

Differences in Active Ageing Index in Eastern European countries. A comparison of Poland and the Czech Republic

Kasia Karpinska

International Seminar "Building an evidence base for active ageing policies: Active Ageing Index and its potential"
Brussels, 16 April 2015

Erasmus University Rotterdam



Why Poland and the Czech Republic?

- Very different ranking in the 2012 AAI

	The Czech Republic		Poland	
	Score	Ranking	Score	Ranking
Overall AAI 2012	34.0	13	27.2	28
1st domain: Employment	26.0	14	19.9	25
2nd domain: Participation in society	19.4	12	12.2	28
3rd domain: Independent and secure living	70.8	13	64.9	23
4th domain: Capacity and enabling environment for active ageing	54.4	15	47.3	22



Why Poland and the Czech Republic?

- Shared past
- Similar welfare system (Fenger, 2007)
- Similar demographic challenges

	Percentage aged 65+		Percentage aged 80+		Old age dependency ratio (%)	
	2010	2060	2010	2060	2010	2060
EU27	17.4	29.5	4.6	12.0	25.9	52.6
Czech Republic	15.2	30.7	3.6	12.2	21.6	55.0
Poland	13.5	34.5	3.3	12.3	19.0	64.6

A stylized, handwritten-style logo for Erasmus, featuring a cursive script of the word 'Erasmus'.

Focus

- What are the most relevant differences between both countries?
- How can those differences be attributed to welfare state characteristics and (active ageing) policies?

Method

- General ranking vs. specific indicators
 - relative contributions
- Piecing together policies and information on socio-cultural context related to all 22 AAI indicators
 - Focus not only on employment at older ages
- Policies implemented before 2010
- Secondary information sources (OECD, Eurobarometer, research reports)

Erasmus

National focus on active ageing

- Lack of comprehensive active ageing policies until mid 2000
- Poland: focus on more urgent social problems (i.e., youth unemployment)
- The Czech Republic: initiatives failed to be implemented
- Recent efforts to lift the position of Poland

Economic performance

- The Czech Republic higher GDP
- BUT- relation between the GDP and AAI outcomes is not necessarily casual

First domain- Employment

- Employment of those aged 55-59 affects strongly the ranking of both countries
 - Lifts up position of the Czech Republic while low value plummets position of Poland
 - Participation rates in Czech Republic have been always relatively high
 - Economic legacy and different transition paths
 - PL: recession, support of early exit, flexibilisation of labor code
 - CZ: increase of retirement age, early exit costly,
 - Gendered participation patterns and exit routes
 - Difference in care arrangements

Ezafus

Second domain- Participation in society

- Poland's low overall ranking is related to this domain
- Scores similar for care to young
- But PL relatively more participation in care to old

Care regimes (Saraceno and Keck, 2010)

- Poland
 - familialism by default - neither financial support nor publicly provided alternatives for care, imposing care responsibilities on family members
- The Czech Republic
 - supported familialism - state provides financial means to support family members in keeping their care responsibilities
 - de-familialism - provision of the social rights reduces family care responsibilities

Saraceno

Third domain: Independent and secure living

- Transformation of the health system
 - share of the GDP devoted to health system higher in the Czech Republic
 - Poland – lower number of medical personnel per hundred thousand inhabitants
- Independent living:
 - the Czech Republic care arrangements are more widely available
 - many older Poles co-reside with their families
- The Czech Republic enjoys one of the lowest poverty rates in the EU

Erasmus

Fourth domain: Capacity and enabling environment for active ageing

- Some aspects are not easily amenable by policies
- Require life course approach to active ageing
 - experiences in earlier life influence how individuals age
 - e.g., healthy life years or mental health
- Link to other aspects of active ageing

- Local focus

Concluding remarks

- Importance of economic situation and transition trajectory
- Importance of welfare regimes and division of care responsibilities
- Some outcomes are not easily amenable by policies
- Striking differences

Erasmus

Thank you for your attention

karpinska@fsw.eur.nl

The logo for Erasmus University, featuring the word "Erasmus" in a stylized, cursive script.