088	0.388	0.070
Latin America and Caribbean	8	0.589	0.035	0.322	0.098	0.722	0.051

Note: These analyses used the countries as units of analyses, so they are not affected by the country population size.

Figure 1. Scatter plot showing the SWPER domains ranking against the Gender Development Index and the Gender Inequality Index rankings with the Pearson correlation (r) indicated in the bottom right of each plot.



- Europe & Central Asia
- Middle East & North Africa
- East Asia & Pacific
- South Asia
- Eastern & Southern Africa
- West & Central Africa
- Latin America & Caribbean