

activism group e.U.

RESEARCH 01

Equality at Large

A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Equality in
Contemporary Societies

14 February 2023

Published by activism group e.U.

Abstract

Equality is one of the foundational ideas of modern democratic societies and international human rights, yet it remains contested in definition and difficult to measure. Equal treatment can coexist with unequal opportunity; equal resources can produce unequal capabilities; and formal equality before the law can coexist with substantial differences in income, wealth, health, education, security, representation and social status. The central analytical question is therefore not simply whether people are equal or unequal, but **equality of what, between whom, and under which conditions.**

This study develops a multidimensional framework for understanding equality by synthesising political philosophy, economics, sociology, development studies and international human-rights analysis. It distinguishes six connected dimensions: **rights, resources, opportunities, capabilities, participation and outcomes.** None is sufficient on its own. The paper argues that equality is best understood as a social condition in which people possess equal fundamental status and can participate in economic, political and social life as equals, while circumstances outside individual control do not systematically determine their life chances.

The analysis distinguishes individual difference from structural inequality, examines the recursive relationship between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome, and gives particular attention to the intergenerational transmission of advantage and disadvantage. It then applies the framework to economic and social inequality, gender, race and ethnicity, and intersectionality. The evidence shows both the scale and the multidimensional character of contemporary inequality: global income and wealth remain highly concentrated; the pandemic exposed unequal resilience and care burdens; and persistent group disparities continue to raise questions about opportunity, institutions and accumulated advantage.

The resulting **Equality at Large Framework** is intended as an analytical foundation rather than a claim that all outcomes should be identical. It connects rights to the material and institutional resources through which rights are exercised; resources to opportunities and capabilities; capabilities to participation; and participation to outcomes that, in turn, become circumstances for the next generation. The framework provides a common language for further research into social equality, equality of opportunity, gender equality, racial equality, intersectional inequality and the institutional foundations of an Economy of Equality.

Keywords: equality; inequality; social equality; equality of opportunity; capabilities; social mobility; gender equality; racial equality; intersectionality; economic inequality; human development

1. Introduction

The proposition that human beings are equal is among the most influential principles of modern political, legal and social thought. Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.¹ Equality is embedded in constitutional systems, anti-discrimination law and international human-rights frameworks. Yet contemporary societies remain profoundly unequal in many of the conditions that shape human lives.

¹United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Paris: United Nations, 1948), art. 1.

People differ in income, wealth, health, education, political influence, social status, personal security and access to institutions. They also enter life under markedly different circumstances. No person chooses their parents, place of birth or early-childhood environment. Nor does an individual choose many of the characteristics that societies have historically used to organise status and opportunity, including sex, socially assigned race or ethnicity, and disability.

Difference, however, is not synonymous with injustice. Individuals differ in preferences, ambitions, abilities, needs and choices, and a society committed to equality need not seek identical lives or identical outcomes. The analytical problem begins when consequential differences become systematically associated with circumstances outside individual control, when those differences restrict access to fundamental opportunities, or when institutions reproduce advantage and disadvantage across generations.

Modern theories of equality have responded to this problem in different ways. Rawls placed equal basic liberties and fair equality of opportunity at the centre of his theory of justice while permitting certain social and economic inequalities under defined conditions.² Dworkin shifted attention towards equality of resources and the relationship between resources, responsibility and choice.³ Sen challenged approaches focused exclusively on resources or utility by asking the foundational question, “Equality of what?”, and by directing attention towards capabilities: the substantive freedoms people possess to achieve valued ways of being and living.⁴

Roemer developed a formal account of equality of opportunity by distinguishing circumstances from effort.⁵ Anderson argued that egalitarianism should be concerned not only with distributions but with social relations in which people can live without oppression or domination.⁶ Fraser similarly connected redistribution and recognition to the possibility of participating in social life as a peer.⁷ These traditions disagree on significant questions, but together they suggest a central proposition: **equality is a multidimensional relationship among individuals, institutions and society.**

This paper has three objectives. First, it establishes a conceptually coherent framework for analysing equality across disciplines. Second, it connects normative theories of equality with the empirical measurement of inequality. Third, it develops a common analytical foundation for a broader research programme concerned with social equality, opportunity, gender, race and ethnicity, intersectionality, and the economic institutions through which resources and opportunities are created and distributed.

2. Scope and Method

This is an interdisciplinary conceptual study rather than a systematic meta-analysis. It draws on foundational scholarship in political philosophy, economics and social theory,

²John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 60-83.

³Ronald Dworkin, “What Is Equality? Part 2: Equality of Resources,” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 4 (1981): 283-345, esp. 285-290.

⁴Amartya Sen, “Equality of What?” in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol. 1, ed. Sterling M. McMurrin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 197-220, esp. 217-220; Amartya Sen, *Inequality Reexamined* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 39-55.

⁵John E. Roemer, *Equality of Opportunity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 1-12, 25-32.

⁶Elizabeth S. Anderson, “What Is the Point of Equality?” *Ethics* 109, no. 2 (1999): 287-337, esp. 312-319.

⁷Nancy Fraser, *Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, Participation*, WZB Discussion Paper FS I 98-108 (Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, 1998), 30-32.

alongside empirical research and internationally comparable evidence produced by institutions including the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Labour Organization (ILO), UN Women and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

The literature is selected according to three principles. Foundational contributions are included where they define concepts that continue to structure contemporary equality research. Empirical studies are included where they provide evidence on the scale, persistence or intergenerational transmission of inequality. Institutional reports are used where they offer transparent, comparable data or authoritative syntheses relevant to the analysis.

Three limitations require emphasis. First, equality, equity, fairness and justice do not possess universally agreed definitions. Second, measurable outcomes are not equivalent to all experiences relevant to equality: income and wealth can be quantified more readily than dignity, discrimination, autonomy, recognition or power. Third, social categories are historically and geographically contingent. Categories such as race, ethnicity, class and gender are classified differently across jurisdictions. Comparative analysis must therefore distinguish the social significance of a category from the specific administrative classification through which it is measured.

3. Equality as a Multidimensional Concept

3.1 Equal dignity and formal rights

The most fundamental conception of equality concerns human status. To say that people are equal does not mean that they are identical. It means that differences in wealth, gender, race, nationality, occupation, ability or social position do not alter a person's fundamental human worth. Formal equality before the law follows from this principle: fundamental rights and legal protection should not depend on inherited or arbitrary characteristics.

Formal equality is indispensable, but it is not equivalent to substantive equality. A rule can apply identically to everyone while affecting people differently because they begin from different positions. Equal legal access to education does not by itself create equal educational opportunity; equal permission to apply for employment does not ensure comparable preparation, networks or freedom from discrimination. **Formal equality asks whether the same status and rules apply. Substantive equality asks whether people can exercise rights and participate in institutions on meaningfully equal terms.**

3.2 Equality of resources

A second tradition examines the distribution of resources, including income, wealth, education, healthcare, housing, time, infrastructure and access to finance. Rawls's theory combined equal basic liberties with fair equality of opportunity and a principle governing justified social and economic inequalities.⁸ Dworkin's resource-based account sought to distinguish inequalities attributable to circumstances from those connected to responsibility and choice.

⁸Rawls, A Theory of Justice, 60-83.

Resource equality nevertheless encounters an immediate difficulty: the same quantity of resources does not necessarily generate the same degree of freedom. A person living with a disability may require additional resources to achieve comparable mobility. A parent with extensive unpaid care responsibilities may have materially less discretionary time than another person with similar income. Resources are therefore essential, but they are means through which opportunities and capabilities are produced rather than a complete measure of equality.

3.3 Equality of opportunity

Equality of opportunity offers an intuitively compelling way to reconcile equality with personal agency. A minimal version requires non-discrimination: positions should not be denied because of characteristics irrelevant to their requirements. A more demanding conception asks whether people actually possess comparable prospects to develop and use their abilities. Rawls's fair equality of opportunity requires more than careers being formally open; social background should not determine the prospects of people with similar talent and motivation.⁹

Roemer's distinction between circumstances and effort sharpens the analytical question. If two people face genuinely comparable opportunities but make different choices, resulting differences may be compatible with equality. The difficulty lies in deciding when opportunity was genuinely comparable. Family income influences housing and schooling; parental education shapes early learning; wealth affects risk-taking and access to capital; health influences education and work; and networks influence information and recruitment.

The relationship between opportunity and outcome is therefore recursive. **Yesterday's outcomes become today's circumstances, and today's circumstances shape tomorrow's opportunities.** OECD research documents intergenerational persistence in earnings, education, occupation and health, including both "sticky floors" that constrain movement from disadvantage and "sticky ceilings" that preserve advantage at the top.¹⁰ Corak likewise shows that mobility is produced through the interaction of families, labour markets and public institutions rather than within families alone.¹¹

3.4 Capabilities

Sen's capability approach addresses the gap between resources and effective freedom. Resources matter because of what they allow people to do and to become. Yet individuals differ in their ability to convert the same resources into valuable functionings. The relevant object of comparison therefore includes capabilities: the real opportunities people have to be healthy, educated, mobile, economically active, politically engaged and socially included.¹²

The distinction is practical rather than abstract. Two citizens may have identical legal access to public space while physical infrastructure makes that space inaccessible to one of them.

⁹Ibid., 73-83.

¹⁰OECD, *A Broken Social Elevator? How to Promote Social Mobility* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2018), 4-5, 69-79, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301085-en>.

¹¹Miles Corak, "Income Inequality, Equality of Opportunity, and Intergenerational Mobility," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27, no. 3 (2013): 79-102, esp. 79-84, <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.3.79>.

¹²Sen, *Inequality Reexamined*, 39-55; Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 87-110.

Two workers may possess the same formal right to full-time employment while one performs most unpaid care. Two students may receive the same university offer while only one possesses the financial resources required to accept it. The capability perspective shifts attention from nominal access to substantive freedom.

This approach has shaped modern human-development analysis. UNDP's 2019 Human Development Report explicitly framed inequality as extending "beyond income, beyond averages and beyond today", while the 2021/2022 report examined how inequality interacts with uncertainty and social transformation.¹³

3.5 Relational and social equality

Distribution and capability still do not exhaust the meaning of equality. People can possess similar material resources while occupying unequal social positions. Anderson argues that the objective of egalitarianism should include social relations in which people can live together as equals, without domination, oppression or humiliating dependence.¹⁴ Fraser's concept of participatory parity makes a closely related point: material distribution and social recognition both matter because each can prevent members of society from interacting as peers.¹⁵

This relational dimension is particularly important for the concept of **social equality**. Economic differences can create unequal dependency and power; gendered structures can influence autonomy, safety and care; racialised classifications can influence institutional treatment and social recognition. Social equality therefore concerns the standing of individuals within society and their ability to participate on equal terms, not merely the size of their incomes.

¹³United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2019: Beyond Income, Beyond Averages, Beyond Today (New York: UNDP, 2019), 1-14; United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2021/2022: Uncertain Times, Unsettled Lives (New York: UNDP, 2022), overview.

¹⁴Anderson, "What Is the Point of Equality?" 312-319.

¹⁵Fraser, Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics, 30-32.

Table 1. Analytical dimensions of equality

Dimension	Core question	Typical evidence	Principal limitation
Rights	Are legal, civil and political statuses equal?	Rights, anti-discrimination protection, access to justice	Formal equality may coexist with unequal practical access.
Resources	What material and institutional means are available?	Income, wealth, housing, health services, education, time	Equal resources can produce unequal capabilities.
Opportunities	How strongly do circumstances shape life chances?	Mobility, parental background, geographic access	Opportunity is difficult to observe directly.
Capabilities	What can people realistically do and become?	Health, education, mobility, agency, effective choice	Capabilities require multidimensional measurement.
Participation	Can people participate as social equals?	Voice, representation, recognition, institutional access	Power and recognition are difficult to quantify.
Outcomes	What distributions ultimately emerge?	Income, wealth, health, education, employment, representation	Disparities require causal explanation; they do not prove cause.

4. Equality, Equity and Justice

Public debate frequently contrasts *equality* with *equity*, often describing equality as giving everyone the same treatment and equity as allocating different support according to need. This distinction can be useful pedagogically, but it is not a settled analytical boundary. Many theories of equality expressly reject identical treatment when relevant circumstances differ.

The more useful distinction for this study is between **formal** and **substantive** equality. Formal equality concerns consistent status and rules. Substantive equality concerns whether institutions enable people to exercise rights and opportunities in practice. Resource equality asks what people possess; opportunity equality asks what paths are genuinely open; capability equality asks what people are realistically able to do; relational equality asks whether they participate as peers; and outcome measures describe the distributions that result.

Justice is broader still. It concerns which forms of equality matter, how they should be balanced with liberty, responsibility and other values, and which inequalities can be justified. Equality and justice should therefore not be treated as synonyms. Equality is one of the principal dimensions through which social arrangements are evaluated.

5. From Individual Difference to Structural Inequality

A theory of equality must distinguish ordinary human variation from structural inequality. A disparity between two individuals, or even between two group averages, does not by itself establish injustice. Structural inequality becomes a plausible object of inquiry when differences are systematic rather than random, are mediated by institutions, concern consequential resources or status, and persist or reproduce themselves over time.

These criteria identify a research problem rather than a predetermined conclusion. A group disparity establishes a pattern to be explained; it does not, on its own, establish the causal mechanism. Conversely, the absence of an explicitly discriminatory rule does not demonstrate equality of opportunity. Rigorous analysis must avoid both errors: automatically inferring discrimination from every disparity, and automatically dismissing disparities because formal rules appear neutral.

5.1 The lottery of birth

The significance of structural inequality becomes particularly clear at birth. Before a person has exercised meaningful effort or choice, a substantial set of circumstances is already determined: country and place of birth, parental income and wealth, parental education, family structure, neighbourhood, early health, disability, language, citizenship, gender and the racial or ethnic classifications through which society may perceive that person.

These circumstances do not determine an individual future completely; they change probabilities. Chetty and colleagues demonstrate large geographic differences in intergenerational mobility within the United States, showing that children with otherwise similar positions in the national income distribution can face very different mobility prospects across local environments.¹⁶ International evidence likewise documents persistence across generations in several dimensions of social and economic position.¹⁷

The metaphor of a “lottery of birth” should therefore not be understood as fatalistic. Its analytical purpose is the opposite: it separates determinants that precede personal choice from those more plausibly connected to agency, and asks which of those determinants are institutionally alterable. The stronger the influence of initial circumstances on later outcomes, the more difficult it becomes to describe observed differences as the product of choice alone.

6. Economic and Social Inequality

Economic inequality is among the most extensively measured dimensions of inequality and one of the principal mechanisms through which other forms of advantage are transmitted. It is useful to distinguish **income**, a flow of economic resources over time, from **wealth**, accumulated assets net of liabilities. Wealth provides economic security, produces investment returns, finances education and housing, permits risk-taking and can be transferred between generations.

Research by Piketty renewed attention to the long-run role of capital ownership and wealth concentration, while Atkinson emphasised that observed inequality reflects institutions and policy choices as well as market forces, technological change and individual behaviour.¹⁸ The empirical implication is that the distribution of economic resources should be studied as an institutional outcome rather than as a self-explanatory fact.

¹⁶Raj Chetty et al., “Where Is the Land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129, no. 4 (2014): 1553-1623, esp. 1553-1558, <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju022>.

¹⁷OECD, *A Broken Social Elevator?*, 4-5, 19-39.

¹⁸Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014); Anthony B. Atkinson, *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), 1-25.

The *World Inequality Report 2022* estimated that in 2021 the richest 10 per cent of the world population received approximately **52 per cent of global income**, while the poorest 50 per cent received approximately **8.5 per cent**. Wealth was considerably more concentrated: the richest 10 per cent owned approximately **76 per cent of global household wealth**, while the poorest half owned around **2 per cent**.¹⁹ These statistics do not by themselves identify an ideal distribution; they establish the magnitude of differences in resources and therefore the importance of asking how those resources shape opportunity, security and influence.

6.1 Poverty, resilience and security

Poverty and inequality are related but distinct. Poverty asks whether people possess sufficient resources relative to an absolute or socially defined threshold. Inequality concerns the distribution of resources across a population. A society can reduce extreme poverty while remaining highly unequal, and it can experience rising poverty without large changes in some inequality measures if losses are broadly distributed.

The COVID-19 shock made this distinction particularly visible. The World Bank characterised the pandemic as the largest setback to global poverty reduction in decades and estimated that more than 70 million additional people were pushed into extreme poverty in 2020. It also showed stark differences in governments' capacity to protect household incomes: fiscal responses in high-income economies were able to offset losses far more extensively than those in low-income economies.²⁰

This suggests an additional equality dimension: **resilience**. Households with savings, stable employment, secure housing, connectivity, insurance and access to effective public services can absorb shocks that are catastrophic for households without these buffers. Current income alone therefore understates the distribution of economic security.

Social equality extends beyond economic resources. Education, health, housing, security, social networks, access to public institutions, occupational status, voice and recognition all shape the effective position of an individual within society. Economic resources interact with these domains, but they cannot be used as a complete proxy for them.

7. Gender Equality

Gender equality demonstrates particularly clearly why equality cannot be reduced to a single metric. Relevant dimensions include education, employment, earnings, occupational segregation, working time, unpaid care, asset ownership, political and corporate representation, health, personal security, legal rights and autonomy. A country can approach parity in education while retaining substantial differences in employment, leadership or unpaid work.

The *Global Gender Gap Report 2022* assessed differences across economic participation, education, health and political empowerment and found that progress towards parity had been disrupted by the pandemic and subsequent crises.²¹ UN Women and UN DESA similarly concluded in their 2022 Gender Snapshot that progress across the Sustainable

¹⁹Lucas Chancel et al., eds., *World Inequality Report 2022* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022), 10.

²⁰World Bank, *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2022: Correcting Course* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2022), xiii-xv, 1-2, <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1893-6>.

²¹World Economic Forum, *Global Gender Gap Report 2022* (Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2022), sec. 1.2 and chap. 2.

Development Goals was insufficient to achieve gender equality by 2030.²² These reports are descriptive benchmarks rather than causal proof, but they illustrate the breadth of the relevant domains.

The distribution of unpaid care is especially important because time is a finite resource. A person who performs substantially more unpaid care may have less scope for paid work, career progression, education, political engagement or rest even when formal rights are identical. Gender equality therefore links rights, resources, capabilities and outcomes: formal access can be equal while practical opportunity remains different.

8. Racial and Ethnic Equality

Race and ethnicity require particular conceptual care. Racial categories are not fixed biological explanations of human social difference; they are socially and historically constructed and vary across jurisdictions. Their social construction does not make their consequences unreal. Where institutions or societies attach significance to racialised or ethnic classifications, those classifications can affect housing, education, employment, finance, healthcare, security, political representation and social recognition.

It is therefore useful to distinguish **individual discrimination** from **systemic inequality**. Individual discrimination asks whether an actor treats a person differently because of race or ethnicity. Systemic analysis asks whether institutional practices, accumulated histories and interacting social structures generate persistent patterns of unequal treatment, opportunity or outcome, including cases in which no single discriminatory act explains the pattern.

OHCHR's 2021 report on racial justice explicitly noted that worldwide mobilisation had shifted public debate towards the systemic nature of racism and the role of institutions, and its 2022 follow-up stressed the importance of data capable of revealing disproportionate impacts and persistent patterns.^{23,24} This approach does not imply that every racial disparity proves discrimination. It changes the research question from intention alone to the mechanisms through which durable group differences arise.

Housing markets, accumulated wealth, school systems, recruitment networks, health systems and criminal-justice institutions can transmit effects over long periods. Racial equality therefore requires analysis of both contemporary treatment and historical accumulation, while remaining careful not to infer causality from descriptive disparity alone.

²²UN Women and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals: The Gender Snapshot 2022 (New York: United Nations, 2022), executive summary and 2-5.

²³United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Promotion and Protection of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Africans and of People of African Descent against Excessive Use of Force and Other Human Rights Violations by Law Enforcement Officers, A/HRC/47/53 (Geneva: United Nations, 2021), paras. 1-2.

²⁴United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), A/HRC/51/53 (2022), paras. 18-19.

9. Intersectionality and Intergenerational Transmission

9.1 Intersectionality

People occupy several social positions simultaneously. Crenshaw developed the concept of intersectionality to show how frameworks analysing race and gender as separate categories can fail to capture forms of discrimination experienced specifically at their intersection.²⁵ The broader implication for equality research is that group averages can conceal important differences within groups and that the interaction of characteristics may produce effects not captured by simply adding separate “gender”, “race” or “class” components.

Intersectional analysis therefore strengthens, rather than weakens, the requirement for causal care. Disaggregation can reveal patterns that aggregate statistics hide, but smaller groups create statistical uncertainty and privacy challenges. The analytical task is to use appropriately disaggregated evidence without converting social categories into fixed or deterministic explanations.

9.2 Intergenerational transmission

Families transmit far more than current income. They transmit wealth, housing, education, health, expectations, cultural knowledge, networks, geographic location and security. Outcomes in one generation therefore become starting conditions for another. A society can offer formally equal competition among adults while childhood conditions differ so substantially that the resulting competition cannot plausibly be treated as independent of origin.

Intergenerational transmission creates the key feedback mechanism in this paper’s framework: **outcomes in generation t become resources and circumstances in generation t+1; those circumstances shape opportunities and capabilities; and these in turn influence subsequent outcomes.** This is why equality of opportunity and equality of outcome cannot be treated as complete alternatives. Outcomes matter not only because of their immediate distribution but because they help construct the opportunity structure faced by the next generation.

10. Measuring Equality and Inequality

Measurement is not a neutral technical step. Every indicator specifies something that should be compared. The Gini coefficient measures dispersion across an income or wealth distribution; percentile shares focus on concentration; poverty measures focus on the lower end of the distribution; mobility measures examine relationships between generations; group comparisons describe differences across social categories; and multidimensional indicators attempt to represent aspects of well-being not captured by income alone. Atkinson demonstrated explicitly that inequality measures contain normative assumptions about the social significance attached to changes at different points of a distribution.²⁶

²⁵Kimberlé Crenshaw, “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics,” University of Chicago Legal Forum 1989, no. 1 (1989): 139-167, esp. 140-150.

²⁶Anthony B. Atkinson, “On the Measurement of Inequality,” Journal of Economic Theory 2, no. 3 (1970): 244-263, esp. 244-248, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531\(70\)90039-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(70)90039-6).

A robust equality analysis therefore requires a **dashboard rather than a single index**. Income inequality may fall while wealth concentration rises. Average educational attainment may improve while socioeconomic gaps persist. Female labour-force participation may increase while representation in senior leadership remains highly unequal. No single statistic can distinguish all of these possibilities.

Table 2. Selected measures and the questions they can answer

Measure	Most useful for	Key interpretive limitation
Gini coefficient	Overall dispersion of income or wealth	Different distributions can yield similar coefficients.
Top/bottom shares	Concentration and distributional extremes	Does not describe the full middle of the distribution.
Poverty rate	Material deprivation relative to a threshold	Poverty is not the same concept as inequality.
Intergenerational elasticity / rank mobility	Association between parental and child outcomes	Requires distinction between absolute and relative mobility.
Group disparities	Identifying systematic differences	Descriptive disparities do not establish their cause.
Multidimensional / capability indicators	Health, education, agency and non-income dimensions	Weighting and choice of dimensions involve value judgements.

10.1 Income and wealth

For economic inequality, summary measures should generally be combined with distributional statistics. A Gini coefficient is useful for comparing overall dispersion but can conceal where change occurs. Top and bottom shares reveal concentration but omit much of the middle. Wealth data face additional measurement difficulties because high-net-worth households are underrepresented in surveys and some assets are difficult to observe. The question should determine the metric, rather than the availability of a familiar metric determining the question.

10.2 Opportunity and mobility

Equality of opportunity is not directly observable. Researchers infer it through relationships between circumstances and later outcomes, using measures such as intergenerational earnings elasticity, parent-child income ranks, educational and occupational mobility, and associations with parental education or geography. Absolute mobility and relative mobility must be distinguished: people may become materially better off than their parents while remaining in a similar relative position in the distribution.

10.3 Capabilities and group inequality

Capabilities are especially difficult to measure because they concern available choices rather than observed behaviour alone. A person working part-time may freely prefer that arrangement or may lack affordable childcare; the observed outcome is the same while the opportunity set is different. Group disparities present a related challenge. Good analysis separates three questions: **Is there a disparity? What mechanisms produce it? Which part, if any, reflects discriminatory or unequal institutional conditions?** This separation is fundamental to scientific credibility.

11. Equality Under Repeated Shocks

The available evidence pointed towards a world in which multiple forms of inequality were interacting under conditions of repeated shocks. The objective of this section is not to offer an exhaustive global survey but to identify empirical developments that test the multidimensional framework.

11.1 Income, wealth and poverty

Global income and especially wealth remained highly concentrated, while the pandemic interrupted long-term progress in reducing extreme poverty. The World Bank's 2022 assessment described an uneven recovery and emphasised that the fiscal capacity to protect households varied enormously between countries.²⁷ These findings reinforce the distinction between current income, accumulated wealth and resilience.

11.2 Work

The labour-market recovery was incomplete. The ILO's *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2023*, published on 16 January 2023, projected global unemployment of around **208 million people in 2023** and warned that slowing employment growth and pressures on job quality threatened progress towards social justice.²⁸ Employment status alone is therefore an incomplete equality measure: wages, security, working conditions, bargaining power and social protection affect what employment enables.

11.3 Gender, race and the life course

Gender evidence continued to show gaps across economic and political participation, while the pandemic highlighted the interaction between market work and unpaid care.²⁹ Racial-justice research increasingly examined systemic patterns and historical legacies alongside individual discrimination.³⁰ The United Nations *World Social Report 2023* added a life-course perspective, emphasising that inequalities accumulate over time and shape economic security in older age.³¹

Taken together, these developments support a central conclusion of this study: shocks occur on unequal terrain. Existing distributions of wealth, health, care, housing, connectivity, institutional protection and political voice condition how people experience the same external event. Equality is therefore dynamic and path-dependent, not merely a snapshot of current income.

12. The Equality at Large Framework

The preceding analysis suggests that equality cannot be represented adequately on a single continuum. The **Equality at Large Framework** synthesises six dimensions that recur across the major theoretical and empirical traditions: rights, resources, opportunities,

²⁷World Bank, *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2022*, xiii-xv, 1-2.

²⁸International Labour Organization, *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2023* (Geneva: ILO, 2023), 13-15, <https://doi.org/10.54394/SNCP1637>.

²⁹World Economic Forum, *Global Gender Gap Report 2022*, sec. 1.2 and chap. 2; UN Women and UN DESA, *Gender Snapshot 2022*, 2-5.

³⁰United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, A/HRC/51/53, paras. 18-19 and 36-42.

³¹United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *World Social Report 2023: Leaving No One Behind in an Ageing World* (New York: United Nations, 2023), chap. 1.

capabilities, participation and outcomes. The framework is not presented as a replacement for the underlying theories. Its contribution is to organise them into a common analytical sequence while making the intergenerational feedback between outcomes and future opportunities explicit.

Figure 1. Equality at Large Framework

RIGHTS	RESOURCES	OPPORTUNITIES	CAPABILITIES	PARTICIPATION	OUTCOMES
Equal status and protection	Material and institutional means	Paths not predetermined by circumstance	Substantive freedom to act	Participation and recognition as a peer	Observed distributions and positions
INTERGENERATIONAL FEEDBACK: outcomes in one generation become resources and circumstances shaping opportunities in the next.					

Rights ask whether people possess equal fundamental legal, civil and political status. **Resources** ask what material and institutional means are available, including income, wealth, education, health services, time, infrastructure and finance. **Opportunities** ask how strongly circumstances outside individual control shape access to valuable paths. **Capabilities** ask whether people can convert resources and rights into substantive freedom. **Participation** asks whether individuals can engage with institutions and one another as peers, with voice and recognition. **Outcomes** record the distributions and social positions that ultimately emerge.

The six dimensions should not be read as mechanically sequential. They interact in both directions. Rights influence institutions; institutions distribute resources; resources shape opportunity and capability; participation influences institutions; and outcomes alter future resources. Most importantly, outcomes become circumstances for the next generation. A parent's wealth is an outcome in one generation and a resource in another. Educational attainment is an outcome for one person and part of a child's developmental environment for the next.

Figure 2. Dynamic relationship between opportunity and outcome

Generation t: Outcomes	Transmission mechanisms	Generation t+1: Opportunities
Income, wealth, education, health, housing, social position	Inheritance, family resources, neighbourhood, institutions, networks, norms	Resources, capabilities, access, mobility prospects
The policy-relevant question is not whether outcomes are identical, but how far inherited outcomes predetermine the opportunity set faced by the next generation.		

12.1 A working definition

Equality is a social condition in which all people possess equal fundamental dignity and rights and are able to participate in society as equals, while circumstances outside individual control do not systematically determine access to resources, opportunities, capabilities, recognition or social position.

This definition deliberately does not require identical outcomes. Differences in preference, decision and circumstance can legitimately produce different results. Nor does it render outcomes irrelevant. Persistent outcome differences are evidence about how rights, resources, opportunities and institutions operate and, through intergenerational transmission, can become determinants of future opportunity.

The definition also preserves human agency. Its purpose is not to deny individual responsibility but to identify the conditions under which responsibility can meaningfully be

exercised. The more strongly circumstances outside individual control constrain the available opportunity set, the less satisfactory it is to interpret outcomes through choice alone.

13. From Equality to an Economy of Equality

Conventional policy discussion often treats inequality primarily as an outcome to be corrected. Markets generate an initial distribution and governments subsequently alter disposable income or access through taxation, transfers and public services. These mechanisms can materially change poverty and inequality, but they address only part of the system.

A broader question is whether equality can also be influenced **before** final outcomes are produced. This directs attention to the institutions through which economic claims arise: education, access to capital, labour-market rules, bargaining power, asset ownership, corporate governance, technology, information and the distribution of gains from innovation. The distinction is sometimes described as one between redistribution and pre-distribution, although the two are complementary rather than mutually exclusive.

An **Economy of Equality** would therefore not imply uniform outcomes. It would ask how economic institutions can expand the capacity of people to contribute to, participate in and benefit from value creation without inherited or ascriptive circumstances systematically fixing their position. This formulation places opportunity, ownership and participation alongside redistribution and provides a bridge between normative equality and institutional design.

14. Directions for Further Research

The framework developed here points towards six areas in which more specialised analysis is required. They follow from the conceptual relationships identified above rather than from a predetermined sequence of publications.

Social and economic equality. Further research should examine how income, wealth, work, housing, health, education and social protection interact to determine security and social position. A central question is when differences in economic resources become inequalities in effective participation.

Equality of opportunity. The intergenerational transmission of advantage deserves separate analysis, including the effects of parental resources, early-childhood conditions, education, health, neighbourhood, networks and access to capital. The central empirical question is how much of adult opportunity remains associated with circumstances of birth.

Gender equality. More detailed research should connect employment and earnings to unpaid care, occupational structure, representation, safety, autonomy and asset ownership. This requires moving beyond a single pay-gap measure towards a life-course understanding of gendered opportunity and capability.

Racial and ethnic equality. Analysis should distinguish formal non-discrimination, direct discriminatory treatment, historical accumulation and contemporary institutional mechanisms. Particular care is required to separate descriptive disparities from causal claims while preserving the ability to identify systemic patterns where evidence supports them.

Intersectional equality. Further work should analyse how social characteristics interact rather than assuming that the effects of class, gender, race, disability, migration status or geography are independent and additive. This has direct implications for data design and disaggregation.

An Economy of Equality. The final area concerns institutional design: how education, taxation, social protection, labour markets, ownership, access to capital, corporate governance and technology might shape equality not only after economic outcomes are generated but within the processes that generate opportunity and value themselves.

15. Conclusion

Equality begins with a simple proposition: human beings possess equal fundamental worth. Its institutional meaning becomes more complex once societies must determine what equal treatment requires among people who differ in resources, needs, circumstances and preferences.

The major traditions examined in this study illuminate different parts of the problem. Rawls emphasises basic liberties and fair opportunity. Dworkin connects resources to responsibility. Sen demonstrates why resources must be translated into capabilities. Roemer clarifies the analytical distinction between circumstance and effort. Anderson moves attention towards social relationships among equals. Fraser connects distribution, recognition and participation. Crenshaw demonstrates that systems of inequality can intersect in ways that disappear when categories are analysed separately.

Empirical evidence shows why these perspectives need to be combined. Global wealth is more concentrated than global income. Poverty and economic insecurity were reshaped by the pandemic and an uneven recovery. Gender inequalities involve care, time and power as well as wages. Racial and ethnic inequality raises questions about institutional processes and historical accumulation in addition to direct discrimination. Mobility research demonstrates that advantages and disadvantages can pass between generations.

The **Equality at Large Framework** therefore organises equality around six connected dimensions: **Rights - Resources - Opportunities - Capabilities - Participation - Outcomes**. Their interaction is dynamic, and intergenerational transmission links the end of one cycle to the beginning of another.

An equal society is not necessarily one in which everyone arrives at the same outcome. It is one in which equal dignity is reflected in institutions, in which circumstances outside individual control do not systematically determine life chances, in which people possess meaningful capabilities to exercise agency, and in which individuals can participate in economic, political and social life as equals. Understanding how far contemporary societies meet those conditions is the necessary starting point for understanding how greater equality might be achieved.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Elizabeth S. "What Is the Point of Equality?" *Ethics* 109, no. 2 (1999): 287-337. <https://doi.org/10.1086/233897>.
- Atkinson, Anthony B. *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Atkinson, Anthony B. "On the Measurement of Inequality." *Journal of Economic Theory* 2, no. 3 (1970): 244-263. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531\(70\)90039-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(70)90039-6).
- Chancel, Lucas, Thomas Piketty, Emmanuel Saez, and Gabriel Zucman, eds. *World Inequality Report 2022*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674276598>.
- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, and Emmanuel Saez. "Where Is the Land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129, no. 4 (2014): 1553-1623. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju022>.
- Corak, Miles. "Income Inequality, Equality of Opportunity, and Intergenerational Mobility." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27, no. 3 (2013): 79-102. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.3.79>.
- Cowell, Frank A. *Measuring Inequality*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989, no. 1 (1989): 139-167.
- Dworkin, Ronald. "What Is Equality? Part 1: Equality of Welfare." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (1981): 185-246.
- Dworkin, Ronald. "What Is Equality? Part 2: Equality of Resources." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 4 (1981): 283-345.
- Fraser, Nancy. *Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, Participation*. WZB Discussion Paper FS I 98-108. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, 1998.
- International Labour Organization. *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2023*. Geneva: ILO, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.54394/SNCP1637>.
- OECD. *A Broken Social Elevator? How to Promote Social Mobility*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301085-en>.
- OECD. *Does Inequality Matter? How People Perceive Economic Disparities and Social Mobility*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1787/3023ed40-en>.
- Piketty, Thomas. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Roemer, John E. *Equality of Opportunity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Sen, Amartya. "Equality of What?" In *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol. 1, edited by Sterling M. McMurrin, 197-220. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Sen, Amartya. *Inequality Reexamined*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Sen, Amartya. *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- UN Women and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals: The Gender Snapshot 2022*. New York: United Nations, 2022.
- United Nations. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York: United Nations, 2015.
- United Nations. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Paris: United Nations, 1948.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *World Social Report 2020: Inequality in a Rapidly Changing World*. New York: United Nations, 2020.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *World Social Report 2023: Leaving No One Behind in an Ageing World*. New York: United Nations, 2023.

- United Nations Development Programme. *Human Development Report 2019: Beyond Income, Beyond Averages, Beyond Today - Inequalities in Human Development in the 21st Century*. New York: UNDP, 2019.
- United Nations Development Programme. *Human Development Report 2021/2022: Uncertain Times, Unsettled Lives - Shaping Our Future in a Transforming World*. New York: UNDP, 2022.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Promotion and Protection of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Africans and of People of African Descent against Excessive Use of Force and Other Human Rights Violations by Law Enforcement Officers*. A/HRC/47/53. Geneva: United Nations, 2021.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Promotion and Protection of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Africans and of People of African Descent against Excessive Use of Force and Other Human Rights Violations by Law Enforcement Officers through Transformative Change for Racial Justice and Equality*. A/HRC/51/53. Geneva: United Nations, 2022.
- World Bank. *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2022: Correcting Course*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1893-6>.
- World Bank. *World Development Report 2006: Equity and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank and Oxford University Press, 2006.
- World Economic Forum. *Global Gender Gap Report 2022*. Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2022.

Publication Note

The Equality at Large Framework is a conceptual synthesis developed for the research programme of activism group e.U.; it should be read as an analytical framework rather than as a claim that all dimensions of equality can be reduced to a single index or that equal outcomes are the objective of equality policy.