NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

CLASSIFICATION, DETECTION AND CONSEQUENCES OF DATA ERROR: EVIDENCE FROM THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX

Hendrik Wolff
Howard Chong
Maximilian Auffhammer

Working Paper 16572
http://www.nber.org/papers/w16572

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
December 2010

We are indebted to Alison Kennedy from UNDP for helpful correspondence and providing the "revised" HDI statistics. We thank Jenny Aker, David Albouy, Werner Antweiler, Richard Carson, Maria Damon, Alain DeJanvry, Levis Kochin, James Rauch, Elisabeth Sadoulet, George Wright, the editor and two anonymous referees for many helpful comments. We gratefully acknowledge generous funding provided by a University of California's Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation faculty research grant. All errors in this manuscript are the authors'. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

© 2010 by Hendrik Wolff, Howard Chong, and Maximilian Auffhammer. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Classification, Detection and Consequences of Data Error: Evidence from the Human Development Index

Hendrik Wolff, Howard Chong, and Maximilian Auffhammer

NBER Working Paper No. 16572
December 2010
JEL No. C43

ABSTRACT

We measure and examine data error in health, education and income statistics used to construct the Human Development Index. We identify three sources of data error which are due to (i) data updating, (ii) formula revisions and (iii) thresholds to classify a country's development status. We propose a simple statistical framework to calculate country specific measures of data uncertainty and investigate how data error biases rank assignments. We find that up to 34% of countries are misclassified and, by replicating prior studies, we show that key estimated parameters vary by up to 100% due to data error.

Hendrik Wolff
University of Washington
hendrik.wolff@gmail.com

Howard Chong
UC Energy Institute
2547 Channing Way
Berkeley, CA 94720
HGChong@berkeley.edu

Maximilian Auffhammer
Agricultural and Resource Economics Department
University of California, Berkeley
207 Giannini Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-3310
and NBER
auffhammer@berkeley.edu

Classification, Detection and Consequences of Data Error: Evidence from the Human Development Index*

Hendrik Wolff, Howard Chong and Maximilian Auffhammer

We measure and examine data error in health, education and income statistics used to construct the Human Development Index. We identify three sources of data error which are due to (i) data updating, (ii) formula revisions and (iii) thresholds to classify a country's development status. We propose a simple statistical framework to calculate country specific measures of data uncertainty and investigate how data error biases rank assignments. We find that up to 34% of countries are misclassified and, by replicating prior studies, we show that key estimated parameters vary by up to 100% due to data error.

'Perhaps the greatest step forward that can be taken, even at short notice, is to insist that economic statistics be only published together with an estimate of their error.'

Oskar Morgenstern, 1970

1. Introduction and Related Literature

This paper studies the Human Development Index (HDI), which has become one of the most widely used measures to communicate a country's development status. Compared to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the HDI is a broader measure of development, since it captures not only the level of income, but also incorporates measures of health and education (Srinivasan, 1994; Streeten, 1994; Anand and Sen, 2000). The United Nations Development Programme, which releases the HDI statistics, classifies each country into one of three categories: 'low human development' for HDI scores between 0.0 and 0.5, 'medium human development' for scores between 0.5 and 0.8 and 'high human development' for scores between 0.8 and 1.0.

---

* For correspondence contact Hendrik Wolff, Department of Economics, University of Washington, 349 Savery Hall, Box 353330, Seattle, WA 98195-3330. phone: (510) 220-7961, hgwolff@u.washington.edu. We are indebted to Alison Kennedy from UNDP for helpful correspondence and providing the "revised" HDI statistics. We thank Jenny Aker, David Albouy, Werner Antweiler, Richard Carson, Maria Damon, Alain DeJanvry, Levis Kochin, James Rauch, Elisabeth Sadoulet, George Wright, the editor and two anonymous referees for many helpful comments. We gratefully acknowledge generous funding provided by a University of California's Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation faculty research grant. All errors in this manuscript are the authors'.

Although these development categories were not originally designed to determine international relations, development aid or should imply any other legal consequences, today these three mutually exclusive categories are used in politics, academia, and the corporate world. In business relations, the categories have been used for international pricing purposes (Bate and Boateng, 2007). Since 2001 the pharmaceutical company Merck sells drugs at different prices with up to 90% discounts for countries that are classified as 'low', and 75% reductions for 'medium' countries (Petersen and Rother, 2001). Second, the HDI has been widely used in debates among development researchers and policy makers (Sen, 2000) and is actively invoked to structure discussions in development-political debates of both governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Jahan, 2000; HDR, 1990 to 2006). For allocation of development aid, it is known that the government of Ireland puts a particular focus on countries categorized as 'low human development' (O'Neill, 2005). International climate accord designs following the expiring Kyoto Agreement have included a proposal for linking countries' abatement responsibilities according to their HDI (Hu, 2009). Thirdly, in economics, an extensive literature has studied the relationships between HDI rankings, economic growth, institutions, and other economic and social measures (Anand and Ravallion, 1993; Easterlin, 2000; Dasgupta, 2001). The conceptual underpinnings of the HDI can be found in the work by Amartya Sen (i.e. 1977, 1984, 1985, 1987). For a recent mathematical ethical rationalization of the HDI see Moreno-Ternero and Romer (2006). Oswald (1997), Blanchflower and Oswald (2005) and Leigh and Wolfers (2006) explore links between a happiness index and the HDI.[1]

Despite extensive use of the HDI statistics, the drastic changes in the distribution of HDI scores for developing countries, as displayed in Figure 1, have gone unnoticed in the academic

[1] Other studies that specifically used the triple-bin classification include Kelley (1991), McGillivray (1991), Noorbakhsh (1998), Baliamoune (2004) in development economics, Mazumdar (2002), Noorbakhsh (2006) in macroeconomics, Hargittai (1998), Keiser *et al.* (2004) in communications and Guindon and Boisclair (2003) to analyze health outcomes across countries.

and policy literature. When the HDI was first published in 1990, the cross country-distribution appeared to be approximately uniformly distributed between zero (least developed) and one (most developed). Today, however, the distribution is twin-peaked with two sharp spikes around the values of 0.5 and 0.8, which are the cut-off values for categorizing countries of 'low', 'medium' and 'high' human development.

In this paper, we investigate the role of data error on the published HDI and the consequences for its use in statistical analysis. We address these questions by exploiting (1) the originally published HDI time series, (2) the subindicator variables used to construct the HDI, (3) changes to the HDI formula, and (4) documented data revisions. We identify three sources of data error: measurement error due to data revisions, data error due to formula updating and misclassification due to inconsistent cut-off values. After isolating data revision error from error due to formula updates, we estimate country specific variances of the HDI scores. For example, the variance due to data revision for Bolivia represents the distribution of possible HDI values for Bolivia in a given year, which is solely created by updates to the data series. We show that the HDI contains data error standard deviations ranging from 0.03 (United States) to 0.11 (Niger), which is significant given the 0 to 1 scale. We find that the magnitude of the error variances is greater the lower the HDI rank, which is consistent with the quality of the statistical agencies improving with higher development. Likewise, country specific variances due to formula revisions are calculated. Mapping these cardinal noise measures onto the ordinal dimension, we find that 11%, 21% and 34% of all countries can be interpreted as currently misclassified in the development bins due to the three sources of data error, respectively.

We also investigate the ordinal rank error. Each year when the new HDI statistics are published, much public attention focuses on the relative rank of a country to its rank in prior

years and to the rank position of competing countries. For example, when Canada lost the top HDI number 1 position in 2001, The National Post (3rd of July, 2001) wrote: '*We're not No. 1! Canada drops in UN rankings…Prime Minister Jean Chretien often refers to the report in public statements and speeches…*'. Or, in 1998, when Pakistan (rank 138) bypassed India (rank 139), *The Tribune* (September 14th, 1998) noted: '*Pak beat India, both lose!*'.[2] To investigate the reliability of such statements, we calculate each country's likelihood of deviation from its original published HDI rank. We find that on average the expected absolute deviation is nine rank positions. Furthermore, the average 95% confidence interval of our simulated HDI rank deviations ranges from -21 ranks to +20 ranks for the 2.5% percentile and the 97.5% percentile respectively. These calculations show that statements based on ordinal comparisons are to be interpreted with great care.

Our results have direct implications for the academic literature. First, there is a vast economic literature that uses the same country level data that are included in the construction of the HDI, namely purchasing power parity adjusted income (i.e. Rogoff, 1996), life expectancy (i.e. Acemoglu and Johnson, 2007) and the educational measures of literacy rate and school enrollment statistics (i.e. Krueger and Lindahl, 2001). We investigate the inherent noise characteristics for each of these variables separately by estimating country specific variances for the underlying variables—GDP per capita, school enrollment, literacy rate and life expectancy. We find that the variables of health and education exhibit particular large error variances in developing countries; in comparison income has a smaller error variance but among the three sub-indicators it reveals the largest updating bias. Second, the HDI has been used to analyze the evolution of the world's distribution of well being, to explore issues of inequality, polarization,

[2] Pakistan ranked 119 and 138 and India ranked 118 and 139 in 1997 and 1998 respectively. For an extended discussion about these and similar rank statements see Morse (2003).

foreign direct investment, development aid and to econometrically test various convergence hypotheses in macroeconomics. By replicating some of these studies and carrying out sensitivity analyses, we find that key parameters, such as estimated Gini coefficients and speed of convergence parameters, vary by up to 100% in their values solely due to the measurement error.

Our paper is related to the literature that discusses the challenges in accurately estimating national accounts and other aggregate statistics. Deaton and Heston (2008) provide an in depth analysis of the various factors that affect PPP. In their case, in order to eliminate differences in national price levels, GDP is combined with data by the International Comparison Program (ICP) but the ICP's methodologies are subject to various changes, (i.e. modifications of baskets, Laspeyres versus Paasche index, product quality adjustments). In discussing previous revisions of the methodologies, Deaton and Heston (2008) conclude that PPP data are '*not always suitable for the purposes to which they are put*'. Krueger and Lindahl (2001) study the relationship between economic growth and country level educational variables and discuss the direction of bias one might expect by using different variables. Other papers that characterize the noise in aggregate statistical data include Barro and Lee (2001) and de la Fuente and Doménech (2006) for educational measures, Dowrick and Quiggin (1997) and Neary (2004) for income based measures and Anderson (1999) for life expectancy. We add to this literature by systematically isolating the different sources of error into data based errors, formula based errors and cut-off value based errors. To our knowledge, this is the first paper to calculate country specific variance measures of the HDI, income, life expectancy, literacy rate, school enrollment, as well as to calculate indicators and probabilities of a country's misclassification.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the data. Section 3 outlines the framework and methods of measuring variances and misclassifications due to data

revisions, formula changes and the threshold problem. Section 4 presents our results. Section 5 provides examples of how the HDI is used in various contexts and how errors can affects prior academic analysis. We conclude with policy recommendations in Section 6.

2. Data

The HDI is a composite indicator measuring a country's level of development along three dimensions: health, education and income. These dimensions are expressed as unit free and double bounded subindicators y_1, y_2, y_3, each taking values between zero and one. The subindicators themselves are functions of data $\boldsymbol{x}$ on primary and secondary school enrollment statistics, literacy rate, life expectancy and GDP per capita adjusted by purchasing power parity (PPP). Finally, the HDI is calculated as a simple average of the three (k = 1, 2, 3) subindicators, HDI = $1/3\Sigma_k y_k(\boldsymbol{x})$, which is then used for ordinal and cardinal comparisons. The HDI is published annually in the Human Development Reports (HDR) by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), which are available for the years 1990 to 2006 (HDR, 1990 to 2006).[3]

2.1. *Original versus Revised Data*

In our analysis we exploit the fact that the original historical data matrix $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ used by the UNDP in year t differs from the revised matrix $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathbf{R}}{}_t^s$ which includes updates between t and $s>t$. The original $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ is available for the years t =1999 to 2006, whereas the revised data $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathbf{R}}{}_t^s$ are available (i) for all years of the analyses, t = 1990 to 2006 and s = 2006 and (ii) for the HDI in t = 1975, the revised $\mathrm{HDI}^{\mathbf{R}}{}_{1975}^s$ is available for s = 1999, 2000,…, 2006. In this paper, $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathbf{R}}{}_t$ refers to the variables for year t kindly provided to the authors as of fall of 2006 by the UNDP office,

[3] The UNDP mainly draws the GDP data from the World Bank, the educational statistics are provided by UNESCO and life expectancy comes from the Population Division of the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Since countries do not consistently provide data using the same methodologies, these data sets are complemented by data from the Penn World Tables as well as by UNDP's own estimates to impute missing values. See the technical appendices of the HDR (1990-2006) for details.

except stated otherwise. $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ refers to the data that we hand-copied[4] from the tth year Human Development Report (HDR, 1990 to 2006).

2.2. *The HDI Formulas and Computation of Counterfactuals*

Since 1990, the UNDP has made three major updates to the formula used to construct the HDI. For each year t and country i the HDI formula is given by

$$HDI_{it} = h_f(\mathbf{x}_{it}).$$

The formula h changed thrice as indexed by $f \in \{A, B, C\}$, which corresponds to the time periods 1990, 1995-1998 and 1999-2006, respectively. The three formulas are explained in the HDR technical appendices (1990 to 1999) of Jahan (2000) and in the appendix of this web based version.[5] We construct three 'counterfactuals' denoted by $h_A(\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{it})$, $h_B(\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{it})$, and $h_C(\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{R}}_{it})$. Hence, for the entire time series we recalculate what the HDI would have been if the alternate formulas had been in place, using the most recent available historical data on the subindicators. In the analysis we exploit exactly these differences between the 'original' HDI generated by the formula that was active at time t compared to the HDI generated by the other two formulas that were not active in that particular year t.

2.3. *The Sample*

We construct a balanced panel from 1990 to 2006. A country is included in our panel if it meets the following two conditions: (a) the country exists continuously between 1990 and 2006 (e.g., Croatia is dropped); (b) between the three revised subindicators and the countries' HDI as provided by the UNDP, the total sum of missing data points is less or equal to five. Furthermore, in some of our analysis we distinguish between industrialized and non-industrialized countries whereby the industrialized countries are defined as in Table 1.1 of HDR (1991). We impute any

[4] The data were hand-copied separately by two of the authors. Only after verifying that the two hand-copied data sets are 100% identical, we proceeded with the analysis.

[5] The web version is available at http://faculty.washington.edu/hgwolff/EJOnlineWebVersionofHDI_Wolffetal2010.pdf .

missing data points by linear interpolation. In this way we obtain a balanced panel 99 countries of which 76 are non-industrialized countries and 23 are industrialized countries.

3. Sources of Data Error and Methodology to Measure Data Uncertainty

This section provides a detailed discussion of the three sources of data error: measurement error due to data revisions (D), data noise due to formula updating (F) and misclassification due to inconsistent cut-off values (C), which we abbreviate by D, F and C. We propose a simple statistical framework to analyze these sources of error, which allows us to calculate country specific variances and confidence intervals and to simulate country specific probabilities of misclassification.

Before discussing the details of each source of error below, it is useful to illustrate when the different types of errors (D, F and C) enter into the construction of the HDI. The columns of Table 1 show the overall structure of the data and the rows display when each error category contributes to the data uncertainty, depending on the level of data analyzed. The first column shows that with respect to the primary data variables $\boldsymbol{x}$, the only source of error is due to data updating (D). For the subindicator functions $\boldsymbol{y}$, two sources of errors are identified. First, with respect to D, $\boldsymbol{y}$ is vulnerable because the data error of $\boldsymbol{x}$ is directly translated into $\boldsymbol{y}$ through the function $\boldsymbol{y}(\boldsymbol{x})$. Additionally, the nonlinear functions $\boldsymbol{y}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are subject to formula changes (F) over time. Similarly, the aggregate HDI measure is subject to D and F through HDI = $1/3\Sigma_k y_k(\boldsymbol{x})$. The HDI development categories are subject to error type C. Finally, the three types of error can be calculated for any function of HDI, θ(HDI), *e.g.* Gini coefficients or regression parameters.

As we will make clear below, we calculate the three types of error independent of each other. Hence it is not the case that error measure F will implicitly include some data error D or

vice versa. Only in Section 3.4 and 4.2 we show how the different type of errors add up and discuss the correlation structures among them.

What are the distinctions between these sources of errors? While the first error D is well known to econometricans as '*measurement error'*, the changes to the data by F and C are due to subjective decisions by the data provider (here the UNDP). This subjective component changed over time and impacted the construction and relative importance of sub-variables of the HDI as well as the judgment on how to classify countries. Another distinction between D, F and C is that our first two types of errors, D and F, are *cardinal* in nature. This is in contrast to our third type of error, C, which is purely *ordinal* in nature in the sense that countries are either misclassified or not within the UN triple-bin classification system.

3.1. *First Source of Data Error: Measurement error*

To obtain the first measure of the randomness of the HDI data, we exploit the following exogenous changes to the data over time: The data $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ (as used by the UNDP for the HDR at year t) are in general not the same data as the UNDP publishes in year s for the same data year t. As revised statistics become available, the UNDP updates the original data matrix $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ at year s, $s \geq t$, which we then denote $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathbf{R}}{}_t^s$.

There are literally hundreds of reasons for data updates each year. The HDI draws their datasets from a multitude of domestic and international agencies (e.g. UNESCO, World Bank, Penn Tables). Often an agency may have data only for some subset of countries and some subset of years. The remaining data points are then filled by datasets from other agencies, and occasionally are interpolated by neighboring years or countries. The dozens of footnotes in the yearly HDR reports point to the institutions that changed data year by year. The complexity of the problem may be best illustrated with a specific example: since 1999, the UNDP publishes

historic HDI scores going back until the year 1975, HDI_{1975}. Figure 2 displays HDI_{1975} scores as they are reported in each of the HDR reports from 1999 to 2006. In every year, between 1999 and 2006, substantial data revisions took place for the *same* 1975 HDI score. For example, while in 2000 Portugal was reported to have a historic HDI_{1975} of 0.73 (that was below the HDI_{1975} of Venezuela), by 2006 Portugal's HDI_{1975} increased to 0.79 and is now substantially above the 2006 reported HDI_{1975} of Venezuela. On average across all countries the HDI updating bias for the year 1975 can be calculated as 0.003 with a standard deviation of the updating error of σ_{1975} = 0.012. Given that the data updates took place after a quarter of a century, we consider 0.012 to be large. Instead, in a world of good data quality σ_{1975} should be close to zero. This implies that whenever an analyst uses UNDP data, the same analysis run at a later date will result in different estimates due to a changed data matrix. Hence, when the HDI is released in year *t*, the value must be understood as an inexact value subject to future data revisions. This problem is what we refer to as measurement error from data updating.

To parameterize this measurement error, assume that the relationship between the observed HDI score of country *i* and the true (but unknown) subindicators, denoted by y^*_{itk}, can be expressed as

$$HDI_{it} = 1/3\Sigma_k(y^*_{itk} + \varepsilon_{itk})$$

where ε_{itk} is orthogonal to y^*_{itk} and is distributed with mean m_{itk} and country specific variance s^2_{itk}. The relationship between the observed HDI score of country *i* and the true HDI^* consequently is $HDI_{it} = HDI_{it}^* + e_{it}$ with e_{it} being the composite error term distributed with mean $1/3\Sigma_k m_{itk}$ and country specific variance σ^2_i that is determined by the covariance structure of the measurement error of the subindicators in country *i*, $cov_i(\varepsilon_{tk})$.

Exploiting the original $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ and revised $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathbf{R}}_t$, we now are in the position to calculate country specific variances of the measurement error due to data updating (D) given by

$$\sigma^2_{\mathrm{D},i} = \Sigma_t(h_t(\boldsymbol{x}_{it})-h_t(\boldsymbol{x}_{it}^{\mathbf{R}}))^2/(T-1) \text{ for } \forall\ t \in \boldsymbol{T} \tag{1}$$

with h_t denoting the formula which was active at time t and $\boldsymbol{T} = A \cup B \cup C \backslash 2006$ is the union of the three time periods A, B, C, except for the last year of 2006. T denotes the number of elements in set $\boldsymbol{T}$. The variance of the data-updating measurement error is based on the difference between the original HDI as published in the HDR at year t, $h_t(\boldsymbol{x_{it}})$, and the reconstructed counterfactual HDI for year t using revised data $\boldsymbol{x}_{it}^{\mathbf{R}}$ available to us today. To obtain a consistent estimate of the variance, we assume that $h_t(\boldsymbol{x}_{it}^{\mathbf{R}})$ represents our currently best available estimate of HDI_{it}^{*} and discuss in our result the implications of this assumption.

Importantly note that we calculate $\sigma^2_{\mathrm{D},i}$ independently from error type F. Specifically, we disentangle D from F by constructing each pair of data $\{h_t(\boldsymbol{x_{it}}), h_t(\boldsymbol{x_{it}}^{\mathbf{R}})\}_t\ \forall\ t \in \boldsymbol{T}$ to be conditional on the same HDI formula, namely the formula that was active at time t. (Instead, if one were using the pairs of data $\{h_t(\boldsymbol{x_{it}}), HDI^{\mathbf{R}}\}$ as reported in the yearly UNDP reports, one would have erroneously incorporated error-type F into error type D).

3.2. *Second Source: Changes in HDI Formula*

Since its release in 1990, the HDI was often criticized with respect to its analytical framework and methodology (Desai, 1991; Kelley, 1991; McGillivray, 1991; Aturupane *et al.*, 1994; Noorbakhsh, 1998). The UNDP responded to this challenge by working with Nobel laureate Amartya Sen, Sudhir Anand, Paul Streeten and others to intellectually lead an effort to update the methodology and value judgments. As a result UNDP has made three major updates to the formula used to construct the HDI which are further discussed in Anand and Sen (1994, 1997, 2000), Jahan (2000), the technical appendices of the HDRs (1990 to 2006) and

summarized in the appendix of the web based version paper. These three changes are clearly visible in the empirical distribution of the HDI displayed in Figure 3. In particular, different distributional characteristics occur for the sub-periods *A* (1990), *B* (1995-1998) and *C* (1999-2006) that correspond to the three formula regimes $h_A(\boldsymbol{x}_{it})$, $h_B(\boldsymbol{x}_{it})$, and $h_C(\boldsymbol{x}_{it})$, respectively.

We exploit this variation of the HDI scores across the counterfactual formulas to calculate country specific variances due to the formula (F) updates that is

$$\sigma^2_{\mathrm{F},i} = \Sigma_t \Sigma_g \, (h_g(\boldsymbol{x}_{it}^{\mathrm{R}}) - h_C(\boldsymbol{x}_{it}^{\mathrm{R}}))^2/(2T-1) \;\forall\; t \in \boldsymbol{T} \qquad (2)$$

where g is the index to sum over the formula indices A, and B. The variance $\sigma^2_{\mathrm{F},i}$ is based on the country specific differences of the HDI generated by the most recent and improved formula h_C compared to the HDI counterfactuals generated by the other two formulas h_B and h_A. We do acknowledge that the formula revisions were undertaken to improve the HDI statistics and hence one interpretation of $\sigma^2_{\mathrm{F},i}$ is to understand it as a measure of *historic* noise due to the formula updates. Alternatively, the country specific measures $\sigma^2_{\mathrm{F},i}$ can be interpreted as a *present* measure of noise, if the UNDP will similarly continue to change the formula in the future and the scores today would have to be understood as subject to those future formula revisions.

Note that we again isolate the error type F from the former error type D. Hence it is not the case that error-type F incorporates error-type D, and/or vice versa.[6]

3.3. *Third Source of Misclassification: Arbitrary Cutoff Values*

In comparison to the *cardinal* measures of noise due to D and F, our third measure of error, C, is entirely *ordinal.* It is an error of misclassification due to the arbitrariness of the two cut-off values used to categorize countries into 'low', 'medium' and 'high' development

[6] We achieve the independence because the function σ_{F} is defined conditional on the revised data $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{R}}$. Hence all terms on the right hand side of σ_{F} are 'counterfactual' measures, what the HDI would have been if the revised data $\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{R}}$ had been already known in prior years under the different formula assumptions.

countries. Despite the fact that changes made to the HDI formula did have considerable impacts on the empirical HDI distributions as displayed in Figure 3, the UNDP has decided to use the *same* cut-off values (0.5 and 0.8) since 1990. Since the original cutoff-values are supposed to distinguish three *qualities* of human development, with each formula change the UNDP could instead have adjusted the cut-off values in such a way that the new adjusted thresholds again reflect these same value judgments for the levels of quality. One possible procedure[7] to obtain revised threshold values—that are consistent with the initial 1990 value judgment of classifying quality *and* consistent with the entire history of formula changes—is as follows. In 1990, Morocco and Egypt were the two countries closest around the original cut off value of 0.5 (with HDI scores of 0.49 and 0.50, respectively). On the counterfactual distribution of formula h_C applied to 1990, these two countries take on the values 0.54 and 0.56. Taking the mean (0.55) provides the revised threshold for separating between the low and medium human development groups. Similarly we proceed with the cut off value 0.8 and obtain the revised value 0.70.

3.4. *Overall Error Variance*

So far, we have treated the two sources of errors D and F independently of each other. The user of the HDI statistics may, however, be also interested in having a sense of the "overall" error within the HDI database.[8] To this end, we calculate the country-specific overall cardinal error variance statistics as

$$\sigma^2(overall)_i = \sigma^2_{Di} + \sigma^2_{Fi} + 2cov(e_{Di}, e_{Fi})$$

which takes into account the covariance structure of the individual error contributions,

$$cov(e_{Di}, e_{Fi}) = \Sigma_t (e_{Dit} - m_{Di})(e_{Fit} - m_{Fi})/T$$

[7] Our procedure to choose the revised bin cutoffs is based upon the objective to maintain constant the initial (1990) value judgment by the UNDP, in the sense that the thresholds separate low from medium and medium from high developed countries. One referee suggested selecting those cutoff values which maximize the objective function to maintain the development category of as many countries as possible. This would lead to the revised thresholds values of 0.62 and 0.76.

[8] We thank the editor for providing the idea to aggregate errors.

whereby $e_{Dit} = HDI_{it} - HDI^{R}_{it}$ and $e_{Fit} = \Sigma_f(h_f(\boldsymbol{x}_{it}^{R}) - h_C(\boldsymbol{x}_{it}^{R}))/2$. We can thus analyze how much each source of error (1) and (2) contributes to the overall level of error in the HDI database.

3.5. *Simulation 1: The expected number of misclassified countries*

For the cardinal sources of data error, for each country we can calculate the probability of being misclassified. Given the parameterization of the measurement error as $\mathrm{HDI}_{i2006}^{*} = \mathrm{HDI}_{i2006} - e_{i2006}$ and assuming $e_{i2006} \sim N(0,\sigma^2_{.,i})$, normally distributed with mean zero and variance $\sigma^2_{.,i}$ (as calculated by $\sigma^2_{\mathrm{F},i}$, $\sigma^2_{\mathrm{D},i}$, and $\sigma^2(\mathrm{overall})_{,i}$) we analytically calculate for each country the probability of being misclassified as

$$\int_{0.5}^{1} p\left(\widehat{HDI}_i\right) d\,\widehat{HDI}_i \;\; \forall\, i \text{ with } HDI \in [0.0, 0.5),$$

$$\int_{0.0}^{0.5} p\left(\widehat{HDI}_i\right) d\,\widehat{HDI}_i \;\; + \int_{0.8}^{1} p\left(\widehat{HDI}_i\right) d\,\widehat{HDI}_i \;\; \forall\, i \text{ with } HDI \in [0.5, 0.8),$$

$$\int_{0.0}^{0.8} p\left(\widehat{HDI}_i\right) d\,\widehat{HDI}_i \;\; \forall\, i \text{ with } HDI \in [0.8, 1.0],$$

where $p()$ is the probability density function of the estimated HDI_i^* distributions. Hence, for countries reported to be 'low development', we calculate the probability of being classified as a medium or a high development country; similarly, we proceed for the 'medium' and 'high' development countries. Finally, adding these integrals over all countries provides the expected number of misclassified countries.

3.6. *Simulation 2: The expected number of deviation in HDI ranks*

In addition to sorting countries into the three broad HDI categories of 'low', 'medium' and 'high', the UNDP statistics are used to produce league rankings of countries. We calculate the expected number of absolute deviations in rank by simulating (n = 1,…, 10,000) the 2006 HDI ranking. The simulated rankings are produced by calculating for every country i the simulated HDI as $\mathrm{SimHDI}_{i,2006} = \mathrm{HDI}_{i,2006} + \eta_i$ with η_i distributed as mean zero and variance

$\sigma^2(overall)_i$. Finally, after each *n*th simulation country *i's simulated* rank is recorded relative to its actual observed rank in 2006.

4. Results

4.1. *Results with Respect to the Cardinal Errors of Data Updating and Formula Changes*

If one followed Oskar Morgenstern's (1970) advice given in the introduction, an alternative way for UNDP to report HDI scores would be to report country specific noise measures. To do so, we display country specific standard errors in Table 2. With respect to the standard errors due to the measurement error of data updating (column 8), we find that $\sigma_{D,i}$ ranges between a minimum value of 0.004 (United States) and a maximum value of 0.069 (Syria), with an average value across all countries of 0.026. Given that the HDI is an average over three subindicators, whereby positive and negative deviations in the subindicators cancel out,[9] and given that the HDI is scaled from of 0 to 1, these standard deviations are large and significant. Figure 4 displays the relationship between the country specific measurement error due to the data revisions, $\sigma_{D,i}$ and the countries' HDI score (as of 2006). We note that more developed countries have smaller updating variances. Similarly column (3) displays the country specific data measurement errors due to formula updates $\sigma_{F,i}$, whose ranges on average are even higher compared to $\sigma_{D,i}$. We find the estimated $\sigma_{F,i}$ range between a minimum value of 0.034 and a maximum value of 0.127 with a world average standard deviation of 0.072.

Since the HDI is primarily used as an ordinal measure, we now turn to the impact of these cardinal measures on the ordinal dimension. Figure 5 displays the case of the "average" non-industrial country with HDI = 0.65 using the average standard deviation over *all* non-

[9] The correlation between the three subindicator error terms ε_{itk}, $k \in \{1,2,3\}$ is close to zero and can be viewed as distributed approximately independently. Hence the average standard deviation of the subindicator errors s^2_k must be larger in magnitude, compared to the standard deviation of the HDI, $\sigma_{D,i}$. Section 4.4 confirms this by analyzing the compound error term.

industrialized countries due to data revisions, σ_D=0.03 and due to formula updates σ_F=0.08. Figure 5 shows that substantial probability mass is spread over all three development categories. In Table 2, the category specific probabilities are displayed for all countries in columns (4)-(6), and (9)-(11) for the formula based error and data upgrading errors respectively. For example, as of 2006, South Africa, Mongolia, Syria, India, Honduras, Bolivia have non-zero probabilities of belonging to all three categories simultaneously. Even a high human development country, such as Costa Rica with HDI of 0.84, can still be a 'low' with 0.3% probability and yet be 'medium' to 37%. Finally, columns (7) and (12) display the total probability of a particular country being misclassified by using formula (4). The sum over these column probabilities show that currently, in expectation, 10.4 countries are misclassified due to data updating measurement error and 20.7 countries are misclassified due to formula updates; these numbers translate into, 11% and 21% of all countries being misclassified.

We interpret the misclassification of 11% due to data updating as *conservative* because $\sigma^2_{D,i}$ is just based on "short term" differences between $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathbf{R}}_t$, based on the years from 1990 to 2006. There also exists "long term" data updating error, which taking into account, that may increase σ^2_D as $|\mathrm{HDI}_t\ \mathrm{HDI}^{\mathbf{R}\,s}_t|$ increases with s. While we cannot capture this long-term effect by formula (1) (due to the lack of published original data prior to the HDR of 1990), we illustrated the magnitude of such "long term" drift in Figure 2.

4.2. *Overall Cardinal Error and Rank Simulations*

The typical user of the HDI statistics may not be concerned about the individual error statistics σ^2_D and σ^2_F if they are calculated independently of each other, but the researcher may be more interested in obtaining a sense of the overall error in the data. For this purpose we calculate country specific overall cardinal error statistics $\sigma^2(\mathrm{overall})_i$ and find that the world average of

these measures $\sigma^2(\text{overall}) = \Sigma_i\sigma^2(\text{overall})_i/N$ equals to 0.007, compared to $\sigma^2_D = 0.001$ and $\sigma^2_F = 0.006$. Furthermore we find that all country specific covariance terms $cov(e_{Di},e_{Fi})$ are relatively small (all correlation coefficients are smaller than 0.06 in absolute value) which implies that the updating error is not linearly correlated with the formula error. This implies that 86% of the total HDI variance is contributed by the formula error and 14% by the measurement error due to data updating.[10] By using the same methodology as in Section 3.5, we calculate the "overall" expected number of countries misclassified as 22.9. The country specific overall variance statistics are given in column (3) of Table 3.

Moreover, column (1) of Table 3 displays the country specific expected absolute value of rank displacements based upon the rank of the country's HDI in 2006. Worldwide, the average country is displaced by about nine ranks. This average absolute displacement obscures the direction of rank displacement and the uncertainty over rank displacements. To this end, Figure 6 displays the average rank displacement over 10,000 simulations as a function of the countries' 2006 HDI score along with the 95% confidence intervals. The confidence intervals are large, leading to an average deviation of -21 ranks and +20 ranks for the 2.5% percentile and the 97.5% percentile respectively. Figure 6 also shows that countries with a low initial 2006 rank (low HDI score) do on average better in the simulated rank statistics and countries with an initial high HDI in 2006 are more likely to lose ranks in the simulations.

4.3. *Results with Respect to the Cutoff Value Problem*

Our third measure of misclassification is due to the non-adjustment problem of the cut-off values 0.5 and 0.8 that the UN uses to classify countries as low, medium and high human developed countries. If the UNDP had adjusted the cut-off values in a manner consistent with the

[10] We calculate the %-contribution of the *j*th cardinal source of error to the overall error as $\sigma^2_{ji}/\sigma^2(\text{overall})_i$. This calculation is hence net of the covariance of the two error sources. The covariance terms can essentially be neglected due to the fact these are small in magnitude.

1990 classification, since 1999 (the year of the last formula update), the thresholds should be at the values 0.55 and 0.70, as opposed to 0.5 and 0.8. This lack of adjustment of the cutoff values results in 34% of the countries being misclassified today.[11] Among all developing countries the percentage of misclassification is even higher: 45%. With such a high percentage statements such as '*over the last decade x% of African countries successfully moved from the 'low' to the 'medium' human development category*'—as expressed in numerous policy papers and news reports (United Nations 1996, People's Daily 2001, Daily Times 2005)—become useless at best, if not blatantly misleading. The listing of the misclassified countries due to this source of error is provided in Table 4.

4.4. *Measurement Error with Respect to the Underlying Variables of the HDI*

Thus far, we analyzed the data error of the HDI. Since the same variables used to construct the HDI serve as key data in many academic studies as well as inputs to many other international comparative statistics, it is worthwhile analyzing the subindicators $\boldsymbol{y}$ pertaining to health, education and income in more detail.

The first four columns of Table 5 display summary statistics of the overall HDI updating error, *e,* and the vector of subindicator updating errors, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$**,** for our sample of 76 non-industrialized countries. In general, the standard deviations of the health and education indexes are larger than the standard deviations of the income statistics. It is interesting to note, however, that the main driver for the HDI upward bias stems from the change to the income index (m_{income}=0.01).[12] Instead, the errors on the health and the education indices show distributions that are centered around zero. Note, that the min/max columns in Table 5 reveal some enormous changes; the

[11] The percentage of countries misclassified is calculated as the number of countries that have HDI scores in the ranges [0.5, 0.55) and [0.70, 0.8) divided by the total number of countries in our sample (99).

[12] Statistically, this upward bias with a standard deviation of 0.02 is not significantly different from zero.

income index changed by 15% (Sudan and Chad) and the education index even by 25% (Mongolia) on the total scale from 0 to 1.

One may ask whether the three subindicator updating errors are correlated. An analysis of the year-by-year correlation matrices of the errors does not show any systematic co-movement, as the correlation coefficients are close to zero in all years. This suggests that the statistical adjustments on the three dimensions are independent of each other and indicates that the respective national statistical offices responsible for health, education, and income statistics have no systematic contemporaneous responses. Furthermore, statistical independence of the three subindicator error variables ε_k implies that their errors must be on average larger than the variance of the HDI error e, which is confirmed by Table 5. Hence, while the three subindicator errors offset each other with respect to the HDI,[13] when working with the variables of education, income and health, one faces even larger data error.

To analyze the drivers of the HDI data error in more detail, we calculate country specific noise measures due to data revisions with respect to the underlying variables, $\boldsymbol{x}$. Table 6 reports country specific standard errors calculated as the country specific standard deviation $\sigma(x_n)_i$ (computed analogously to (2) by exploiting the 2006 data revision of x_{nit} for t = 1999 to 2005). In order to obtain a sense of the relative magnitude of the errors in each variable, we divide the standard deviations by the level corresponding variable in the year 2006, x_{ni2006} and display the resulting relative standard errors in Figure 7. Adult literacy rate, GDP and the gross enrollment ratio contribute most to the updating error of the HDI. In contrast, life expectancy is revised

[13] Under the assumption of independence, the standard deviation for the composite HDI error, e, is given by std(e)=SQRT[($\Sigma_k s_k^2/9$)], which, after replacing s_k by , equals to std(e)= 0.014. The estimated standard deviation of the HDI measurement error by formula (1) applied to period C is 0.015, hence very close to std(e), confirming this theoretical result of independence.

much less. As is clearly recognizable in Figure 7, we find that the more highly developed the country the smaller its measurement error due to data updating.

5. Discussion of the results

Given that the HDI is subject to a considerable amount of measurement error, the use of the HDI and its triple bin classification system can lead to serious interpretability problems. We now investigate the consequences of these three sources of errors by replicating prior studies and uses of the HDI, with each of the analysis being uniquely linked to our three sources of errors.

5.1. *The HDI as a definitional measure*

While there does not exist a standardized definition of the term "developing country", the definition is often linked to the HDI, as being a country with low to moderate development status. In fact, often scientific studies have been explicitly using the HDI system to identify a set of developing countries (i.e. Noorbakhsh, 2006; Varenne, 2007; Lauber and Roessler, 2007; Alvan, 2009). Leading online dictionaries do refer to the HDI in order to define the term "developing country" (Wikipedia, 2008; Babylon, 2009; SearchWiki, 2009). Here it is common to differentiate development status by using three different colors. In Figure 8, we recreate such a map by displaying the HDI scores for 2006. To demonstrate the impact of misclassification in our sample, we reclassify the countries using the updated thresholds of 0.55 and 0.70 as discussed in Section 3.3. The visual impact of this reclassification is striking, especially in South America, Southeast Asia and Africa. This misclassification is particularly problematic, if organizations/institutions use these categories to design particular policies or rules.

5.2. *The HDI and Foreign Development Aid:*

Although, to our knowledge, the HDI is not formally used by any development agency as the sole index used to determine the distribution of development funds, there are clear

indications that the HDI plays a significant role in governmental institutions' and NGOs' decisions for foreign aid allocation.[14] In 2000, the Deputy Director of the UNDP exemplified this debate by stating:

> *'At the global level, issues are now being explored as to whether bilateral aid can be allocated on the basis of HDI, or the core funds of multilateral agencies can be based on the index […]'* (p. 10, Jahan, 2000).

In fact, 'charity scorecards' are increasingly used as a tool for helping individuals decide which countries to donate money to. Here the HDI can be used to construct such a score. For example, on the homepage of http://www.charityscorecard.org/ a world map of HDI scores is displayed. The use of the HDI in this context may explicitly and implicitly steer users to "misclassified countries". Further, the triple bin classification is often used for report writing purposes to describe donor activities by governmental organizations (United Nations, 1996; HDR, 2001 to 2007) and non-governmental organizations. For example, Geneva Global (2007), which holds investments of 60 million client dollars in development projects, structures its funds according to the three HDI categories. For each year, the United Nations (HDR 2001 to 2006) analyzes the newest data on development aid as a function of the three human development categories. Drawing on these HDR statistics, Table 7 summarizes that across all years countries in the 'low' category obtained 3.4 times the official development assistance (ODA) per capita as compared to the medium development countries, which we do not claim is a causal effect but rather an interesting correlation.

5.3. *Use of the HDI statistics in the academic literature*

[14] For a related discussion see Alesina and Dollar (2000), Alesina and Weder (2002), Arcelus *et al.* (2005), Bandyopadhyay and Wall (2006), Easterly *et al*. (2004).

The HDI has been increasingly employed in the academic literature to describe the evolution of the world's "welfare" distribution in terms of various measures of inequality, such as the Gini coefficient, and to discuss the path of polarization, *e.g.* Pillarisetti (1997), Ogwang (2000), Mazumdar (2002), Noorbakhsh (2006), Prados de la Escosura (2007). The results published in these studies can differ greatly depending on which year the researcher collected the data in. To illustrate, Figure 9 displays HDI Gini coefficients using the formulas h_A, h_B and h_C for data covering 1975 to 2005 in five years intervals. The values produced by formula h_A are 25% to 50% *higher* and the time trend *steeper* compared to the time series generated by formula h_C. This substantial difference would lead to different conclusions or policy recommendations by the analyst. For a recent discussion on the relevance of levels and gradients of Gini estimates see for example Sala-i-Martin (2006) and Prados de la Escosura (2007).

We find that a number of recent studies are sensitive to random selection of countries that is due to the "arbitrariness" of the cut-off values: For example in the macroeconomic literature, Mazumdar (2002) and Noorbakhsh (2006) use the triple bins to analyze the existence of convergence clubs (Quah 1996) by testing the beta and the sigma conditional convergence hypothesis, originally discussed in Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1992). In particular, Noorbakhsh (2006) runs beta-convergence regressions of the form

$$\ln(hdi_{it+T}/hdi_{it})/T = \alpha + \beta\ln(hdi_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it} \qquad (3)$$

conditional on the country belonging to the 'low' development bin. The dependent variable is the annualized growth of the HDI variable for country i over the period t to $t+T$ and hdi_{it} is the ratio of HDI in the ith country to the average for the sample.[15] The regression is then repeated for the

[15] A value of β in the range of (-1, 0) would imply β-convergence of the countries in the sample. A β of zero means no convergence and a positive value for β indicates divergence, with the speed of convergence/divergence the higher the absolute value of β.

bins 'medium' and 'high' and the comparison of the β estimates is used to analyze the existence of convergence clubs.

To illustrate the consequences of the random selection, we first rerun the convergence regression (3) conditional on the HDI being in the interval A_0 = [0.5, 0.8) as specified in Noorbakhsh (2006, p. 10, table 3). Then we perform the same regression with the adjusted cut-off values in the set A_1 = [0.55, 0.70). The results are displayed in Table 8. Comparing the main parameter of interest, β, the estimate of the second regression is about 100% off the first regression implying a much faster speed of convergence.[16] This demonstrates that results based on the reported HDI can be very sensitive to changes of the HDI triple bin classification system.

5.4. *Implications of the results in statistical analysis*

Econometrically speaking, the average error measures σ^2_D and σ^2_F calculated in Section 4.1 imply that there is a 3% and 14% downward attenuation bias in a ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, $y = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{HDI*} + \varepsilon$, if the observed HDI—instead of the "true" (but unknown) HDI*—is used as the regressor (for any variable y of interest). The bias of the OLS estimate b_2 is given by[17]

$$\text{plim } b^D_2 = [1-\sigma^2_D/(\sigma^2_D+\sigma^2_{HDI*})]\beta_2 \approx 0.97\beta_2$$

and

$$\text{plim } b^F_2 = [1-\sigma^2_F/(\sigma^2_F+\sigma^2_{HDI*})]\beta_2 \approx 0.86\beta_2.$$

This is important since in many econometric cross-country studies the HDI is used as a regressor, i.e. Globerman and Shapiro (2002), Mazumdar (2002), Sanyal and Samanta (2004), Neumayer

[16] Note that the two β estimates are statistically significant with t values of -6.74 and -.4.59 for the sample of countries in A_0 and in A_1, respectively. We reject at the 1% significance level the hypothesis of uniform convergence in A_0 and in A_1 based on the Wald test examining whether β_1 is different from β_0, based on the pooled sample with appropriate interaction terms, with standard errors clustered by country.

[17] σ^2_{HDI*} is approximated by the empirical analogue of the 2006 HDI scores, $\hat{\sigma}^2_{HDI*} = 0.036$.

(2003), Noorbakhsh (2006), Leigh and Wolfers (2006). This is even more crucial when working with the individual subindicator variables, since (as shown in Section 4.4) their average standard deviation of the measurement error is larger than the error of the HDI.

6. Conclusions

This paper identifies three sources of HDI data error and we make the following empirical contributions. First, we calculate country specific noise measures due to measurement error, formula choice and inconsistencies in the cut-off values. We find that the HDI statistics contain a substantial amount of noise on the order of 0.01 to 0.11 standard deviations. In analyzing the sources of the updating error we calculate country specific variances of GDP per capita, literacy rate, educational enrollment and life expectancy and we calculate the interdependence between these measures. We find that in general the higher the development status of a country, the more precise are the reported data. Second, we calculate the misclassification measures with respect to these three sources of data error by simulating the probabilities of being misclassified and sensitivity analysis of the cut-off values. We find that up to 45% of the developing countries are misclassified due to the failure to update the cutoff values. The discrete classification system is vulnerable when many countries are close to the thresholds, as is the case in the most recent years. Third, we discuss various empirical examples from the prior macroeconomic/development literature where the HDI has been employed and find that its use is problematic. Key parameters vary by up to 100% in their values. Although there may be certain benefits for the UN and charities for using a triple-bin classification system—bins are likely to improve publicity for the HDI and may hence help with more efficient internal organization of aid institutions—our results raise serious concerns about the system. We suggest that the United Nations should discontinue the practice of classifying countries into these

triple bins because in our view the two cut-off values are arbitrary, can provide incentives for strategic behavior in reporting official statistics, and have the potential to misguide politicians, investors, charity donators and the public at large.

This paper did not investigate the drivers of why in the early years of the HDI—when its political role was still uncertain—the distribution as displayed in Figure 1 looked so different from today's. However, we caution governments, private investors, donor organizations and users of the charity scorecards not to take the triple bin system as a tool for international negotiations (Hu, 2009), foreign direct investments (Arcelus *et al.*, 2005), pricing (Bate and Boateng, 2007), or the allocation of foreign aid (Jahan, 2000; Neumayer, 2003). Such politically sensitive uses of the HDI might potentially provide perverse incentives for a country to manipulate the subindicator variables, if it has realized the comparative advantage of a 0.49 HDI score vs. a 0.51 score. In fact, announcements such as the statement by Jahan (2000) (discussed in Section 5.2) might have just created these incentives. We quote Oskar Morgenstern (1970):

> *'Governments, too are not free from falsifying statistics. This occurs, for example, when they are bargaining with other governments and wish to obtain strategic advantages or feel impelled to bluff [...]. A special study of these falsified, suppressed, and misrepresented government statistics is greatly needed and should be made.'*

References

Acemoglu, D. and Johnson, S. (2007). 'Disease and Development: The Effect of Life Expectancy on Economic Growth', *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 115, pp. 925-985.

Alesina, A. and Dollar, D. (2000). 'Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?', *Journal of Economic Growth*, vol. 5(1), pp. 33-63.

Alesina, A. and Weder, B. (2002). 'Do Corrupt Governments Receive Less Foreign Aid?' *American Economic Review*, vol. 92(4), pp. 1126-1137.

Anand, S. and Sen A.K. (2000). 'The Income Component of the Human Development Index', *Journal of Human Development*, vol. 1(1), pp. 83-106.

Anand, S. and Ravallion, M. (1993). 'Human Development in Poor Countries: On the Role of Private Incomes and Public Services', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 7(1), pp. 133-150.

Anand, S. and Sen A.K. (1994). 'Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement', Human Development Report Office. UNDP. New York.

Anand, S. and Sen, A.K. (1997). 'Concepts of Human Development and Poverty. A Multidimensional Perspective', in Human Development Papers. UNDP. New York.

Anand, S. and Sen, A. (2000). 'The Income Component of the Human Development Index', *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, vol. 1(1), pp. 83-106.

Anderson R.N. (1999). 'Method for constructing complete annual U.S. life tables'. *Vital Health Stat* vol. 2(129), pp. 1-28.

Arcelus, F.J., Sharma, B. and Srinivasan, G. (2005). 'Foreign Capital Flows and the Efficiency of the HDI Dimensions', *Global Economy Journal*, vol. 5(2), Article 4.

Aturupane, H., Glewwe, P. and Isenman, P. (1994). 'Poverty, Human Development, and Growth. An Emerging Consensus?', *American Economic Review*, vol. 84(2), pp. 244-249.

Babylon (2009): 'Definition of the term "Developing Country" in Dictionary *Babylon*' http://www.babylon.com/definition/developing_countries/English (last accessed: 29 October 2009).

Baliamoune, M. (2003). 'On the Measurement of Human Well-Being. Fuzzy Set Theory and Sen'S Capability Approach', *World Institute for Development Economic Research Paper* 2004/16.

Bandyopadhyay, S. and Wall, H.J. (2006). 'The Determinants of Aid in the Post-Cold War Era', Working Paper 2006-021B, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Barro, R.J. and Lee, J.W. (1993). 'International Comparisons of Educational Attainment', *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 32(3), pp. 363-94.

Barro R.J. and Lee, J.W. (2001), 'International data on educational attainment. updates and implications', *Oxford Economic Papers*, vol. 53, pp. 541-563.

Barro, Robert J., and Sala-i-Martin, X. (1992). 'Convergence', *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 100, pp. 223–251.

Bate, R and Boateng, K. (2007). 'Drug Pricing and Its Discontents. At Home and Abroad', *Health Policy Outlook*, vol. 9, August.

Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J. (2005). 'Happiness and the Human Development Indevol. x. The Paradox of Australia', *Australian Economic Review*, vol. 38, pp. 307-318.

Charityscorecard.org, http.//www.charityscorecard.org/ (last accessed 2 January, 2009).

Daily Times (2005). 'Pakistan ranked at 135th in human development'. September 15.

Dasgupta, P. (2001). 'Valuing Objects and Evaluating Policies in Imperfect Economies', THE ECONOMIC JOURNAL, vol. 111, pp. 1-29.

Deaton A. and Heston, A. (2008). 'Understanding PPP and PPP-based national accounts', NBER Working Paper No. 14499.

de la Fuente, A. and Doménech, R. (2006). 'Human Capital in Growth Regressions: How Much Difference Does Data Quality Make?', *Journal of the European Economic Association*, vol. 4(1), pp. 1-36.

Desai, M. (1991). 'Human Development. Concepts and Measurement', *European Economic Journal*, vol. 35, pp. 350-357.

Dowrick, S. and Quiggin, J. (1997). 'True Measures of GDP and Convergence', *American Economic Review*, vol. 87(1), pp. 41-64.

Easterlin, R. A. (2000). 'The Worldwide Standard of Living Since 1800', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 14(1), pp. 7–26.

Easterly, W., Levine, R. and Roodman, D. (2004). 'Aid, Policies, and Growth. Comment', *American Economic Review*, vol. 94(3), pp. 774-780.

Geneva Global (2007). 'Geneva Global Performance Philanthropy', 15550 Liberty Ridge Drive Wayne, PA 19087, USA. http.//www.genevaglobal.com/sector-priorities/high-hd/ (last accessed 2 January 2009).

Globerman, S. and Shapiro, D. M. (2002). 'Global Foreign Direct Investments Flows. The Role of Governance Infrastructure', *World Development*, vol. 30(11), pp. 1899-1919

Guindon, G.E. and Boisclair, D. (2003). 'Past, current and future trends in tobacco use', *Tobacco Control*, WHO Tobacco Control Papers, TRENDS2003.

Hargittai, E. (1998). 'Holes in the Net. The Internet and International Stratification Revisited' *Proceedings of the Internet Society's Internet Summit meetings*.

HDR (1990 to 2006). 'Human Development Report', UNDP, Oxford University Press.

Hu, A. (2009). ‘A new approach at Copenhagen’, *Chinadialogue* 2892, Part 1, April 06, 2009. Rutgers Climate and Social Policy Initiative.

Jahan, S. (2000). ‘Measurement of Human Development. Seven Questions’, Lecture Reading by Deputy Director of the Human Development Report Office, UNDP.

Keiser, J., Utzinger, J. Tanner, M. and Singer, B.H. (2004). ‘Representation of authors and editors from countries with different human development indexes in the leading literature on tropical medicine’, *British Medical Journal*, vol. 328, pp. 1229-1232.

Kelley, A. C. (1991). ‘The Human Development Index. "Handle with Care"’, *Population and Development Review*, vol. 17(2), pp. 315-324.

Krueger, A.B. and Lindahl, M. (2001). ‘Education for Growth. Why and For Whom?’, *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 39(4), pp. 1101-1136

Leigh, A. and Wolfers, J. (2006). ‘Happiness and the Human Development Index. Australia is Not a Paradox’, *Australian Economic Review*, vol. 39(2). 176-184.

Mazumdar, K. (2002). ‘A Note on Cross-Country Divergence in Standard of Living’, *Applied Economic Letters*, vol. 9(2), pp. 87-90.

McGillivray, M. (1991). ‘Redundant Composite Development Indicator’. *World Development*, vol. 19 (10), pp. 1461-9.

Moreno-Ternero, J.D. and Romer, J.E. (2006). ‘Impartiality, Priority, and Solidarity in the Theory of Justice’, *Econometrica*, vol. 74(5), pp. 1419–1427.

Morgenstern, O. (1970). ‘On the Accuracy of Economic Observations’, second edition, Princeton University Press.

Morse, S. (2003). ‘Greening the United Nations’ Human Development Index’, *Sustainable Development*, vol. 11, pp. 183–198.

Neary J. P. (2004). 'Rationalizing the Penn World Table. True Multilateral Indices for International Comparisons of Real Income', *American Economic Review*, vol. 94(5), pp. 1411-1428.

Neumayer, E. (2003). 'The Determinants of Aid Allocation by Regional Multilateral Development Banks and United Nations Agencies', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 47(1), pp. 101-22.

Noorbakhsh, F. (1998). 'The human development index. some technical issues and alternative indices', *Journal of International Development*, vol. 10(5), pp. 589–605.

Noorbakhsh, F. (2006). 'International Convergence or Higher Inequality in Human Development? Evidence for 1975 to 2002', World Institute for Development Economic Research Paper No. 2006/15.

Ogwang, T. (2000). 'Inter-Country Inequality in Human Development Indicators', *Applied Economic Letters*, vol. 7(7), pp. 443-46.

O'Neill, H. (2005). 'Ireland's Foreign Aid in 2004', *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, vol. 16, pp. 279–316.

Oswald, A. J. (1997). 'Happiness and Economic Performance', ECONOMIC JOURNAL, vol. 107(445), pp. 1815–1831.

Pakistan Times (2004). 'Pakistan improves Human Development Indicators', *Pakistan Times National News Desk*. July 20, 2004.

People's Daily (2001). 'Ghana's Human Development Performance Recommended by UNDP', July 11, 2001.

Petersen, M. and Rother, L. (2001). 'Maker Agrees to Cut Price of 2 AIDS Drugs in Brazil', *New York Times*. March 31, 2001.

Pillarisetti, J. R. (1997). 'An Empirical Note on Inequality in the World Development Indicators', *Applied Economic Letters*, vol. 4(3), pp. 145-47.

Quah, D. (1996). 'Twin Peaks. Growth and Convergence in Models of Distribution Dynamics', ECONOMIC JOURNAL, vol. 106(437), pp. 1045–1055.

Rogoff, K. (1996). 'The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle', *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 34(2), pp. 647-668.

Sala-i-Martin, X. (2006). 'The World Distribution of Income. Falling Poverty and…Convergence, Period*', Quarterly Journal of Economics,* vol. 121(2), pp. 351-97.

Sanyal, R. N. and Samanta, S. K. (2004). 'Determinants of bribery in international business', *Thunderbird International Business Review*, vol. 46(2), pp. 133–148.

SearchWiki (2009). 'Definition of the term "Developing Country" in Dictionary SearchWiki', http://www.searchthewiki.com/wikisearch/?q=Developing%20-countries (last accessed: 29 October 2009).

Sen, A. K. (1977). 'On Weights and Measures. Informational Constraints in Social Welfare Analysis', *Econometrica*, vol. 45(7), pp. 1539-72.

Sen, A. K. (1984). 'The Living Standard', *Oxford Economic Papers*, vol. 36, pp. 74-90.

Sen, A. K. (1985). *Commodities and Capabilities*, Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Sen, A. K. (1987). 'On Ethics and Economics', The Royer Lectures at the University of California at Berkeley. Oxford. Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Sen, A. K. (2000). 'A Decade of Human Development', *Journal of Human Development*, vol. 1(1), pp. 17-23.

Srinivasan, T. N. (1994). 'Human Development. A New Paradigm or Reinvention of the Wheel?', *American Economic Review*, vol. 84(2), pp. 238-243.

United Nations (1996). 'Africa Recovery', UN-NADAF Midterm Review, September 1996.

Wikipedia (2008): Definition of the term "Developing Country" in Dictionary "Wikipedia". http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title= Developing_country&oldid=188947979 (last accessed 1 February 2008).

Table 1. Structure of the Type of Errors for Different Levels of Data Aggregation

Type of Error	***x***	***y***(***x***)	*HDI*(***y***)	θ(*HDI*)
Data revisions D	√	√	√	√
Formula updates F		√	√	√
Cut-off value C			√	√

Note: For each column we indicate by the symbol √ which type of data error can affect the particular variable displayed in the column. ***x*** refers to the raw variables, ***y***(***x***) to the subindicators which are functions of ***x***, HDI is a function of the ***y*** and θ(*HDI*) refers to any parameter of interest (i.e. Gini coefficient) that is calculated as a function of one or multiple HDI values.

Table 2. Country *i* specific standard deviations and probabilities of belonging to development category *j*

Country *i*	2006 reported human develop-ment status	2006 HDI	Measures based on formula updates (F)					Measures based on measurement error due to data revisions (D)				
			$\sigma_{F,i}$	Pr{*i*='low')	Prob{*i*='mid')	Prob{*i*='high')	Prob{*i*=mis-classified)	$\sigma_{D,i}$	Pr{*i*='low')	Prob{*i*='mid')	Prob{*i*='high')	Prob{*i*=mis-classified)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Niger	low	0.31	0.13	93.1	6.9	0.0	6.9	0.03	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mali	low	0.34	0.12	91.9	8.1	0.0	8.1	0.03	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Burkina Faso	low	0.34	0.11	92.3	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.02	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chad	low	0.37	0.11	89.3	10.7	0.0	10.7	0.04	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ethiopia	low	0.37	0.11	88.3	11.7	0.0	11.7	0.03	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Burundi	low	0.38	0.11	85.4	14.6	0.0	14.6	0.02	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mozambique	low	0.39	0.11	83.4	16.6	0.0	16.6	0.03	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Malawi	low	0.40	0.13	78.7	21.2	0.1	21.3	0.01	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zambia	low	0.41	0.09	86.2	13.8	0.0	13.8	0.04	98.5	1.5	0.0	1.5
Côte d'Ivoire	low	0.42	0.09	82.1	17.9	0.0	17.9	0.02	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Benin	low	0.43	0.10	76.8	23.2	0.0	23.2	0.03	99.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Tanzania	low	0.43	0.08	80.1	19.9	0.0	19.9	0.02	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.2
Nigeria	low	0.45	0.10	69.0	31.0	0.0	31.0	0.05	87.5	12.5	0.0	12.5
Rwanda	low	0.45	0.08	72.4	27.6	0.0	27.6	0.05	86.0	14.0	0.0	14.0
Senegal	low	0.46	0.08	68.5	31.5	0.0	31.5	0.02	99.5	0.5	0.0	0.5
Mauritania	low	0.49	0.08	56.6	43.4	0.0	43.4	0.03	66.5	33.5	0.0	33.5
Kenya	low	0.49	0.08	54.7	45.3	0.0	45.3	0.02	64.3	35.7	0.0	35.7
Zimbabwe	low	0.49	0.05	56.6	43.4	0.0	43.4	0.03	62.3	37.7	0.0	37.7
Lesotho	low	0.49	0.06	53.7	46.3	0.0	46.3	0.03	59.5	40.5	0.0	40.5
Togo	low	0.50	0.08	52.5	47.5	0.0	47.5	0.04	55.0	45.0	0.0	45.0
Uganda	medium	0.50	0.10	49.2	50.7	0.1	49.3	0.02	46.2	53.8	0.0	46.2
Cameroon	medium	0.51	0.07	46.6	53.4	0.0	46.6	0.04	44.6	55.4	0.0	44.6
Madagascar	medium	0.51	0.08	45.4	54.6	0.0	45.4	0.03	39.3	60.7	0.0	39.3
Sudan	medium	0.52	0.07	41.1	58.9	0.0	41.1	0.03	32.2	67.8	0.0	32.2
Congo	medium	0.52	0.08	39.9	60.1	0.0	39.9	0.05	35.3	64.7	0.0	35.3
Papua New Guinea	medium	0.52	0.06	33.9	66.1	0.0	33.9	0.04	27.7	72.3	0.0	27.7
Nepal	medium	0.53	0.09	38.0	61.9	0.1	38.1	0.02	10.4	89.6	0.0	10.4
Bangladesh	medium	0.53	0.08	35.3	64.7	0.0	35.3	0.02	7.3	92.7	0.0	7.3
Ghana	medium	0.53	0.06	30.8	69.2	0.0	30.8	0.04	20.5	79.5	0.0	20.5
Pakistan	medium	0.54	0.07	27.5	72.5	0.0	27.5	0.03	10.7	89.3	0.0	10.7
Lao People's Dem. R.	medium	0.55	0.08	25.2	74.7	0.1	25.3	0.06	18.7	81.3	0.0	18.7
Botswana	medium	0.57	0.05	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3	0.04	3.4	96.6	0.0	3.4
India	medium	0.61	0.06	3.0	96.9	0.1	3.1	0.01	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Morocco	medium	0.64	0.04	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.02	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
South Africa	medium	0.65	0.05	0.2	99.5	0.3	0.5	0.07	1.3	97.2	1.6	2.8
Guatemala	medium	0.67	0.04	0.0	99.9	0.1	0.1	0.02	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Honduras	medium	0.68	0.06	0.1	97.9	2.0	2.1	0.02	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Mongolia	medium	0.69	0.07	0.3	94.1	5.6	5.9	0.06	0.1	96.1	3.9	3.9
Bolivia	medium	0.69	0.06	0.0	97.1	2.8	2.9	0.02	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Nicaragua	medium	0.70	0.05	0.0	98.6	1.4	1.4	0.04	0.0	99.2	0.8	0.8
Egypt	medium	0.70	0.04	0.0	99.5	0.5	0.5	0.04	0.0	99.7	0.3	0.3

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Viet Nam	medium	0.71	0.07	0.2	88.9	10.9	11.1	0.02	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Indonesia	medium	0.71	0.06	0.0	93.9	6.0	6.1	0.03	0.0	99.9	0.1	0.1
Syrian Arab Republic	medium	0.72	0.06	0.0	92.0	7.9	8.0	0.07	0.1	88.6	11.3	11.4
Jamaica	medium	0.72	0.06	0.0	88.0	11.9	12.0	0.02	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Algeria	medium	0.73	0.04	0.0	95.6	4.4	4.4	0.04	0.0	97.5	2.5	2.5
El Salvador	medium	0.73	0.05	0.0	90.3	9.7	9.7	0.05	0.0	91.1	8.9	8.9
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	medium	0.75	0.05	0.0	84.6	15.4	15.4	0.03	0.0	98.1	1.9	1.9
Dominican Republic	medium	0.75	0.06	0.0	80.0	20.0	20.0	0.02	0.0	99.9	0.1	0.1
Sri Lanka	medium	0.76	0.08	0.0	72.3	27.7	27.7	0.02	0.0	96.6	3.4	3.4
Paraguay	medium	0.76	0.07	0.0	72.1	27.9	27.9	0.03	0.0	93.0	7.0	7.0
Turkey	medium	0.76	0.07	0.0	72.0	28.0	28.0	0.01	0.0	99.9	0.1	0.1
Jordan	medium	0.76	0.07	0.0	73.1	26.9	26.9	0.03	0.0	89.1	10.9	10.9
Tunisia	medium	0.76	0.06	0.0	76.2	23.8	23.8	0.02	0.0	96.2	3.8	3.8
Philippines	medium	0.76	0.06	0.0	73.8	26.2	26.2	0.03	0.0	90.6	9.4	9.4
Peru	medium	0.77	0.05	0.0	74.1	25.9	25.9	0.02	0.0	96.9	3.1	3.1
China	medium	0.77	0.06	0.0	69.7	30.3	30.3	0.02	0.0	94.7	5.3	5.3
Lebanon	medium	0.77	0.06	0.0	68.1	31.9	31.9	0.04	0.0	74.9	25.1	25.1
Saudi Arabia	medium	0.78	0.07	0.0	63.1	36.9	36.9	0.02	0.0	86.9	13.1	13.1
Albania	medium	0.78	0.07	0.0	59.5	40.5	40.5	0.04	0.0	66.8	33.2	33.2
Thailand	medium	0.78	0.09	0.1	56.9	43.0	43.1	0.02	0.0	80.0	20.0	20.0
Venezuela	medium	0.78	0.09	0.1	57.1	42.9	42.9	0.02	0.0	79.8	20.2	20.2
Colombia	medium	0.79	0.09	0.1	54.4	45.6	45.6	0.02	0.0	72.1	27.9	27.9
Brazil	medium	0.79	0.08	0.0	53.9	46.1	46.1	0.02	0.0	62.6	37.4	37.4
Mauritius	high	0.80	0.09	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.01	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Malaysia	high	0.81	0.10	0.1	47.9	52.1	47.9	0.01	0.0	24.4	75.6	24.4
Romania	high	0.81	0.09	0.1	47.8	52.1	47.9	0.05	0.0	46.3	53.7	46.3
Panama	high	0.81	0.08	0.0	45.7	54.3	45.7	0.04	0.0	39.9	60.1	39.9
Trinidad and Tobago	high	0.81	0.11	0.2	46.5	53.4	46.6	0.01	0.0	26.4	73.6	26.4
Oman	high	0.81	0.06	0.0	43.7	56.3	43.7	0.07	0.0	44.2	55.8	44.2
Bulgaria	high	0.82	0.09	0.0	42.8	57.2	42.8	0.03	0.0	29.6	70.4	29.6
Mexico	high	0.82	0.10	0.1	41.8	58.1	41.9	0.01	0.0	3.9	96.1	3.9
United Arab Emirates	high	0.84	0.05	0.0	21.1	78.9	21.1	0.02	0.0	3.4	96.6	3.4
Costa Rica	high	0.84	0.12	0.3	36.5	63.2	36.8	0.01	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1
Uruguay	high	0.85	0.10	0.0	30.8	69.2	30.8	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Chile	high	0.86	0.11	0.0	29.1	70.9	29.1	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Argentina	high	0.86	0.08	0.0	21.5	78.5	21.5	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Hungary	high	0.87	0.08	0.0	19.7	80.3	19.7	0.02	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Portugal	high	0.90	0.07	0.0	6.7	93.3	6.7	0.03	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1
Korea, Rep. of	high	0.91	0.07	0.0	6.6	93.4	6.6	0.02	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Greece	high	0.92	0.08	0.0	6.3	93.7	6.3	0.02	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Hong Kong, China	high	0.93	0.05	0.0	0.9	99.1	0.9	0.02	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Israel	high	0.93	0.06	0.0	1.2	98.8	1.2	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
New Zealand	high	0.94	0.06	0.0	1.1	98.9	1.1	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Spain	high	0.94	0.06	0.0	1.0	99.0	1.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
United Kingdom	high	0.94	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Italy	high	0.94	0.06	0.0	0.9	99.1	0.9	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
France	high	0.94	0.05	0.0	0.3	99.7	0.3	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Denmark	high	0.94	0.04	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Austria	high	0.94	0.05	0.0	0.2	99.8	0.2	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Belgium	high	0.95	0.04	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Switzerland	high	0.95	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Netherlands	high	0.95	0.04	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
United States	high	0.95	0.03	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Japan	high	0.95	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Sweden	high	0.95	0.05	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Ireland	high	0.96	0.05	0.0	0.2	99.8	0.2	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Australia	high	0.96	0.05	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.02	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Norway	high	0.97	0.04	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Expected # of countries misclassified					20.7					10.4		

Table 3. Overall error statistics and simulated rank deviations

Country *i*	Expected absolute rank deviation from rank in 2006	2006 HDI	Measures based on overall error				
			$\sigma_{(overall),i}$	Pr{*i*='low'}	Prob{*i*='mid'}	Prob{*i*='high'}	Prob{*i*=mis-classified}
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Niger	3.7	0.31	0.13	92.7	7.3	0.0	7.3
Mali	4.3	0.34	0.12	91.0	8.9	0.0	9.0
Burkina Faso	4.8	0.34	0.11	91.9	8.1	0.0	8.1
Chad	5.3	0.37	0.11	87.9	12.1	0.0	12.1
Ethiopia	5.7	0.37	0.11	87.2	12.8	0.0	12.8
Burundi	6.2	0.38	0.11	84.9	15.1	0.0	15.1
Mozambique	6.5	0.39	0.12	82.4	17.6	0.0	17.6
Malawi	6.8	0.40	0.13	78.6	21.3	0.1	21.4
Zambia	6.9	0.41	0.10	83.5	16.5	0.0	16.5
Côte d'Ivoire	7.0	0.42	0.09	81.4	18.6	0.0	18.6
Benin	7.1	0.43	0.10	75.7	24.3	0.0	24.3
Tanzania	7.3	0.43	0.09	79.0	21.0	0.0	21.0
Nigeria	7.3	0.45	0.11	67.5	32.4	0.1	32.5
Rwanda	7.1	0.45	0.10	69.7	30.3	0.0	30.3
Senegal	7.1	0.46	0.08	68.2	31.8	0.0	31.8
Mauritania	7.1	0.49	0.09	56.1	43.8	0.0	43.9
Kenya	7.1	0.49	0.08	54.5	45.5	0.0	45.5
Zimbabwe	7.0	0.49	0.06	55.9	44.1	0.0	44.1
Lesotho	7.0	0.49	0.07	53.4	46.6	0.0	46.6
Togo	7.1	0.50	0.09	52.3	47.7	0.0	47.7
Uganda	7.2	0.50	0.10	49.2	50.7	0.1	49.3
Cameroon	7.3	0.51	0.08	47.1	52.8	0.0	47.2
Madagascar	7.4	0.51	0.09	45.8	54.2	0.0	45.8
Sudan	7.7	0.52	0.08	42.0	58.0	0.0	42.0
Congo	7.9	0.52	0.09	41.6	58.2	0.2	41.8
Papua New Guinea	8.1	0.52	0.07	37.0	63.0	0.0	37.0
Nepal	8.5	0.53	0.09	38.3	61.6	0.1	38.4
Bangladesh	8.6	0.53	0.08	35.8	64.2	0.1	35.8
Ghana	9.2	0.53	0.07	33.4	66.5	0.0	33.5
Pakistan	9.5	0.54	0.07	29.6	70.3	0.0	29.7
Lao People's Dem. R.	9.8	0.55	0.10	29.7	69.7	0.6	30.3
Botswana	10.1	0.57	0.06	13.5	86.5	0.0	13.5
India	10.2	0.61	0.06	3.4	96.5	0.1	3.5
Morocco	10.3	0.64	0.04	0.0	99.9	0.0	0.1
South Africa	10.4	0.65	0.09	3.9	91.6	4.5	8.4
Guatemala	10.5	0.67	0.05	0.0	99.7	0.3	0.3
Honduras	10.8	0.68	0.06	0.1	97.1	2.8	2.9
Mongolia	10.7	0.69	0.09	2.0	85.9	12.1	14.1
Bolivia	10.6	0.69	0.06	0.1	96.0	3.9	4.0
Nicaragua	10.7	0.70	0.06	0.1	94.3	5.6	5.7
Egypt	10.6	0.70	0.05	0.0	96.9	3.1	3.1
Viet Nam	10.5	0.71	0.08	0.3	88.2	11.5	11.8

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Indonesia	10.4	0.71	0.07	0.1	91.1	8.8	8.9
Syrian Arab Republic	10.5	0.72	0.09	1.0	80.7	18.3	19.3
Jamaica	10.4	0.72	0.07	0.1	86.5	13.4	13.5
Algeria	10.2	0.73	0.06	0.0	90.5	9.5	9.5
El Salvador	10.2	0.73	0.07	0.1	82.9	17.0	17.1
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	10.2	0.75	0.06	0.0	81.6	18.4	18.4
Dominican Republic	10.1	0.75	0.06	0.0	79.1	20.9	20.9
Sri Lanka	10.0	0.76	0.08	0.1	71.3	28.6	28.7
Paraguay	9.8	0.76	0.08	0.0	71.2	28.8	28.8
Turkey	9.8	0.76	0.08	0.0	71.6	28.4	28.4
Jordan	9.6	0.76	0.07	0.0	70.6	29.3	29.4
Tunisia	9.5	0.76	0.06	0.0	74.6	25.4	25.4
Philippines	9.7	0.76	0.06	0.0	72.0	27.9	28.0
Peru	9.5	0.77	0.05	0.0	73.3	26.7	26.7
China	9.6	0.77	0.06	0.0	69.2	30.8	30.8
Lebanon	9.8	0.77	0.07	0.0	65.2	34.8	34.8
Saudi Arabia	9.8	0.78	0.07	0.0	62.6	37.4	37.4
Albania	9.9	0.78	0.08	0.0	58.3	41.7	41.7
Thailand	10.0	0.78	0.09	0.1	56.7	43.2	43.3
Venezuela	10.0	0.78	0.09	0.1	56.8	43.1	43.2
Colombia	10.3	0.79	0.09	0.1	54.2	45.7	45.8
Brazil	10.4	0.79	0.09	0.0	53.7	46.3	46.3
Mauritius	10.5	0.80	0.09	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Malaysia	10.5	0.81	0.10	0.1	47.9	52.1	47.9
Romania	10.7	0.81	0.11	0.2	47.9	51.9	48.1
Panama	10.7	0.81	0.09	0.0	46.0	54.0	46.0
Trinidad and Tobago	10.7	0.81	0.11	0.2	46.5	53.3	46.7
Oman	10.8	0.81	0.09	0.0	45.6	54.3	45.7
Bulgaria	11.0	0.82	0.09	0.0	43.1	56.8	43.2
Mexico	11.0	0.82	0.10	0.1	41.9	58.0	42.0
United Arab Emirates	10.9	0.84	0.05	0.0	23.1	76.9	23.1
Costa Rica	10.9	0.84	0.12	0.3	36.6	63.1	36.9
Uruguay	10.9	0.85	0.10	0.0	30.8	69.1	30.9
Chile	10.8	0.86	0.11	0.0	29.2	70.8	29.2
Argentina	10.6	0.86	0.08	0.0	21.8	78.2	21.8
Hungary	10.5	0.87	0.08	0.0	20.1	79.9	20.1
Portugal	10.2	0.90	0.08	0.0	8.7	91.3	8.7
Korea, Rep. of	9.9	0.91	0.08	0.0	7.0	93.0	7.0
Greece	9.6	0.92	0.08	0.0	6.6	93.4	6.6
Hong Kong, China	9.2	0.93	0.06	0.0	1.3	98.7	1.3
Israel	9.0	0.93	0.06	0.0	1.4	98.6	1.4
New Zealand	8.6	0.94	0.06	0.0	1.2	98.8	1.2
Spain	8.3	0.94	0.06	0.0	1.2	98.8	1.2
United Kingdom	7.9	0.94	0.05	0.0	0.2	99.8	0.2
Italy	7.7	0.94	0.06	0.0	1.0	99.0	1.0
France	7.4	0.94	0.05	0.0	0.3	99.7	0.3
Denmark	7.2	0.94	0.04	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Austria	7.2	0.94	0.05	0.0	0.2	99.8	0.2
Belgium	7.2	0.95	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1
Switzerland	7.2	0.95	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Netherlands	7.4	0.95	0.04	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1
United States	7.8	0.95	0.03	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Japan	8.3	0.95	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1
Sweden	9.0	0.95	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1
Ireland	9.7	0.96	0.05	0.0	0.2	99.8	0.2
Australia	11.3	0.96	0.05	0.0	0.1	99.9	0.1
Norway	14.0	0.97	0.04	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Average world absolute deviation in rank	9.0		Expected # of countries misclassified.				22.9

Table 4. As of 2006, countries misclassified due to the arbitrary cut off points

Countries with $HDI_{2006} \in [0.5 \text{ and } 0.55)$	Countries with $HDI_{2006} \in [0.7 \text{ and } 0.8)$
Bangladesh	Albania
Cameroon	Brazil
Congo	China
Ghana	Colombia
Madagascar	Dominican Republic
Nepal	Algeria
Pakistan	Egypt
Papua New Guinea	Indonesia
Sudan	Iran, Islamic Rep. of
Uganda	Jamaica
	Jordan
	Lebanon
	Sri Lanka
	Peru
	Philippines
	Paraguay
	Saudi Arabia
	El Salvador
	Syrian Arab Republic
	Thailand
	Tunisia
	Turkey
	Venezuela
	Vietnam

Table 5. Updating error summary statistics for the period 1999 to 2005

	Non-industrialized Countries				Industrialized Countries				Industrial vs. Non-industrialized Countries	
Indicators	mean	std. dev.	min	max	mean	std. dev.	min	max	Difference in means	Ratio of std. dev
HDI	0.01	0.02	-0.06	0.08	0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.05	0.002*	0.55
Health	0.00	0.03	-0.14	0.11	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.002†	0.20
Education	0.00	0.03	-0.11	0.25	0.00	0.01	-0.09	0.05	-0.004*	0.44
Income	0.01	0.02	-0.07	0.15	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.09	0.009*	0.95

Symbol * states that estimate of 'Differences in means' is statically significant at 1% level, tested by regressing the vector of updating errors on a constant and an indicator variable that takes the value one if the country is industrialized and zero otherwise using robust standard errors. Symbol † indicates that the estimate of the same regression is different from zero only at the 15% significance level.

Table 6. Upgrading error statistics of variables underlying the HDI

country	HDI 2006	GDP per capita 2006 [PPP US$]	$\sigma(GDP)_i$	Gross enroll-ment ratio (GER) 2006 [%]	$\sigma(GER)_i$	Adult literacy rate (ALR) 2006 [%]	$\sigma(ALR)_i$	Life expectancy (LE) at birth 2006 [years]	$\sigma(LE)_i$
Niger	0.311	779.1	67.7	21.5	0.6	18.2	1.2	44.6	2.4
Mali	0.338	997.8	55.3	35.0	1.1	28.7	11.1	48.1	2.6
Burkina Faso	0.342	1168.8	75.5	26.4	1.0	27.6	6.5	47.9	0.7
Chad	0.368	2090.1	73.5	34.8	1.5	49.1	10.2	43.7	1.0
Ethiopia	0.371	755.8	86.3	36.0	1.1	44.0	0.5	47.8	1.4
Burundi	0.384	677.3	49.2	36.2	5.1	52.8	2.7	44.0	1.4
Mozambique	0.390	1236.6	59.2	48.6	4.9	49.0	0.6	41.6	2.2
Malawi	0.400	646.2	59.6	64.3	1.7	63.5	0.6	39.8	1.0
Zambia	0.407	943.2	69.4	54.3	2.9	81.5	4.8	37.7	3.4
Côte d'Ivoire	0.421	1551.0	90.3	39.6	1.2	52.7	1.2	45.9	2.5
Benin	0.428	1091.0	136.4	49.4	1.4	42.0	3.3	54.3	1.4
Tanzania	0.430	674.4	36.7	47.8	4.1	79.1	3.4	45.9	2.8
Nigeria	0.448	1154.2	56.1	55.0	5.7	69.5	0.5	43.4	2.9
Rwanda	0.450	1262.7	254.9	51.8	6.6	71.6	2.4	44.2	3.9
Senegal	0.460	1712.8	144.6	38.1	0.9	41.2	0.3	56.0	1.0
Mauritania	0.486	1940.5	277.3	45.6	1.6	42.2	3.5	53.1	1.5
Kenya	0.491	1139.6	73.8	60.1	2.6	86.0	4.4	47.5	1.8
Zimbabwe	0.491	2065.2	352.4	52.4	2.6	91.3	1.8	36.6	2.5
Lesotho	0.494	2618.9	247.9	65.5	2.9	85.3	1.6	35.2	3.7
Togo	0.495	1535.8	178.6	55.0	3.3	62.2	3.1	54.5	2.3
Uganda	0.502	1478.4	93.4	66.1	10.7	70.7	0.4	48.4	1.2
Cameroon	0.506	2173.6	194.5	62.3	2.7	75.8	0.3	45.7	2.3
Madagascar	0.509	857.0	57.2	56.5	2.2	69.7	6.5	55.6	2.7
Sudan	0.516	1948.7	400.5	36.7	0.9	62.1	0.9	56.5	0.3
Congo	0.520	978.2	279.0	51.7	11.4	84.9	0.4	52.3	1.5
Papua N. G.	0.523	2543.4	146.3	40.7	1.6	66.7	6.0	55.7	1.5
Nepal	0.527	1489.8	75.2	57.0	2.3	46.3	1.3	62.1	0.7
Bangladesh	0.530	1870.3	163.4	57.1	7.7	42.1	0.8	63.3	0.6
Ghana	0.532	2239.7	159.4	47.2	2.3	76.0	7.8	57.0	1.5
Pakistan	0.539	2225.4	118.1	38.4	3.2	46.6	2.2	63.4	2.2
Lao	0.553	1953.9	122.7	61.0	0.5	68.1	8.7	55.1	0.4
Botswana	0.570	9944.7	728.2	70.7	3.7	80.5	0.4	34.9	4.0
India	0.611	3139.4	258.1	62.0	1.3	60.3	1.2	63.6	0.4
Morocco	0.640	4309.4	134.1	57.8	1.7	52.6	0.4	70.0	0.4
South Africa	0.653	11192.2	1017.3	76.6	6.6	86.7	1.5	47.0	1.6
Guatemala	0.673	4313.0	304.6	66.2	2.8	71.2	0.6	67.6	0.5
Honduras	0.683	2876.4	216.5	71.4	1.7	77.3	2.2	68.1	1.7
Mongolia	0.691	2055.6	131.8	77.3	2.0	98.6	13.6	64.5	1.9
Bolivia	0.692	2719.6	221.5	86.5	5.7	87.7	0.3	64.4	0.3
Nicaragua	0.698	3634.2	361.5	70.2	2.1	67.8	4.6	70.0	0.2
Egypt	0.702	4210.8	139.5	75.5	1.8	58.5	0.9	70.2	0.5
Viet Nam	0.709	2744.8	84.0	62.8	1.3	93.2	1.6	70.8	0.5
Indonesia	0.711	3608.5	175.0	68.4	2.0	89.0	0.2	67.2	0.2
Syria	0.716	3609.8	542.5	62.6	3.1	77.7	3.1	73.6	0.9
Jamaica	0.724	4163.1	166.0	76.9	5.0	88.3	0.1	70.7	1.6

Algeria	0.728	6603.1	449.3	73.2	1.8	71.0	1.3	71.4	0.5
El Salvador	0.729	5040.8	688.1	69.7	1.5	80.6	0.2	71.1	0.2
Iran	0.746	7524.8	287.1	72.2	2.9	80.1	1.1	70.7	0.6
Dominican R.	0.751	7449.3	461.8	74.1	1.7	85.1	1.1	67.5	2.0
Sri Lanka	0.755	4389.6	214.3	62.7	3.0	92.5	0.7	74.3	0.8
Paraguay	0.757	4812.9	552.4	69.7	3.7	94.2	1.1	71.2	0.1
Turkey	0.757	7752.6	209.6	69.1	2.5	87.0	0.6	68.9	0.6
Jordan	0.760	4687.8	320.0	79.0	11.0	91.9	0.6	71.6	0.3
Tunisia	0.760	7767.6	227.5	75.4	0.8	75.2	0.1	73.5	1.2
Philippines	0.763	4614.1	217.9	81.5	1.1	95.8	1.6	70.7	0.1
Peru	0.767	5678.4	218.7	86.4	2.9	91.2	2.3	70.2	0.2
China	0.768	5896.1	127.2	70.4	2.5	87.6	2.4	71.9	0.3
Lebanon	0.774	5836.8	653.7	83.8	1.9	87.8	0.4	72.2	1.2
Saudi Arabia	0.777	13825.2	1479.4	58.6	1.6	79.6	0.4	72.0	0.4
Albania	0.784	4977.8	426.7	68.0	0.8	87.2	5.9	73.9	0.1
Thailand	0.784	8089.8	303.7	73.7	4.7	96.2	1.7	70.3	0.6
Venezuela	0.784	6042.7	991.1	74.2	1.8	93.7	0.3	73.0	0.3
Colombia	0.790	7256.3	415.2	72.9	2.3	92.7	0.6	72.6	0.2
Brazil	0.792	8194.7	439.7	85.7	6.4	88.5	0.8	70.8	0.8
Mauritius	0.800	12027.3	506.4	74.5	1.5	86.0	0.6	72.4	0.4
Malaysia	0.805	10276.1	331.0	73.2	2.2	89.4	0.2	73.4	0.1
Romania	0.805	8479.5	756.9	75.3	2.1	98.5	0.5	71.5	0.4
Panama	0.809	7277.8	756.8	79.7	2.1	92.8	0.3	75.0	0.1
Trinidad & T.	0.809	12181.9	339.7	66.9	1.9	98.7	2.4	69.8	1.4
Oman	0.810	15259.1	1451.6	68.3	2.1	77.1	0.6	74.3	0.8
Bulgaria	0.816	8077.9	646.3	80.9	2.5	98.7	0.2	72.4	0.5
Mexico	0.821	9803.2	406.7	75.3	0.7	92.3	0.8	75.3	0.6
Arab. Emirat.	0.839	24055.9	1859.6	59.9	4.7	78.3	0.3	78.3	1.1
Costa Rica	0.841	9481.4	1016.6	72.4	1.2	96.1	0.1	78.3	0.6
Uruguay	0.851	9420.6	460.2	89.4	1.3	97.9	0.1	75.6	0.2
Chile	0.859	10873.6	1458.5	81.3	1.0	96.3	0.2	78.1	0.6
Argentina	0.863	13298.0	1038.5	89.3	4.8	97.2	0.1	74.6	0.2
Hungary	0.869	16814.4	1232.3	87.5	2.0	99.0	0.1	73.0	0.4
Portugal	0.904	19628.9	970.5	89.3	2.5	99.0	0.7	77.5	0.3
Korea, R.	0.912	20499.3	1002.1	95.0	2.0	99.0	0.3	77.3	0.8
Greece	0.921	22204.7	908.5	93.4	1.8	99.0	2.3	78.3	0.2
Hong Kong	0.927	30822.1	967.0	76.7	4.5	94.3	0.3	81.8	0.5
Israel	0.927	24381.6	1066.0	89.7	2.6	95.8	0.8	80.0	0.2
New Zealand	0.936	23413.0	1027.2	100.0	2.4	99.0	0.0	79.3	0.3
Spain	0.938	25046.8	1268.7	96.1	1.9	99.0	0.2	79.7	0.2
Italy	0.940	28180.2	1831.0	89.3	3.1	99.0	0.1	80.2	0.4
UK	0.940	30821.2	1427.8	93.1	7.5	99.0	0.0	78.5	0.0
France	0.942	29300.5	1421.8	92.6	1.2	99.0	0.0	79.6	0.2
Denmark	0.943	31913.8	2203.3	100.0	2.3	99.0	0.0	77.3	0.1
Austria	0.944	32276.4	1840.6	91.1	1.7	99.0	0.0	79.2	0.2
Belgium	0.945	31095.8	1158.4	94.7	4.4	99.0	0.0	79.1	0.3
Netherlands	0.947	31789.4	2108.1	98.2	2.1	99.0	0.0	78.5	0.0
Switzerland	0.947	33039.6	1606.2	85.7	2.8	99.0	0.0	80.7	0.4
United States	0.948	39676.1	1870.0	93.3	1.3	99.0	0.0	77.5	0.2
Japan	0.949	29251.4	1534.0	85.5	1.9	99.0	0.0	82.2	0.2
Sweden	0.951	29540.7	1269.6	96.5	6.5	99.0	0.0	80.3	0.3

Ireland	0.956	38827.0	1826.0	99.0	1.8	99.0	0.0	77.9	0.3
Australia	0.957	30331.1	3492.0	100.0	5.7	99.0	0.0	80.5	0.3
Norway	0.965	38453.5	4225.7	100.0	0.9	99.0	0.0	79.6	0.1

Table 7. Official development assistance (ODA) received in US dollar per capita by year and human development category

	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
'medium'	7.2	6.5	6.5	5.7	5.9	6.6
'low'	30.1	27.9	24.2	18.4	14.9	14.5

Data are from the Human Development Reports 2001 to 2006.

Table 8. Convergence club regression results for medium development category

Sample conditional on	$HDI_{2006} \in [0.5,0.8)$	$HDI_{2006} \in [0.55,0.70)$
constant α	-.02556 (-56.69)	-.02847 (-35.36)
slope β	-.01380 (- 6.74)	-.02667 (-4.59)
adjusted R^2	.53	.74

t statistics in parentheses.

Fig. 1. Historical HDI scores for Non-industrialized Countries in 1990/91 and 2005/06



Notes: On the horizontal axis we display the HDI, which ranges from 0 to 1. 1990/91 are the first and 2005/06 are last two years for which the HDI scores originally have been made available (HDR, 1990, 1991, 2005, 2006). To make the HDI-distributions comparable across years we use the balanced panel of 99 developing countries that have been evaluated by the UNDP for all years. Countries that existed for a subset of years only (e.g. Croatia) are not considered. All densities are estimated by the Epanechnikov kernel method with bandwidth 0.01.

Fig. 2. HDI of 1975 of Portugal and Venezuela as reported in the years 1999 to 2006



Fig. 3. Density of HDI as published by the HDR reports



Fig. 4. Relationship between countries' development status and the standard deviations due to measurement error generated by data updates



Linear trendline based on sample of 99 countries, $R^2 = 0.184$.

Fig. 5. Representation of data error of a country with HDI = 0.65



Fig. 6. Simulated HDI ranks compared to rank of country in 2006



Average, 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles of simulated rank distributions, displaying the deviation in rank for a country compared to its rank in 2006. Ranks based on the sample of 99 countries for which the overall cardinal error can be calculated consistently.

Fig. 7. Relationship between Countries' Development Status and the relative standard Errors due to Measurement Error generated by Data Updates of the underlying Variables of the HDI



Quadratic trendline $y = -2.2904x^3 + 4.9837x^2 - 3.5914x + 0.8739$ is based on least squares estimation of sample of 99 countries, $R^2 = 0.375$.



Linear trendline is based on least squares estimation of sample of 99 countries, $R^2 = 0.073$.



Linear trendline is based on least squares estimation of sample of 99 countries, $R^2 = 0.456$.



Linear trendline is based on least squares estimation of sample of 99 countries, $R^2 = 0.118$.

Fig. 8. *World map of the Human Development Index*

Panel (a). Reported Human Development Index 2006



Panel (b). Adjusted Human Development Index 2006



Note. Panel (a) displays the classification using the actually reported HDI Index for the year 2006 for all reported countries (industrialized and non-industrialized). Countries in white have no reported data. Panel (b) displays the classification based on the revised thresholds that we calculate in Section 4.3. if the UNDP had consistently updated the cutoff values for classification.

Fig. 9. Gini Coefficients computed by the HDI Formulas A, B and C



Appendix

Formula Changes

The most important changes are described in the following subsections, and the reader is referred to Anand and Sen (1994, 1997, 1998), the technical appendices of the HDRs (1990 to 2006) and to Jahan (2000) for details.

Income. At first, in 1990 GDP per capita (in PPP) was logged in the income index. Between 1991 and 1998, however income above a certain cut-off point got substantially adjusted with a regressive version of the "Atkinson Function". The cut-off point was taken as the average world income on the assumption that every person should have at least this level of income for building basic capabilities (Jahan 2000). Since this formulation however was argued to particularly punish middle income countries, the original formulation of logging GDP per capita was again introduced in 1999 with formula h_C (Anand and Sen, 1998).

Education. Following the suggestion by Kelley (1991), compared to 1990, in 1991 mean years of schooling was added as a second component to adult literacy to form a more general index of education. Adult literacy was given two-thirds weight and mean years of schooling one-third weight according to an argument that adult literacy is a more representative stock variable for educational attainment. However, the variable "mean years of schooling" was constructed in a complicated way and for some of the countries it was criticized to not reflect their educational infrastructure properly (Jahan 2000). In an effort to further improve the measure, from 1995 onward, mean year of schooling was replaced by the combined gross enrolment of schooling at the primary, secondary and tertiary level of education.

Maxima and mimina. Until 1994, in order to normalize the variables $\boldsymbol{x}$ into the double bounded indices $\boldsymbol{y}$, observed maxima and minima were used as goalposts. This created however the problem that it got difficult to distinguish whether changes in the HDI of a country was because of its improved performance or because of changes to the maxima and minima of the sample of countries considered. In order to make HDI trends over time more meaningful, since 1994 fixed maxima and minima were introduced based on the trends of the variables of what that their values was estimated to be in the following 25 years (HDR, 1994).

<u>HDI formulas h_f used by the UNDP in the three subperiods $f \in \{A, B, C\}$</u>

Formula h_C

y_{1i} = *health*$_i$ = (*life expectancy*$_i$ – 25) / (85 – 25)

y_{2i} = *education*$_i$ = 2/3 *adult literacy index*$_i$ + 1/3 *combined gross enrollment index*$_i$

y_{3i} = *income*$_i$ = min(1, (log(*GDP per capita*$_i$) – log(100)) / (log(40000) – log(100)))

adult literacy index$_i$ = (*adult literacy rate*$_i$ – 0) / (100 – 0)

gross enrollment index$_i$ =min(1, (*Combined gross enrolment ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary level schools*$_i$ / 100)[18]

Formula h_B

income is calculated by a version of the "Atkinson Function". Given a cutoff value *c*

W(y*) = y* for y* < *c*

W(y*) = *c* + 2(y* – *c*)^(1/2) for y* in [*c*, 2*c*]

W(y*) = *c* + 2(*c*)^(1/2) + 3(y* – *c*)^(1/3) for y* in [2*c*, 3*c*]

for [3*c*, 4*c*], [4*c*, 5*c*] etc.

whereby *c* is defined as 'world average income'.[19] With this function defined,

y_{3i} = *income*$_i$ = W(y*$_i$) = (W(*GDP per capita*$_i$) – W(100)) / W(40000)

y_{1i} and y_{2i} are defined as in formula h_C

Formula h_A

y_{1i} = *health*$_i$ = (*life expectancy*$_i$ – low$_1$) / (high$_1$ – low$_1$)

y_{2i} = *education*$_i$ = *adult literacy rate*$_i$ – low$_2$) / (high$_2$ – low$_2$)

y_{3i} = *income*$_i$ = log(*GDP per capita*$_i$) – log(low$_3$)) / (log(high$_3$) – log(low$_3$))

The "goalposts" of low$_k$ and high$_k$ for each subindicator $k \in \{1,2,3\}$ are the values of the minimum and the maximum of the *k*th subindicator index of all considered countries. In 1990, the implicit goalposts were 42 and 78 for life expectancy, 12.3 and 100 for literacy rate, and 10^2.34 and 10^3.68 for GDP per capita.

[18] The combined gross enrolment ratio is calculated for the number of students enrolled in primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education, regardless of age, as percentage of the population of official school age for the three levels. The gross enrolment ratio can be greater than 100% as a result of grade repetition and entry at ages younger or older than the typical age at that grade level. For this reason the education index takes the minimum of one and the ratio.

[19] This function is described on page 111 in the Technical Notes of the HDR of 1995.