

Human Development Index



The Human Development Index is used to measure more than just the wealth of country.

It includes life expectancy, adult literacy, GDP per capita, enrolment in education. It is a quick way of measuring well-being and is used to measure development as many geographers as you know are unhappy using just GDP and income as a way comparing countries. Each country is given a score between 0 and 1. A score of 1 would be the best.

Here is some the Human Development Index 2006 for a selection of countries.

Australia	0.957
Brazil	0.792
France	0.942
Ghana	0.532
Japan	0.949
Nigeria	0.448
Thailand	0.784
Spain	0.938
UK	0.940
Bangladesh	0.530
China	0.768
Germany	0.932
India	0.611
Kenya	0.491
Zambia	0.407
Saudi Arabia	0.777
South Korea	0.912
USA	0.948

Draw an **empty** table like the one on the left.

Copy the countries into the table from in order of HDI score (nearest 1 at the top)

Shade each group of countries (high, medium and low HDI) using a different colour for each and using the following key:

Above 0.8 = High human development

From 0.5-0.8 = medium human development

Below 0.5 = low human development

Do you think this a better way at looking at inequality in the world? Why do you think geographers think that looking at HDI is better than just looking at GDP?