COVID-19 and Well-being: Life in the Pandemic

LATVIA
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Note: Between Q4 2019 and Q4 2020, household disposable income per capita increased cumulatively by 2% for the OECD on average.

Note: The labour underutilisation rate includes the unemployed, marginally attached workers and the underemployed, expressed as a share of the total labour force. Between Q4 2019 and Q4 2020, the labour underutilisation rate increased from 11% to 14% in Latvia, and from 12% to 18% for the OECD 34 on average.

Note: Excess mortality is expressed as the percentage change in the total number of deaths from week 11 2020 to week 19 2021, compared to the 2015-2019 average. Between March 2020 and May 2021, excess mortality averaged 6% in Latvia, and 16% for the OECD 33.

Note: Risk of depression is measured using the PHQ-4 instrument. In 2020 and 2021, the share of people at risk of depression was 27% for both years for the OECD 15 on average. Data for 2014 are not strictly comparable with later years, as they come from a different source.
Note: Risk of anxiety is measured using the PHQ-4 instrument. In 2020 and 2021, the share of people at risk of anxiety was 25% and 26% respectively for the OECD 15 on average.

Note: Very low life satisfaction is defined as answering 4 or less on the 0-10 Cantril ladder scale. Between 2019 and 2020, the share of people reporting low life satisfaction decreased from 14% to 13% in Latvia, and increased from 11% to 12% for the OECD 35 on average.

Note: Data refer to people reporting feeling lonely “most” or “all of the time” in the past two weeks. In April-June 2020 and February-March 2021, it was 12% and 17% respectively in Latvia, and 14% and 19% for the OECD 22 on average. In 2016, the share of people feeling lonely was 5% in both Latvia and for the OECD 22 on average, but this value is not strictly comparable with later years, as it stems from a different source.

Note: Data refer to the share of people agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement “I feel left out of society”. In June-July 2020 and February-March 2021, it was 14% and 24% respectively in Latvia, and 19% and 27% for the OECD 22 on average. In 2016, the share of people feeling left out was 8% in both Latvia and for the OECD 22 on average, but this value is not strictly comparable with later years, as it stems from a different source.

Note: Between Q4 2019 and Q4 2020, household debt decreased from 119% to 118% of gross household disposable income for the OECD 20 on average.

Note: Between Q4 2019 and Q4 2020, government gross debt increased from 81% to 95% of GDP for the OECD 27 on average.
Note: Data refer to the share of people reporting changes in health behaviour since the start of the pandemic until October-November 2020.

Note: Between 2019 and 2020, the share of young people aged 15-29 not in employment, education or training increased from 10% to 14% in Latvia, and from 13% to 14% for the OECD 30 on average.

Note: Between 2019 and 2020, the share of people answering “yes” to a question about whether they have confidence in the national government increased from 24% to 31% in Latvia, and from 45% to 49% for the OECD 35 on average.

Note: A Red List Index value of 0 refers to all species having gone extinct, and a value of 1.0 refers to all species qualifying as “Least Concern”. Between 2019 and 2021, the Red List Index of threatened species remained stable at 0.98 in Latvia, and decreased from 0.89 to 0.88 for the OECD on average.
Latvia’s current well-being, 2019 or latest available year

Note: This chart shows Latvia’s relative strengths and weaknesses in well-being compared to other OECD countries. Longer bars always indicate better outcomes (i.e. higher wellbeing), whereas shorter bars always indicate worse outcomes (lower well-being) – including for negative indicators, marked with an *, which have been reverse-scored. Inequalities (gaps between top and bottom, differences between groups, people falling under a deprivation threshold) are shaded with stripes, and missing data in white. Data for employment rate, negative affect balance, gender gap in feeling safe, and lack of social support refer to 2020. Data for all other indicators refer to 2019 or the latest available year.

Latvia’s resources for future well-being, 2019 or latest available year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Capital</th>
<th>Economic Capital</th>
<th>Human Capital</th>
<th>Social Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions per capita</td>
<td>Produced fixed assets</td>
<td>Educational attainment of young adults</td>
<td>Trust in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material footprint</td>
<td>Financial net worth of government</td>
<td>Premature mortality</td>
<td>Trust in government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red List Index of threatened species</td>
<td>Household debt</td>
<td>Labour underutilisation rate</td>
<td>Gender parity in politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ◆=top-performing OECD tier, ◇=middle-performing OECD tier, ▼=bottom-performing OECD tier. ▲ indicates consistent improvement; ↔ indicates no clear or consistent trend; ▼ indicates consistent deterioration, and “…" indicates insufficient time series to determine trends since 2010. Data refer to 2019 or the latest available year for all indicators except for the Red List Index (2021), produced fixed assets (2020 or latest available year for the trend analysis), financial net worth of government, household debt, educational attainment of young adults, the labour market underutilisation rate and trust in government (2020 for the tiers, 2020 or the latest available year for the trend analysis).
Inequalities between top and bottom performers in Latvia
Vertical inequalities for selected indicators of current well-being, 2019 or latest available year

Household income of the top 20% relative to the bottom 20%

Share of wealth owned by the top 10%

Earnings of the top 10% relative to the bottom 10%, full-time employees

PISA score in science of the top 10% relative to the bottom 10%

Life satisfaction scores of the top 20% relative to the bottom 20%

Satisfaction with time use scores of the top 20% relative to the bottom 20%

Note: For all figures, countries are ranked from left (most unequal) to right (least unequal).
Inequalities between men and women in Latvia

Gender ratios (distance from parity) for selected indicators of current well-being, 2019 or latest available year

Note: *Grey bubbles denote no clear difference between men and women, defined as gender ratios within 0.03 points distance to parity. Data refer to 2019 or the latest available year for all indicators except for the employment rate, long-term unemployment rate, long paid working hours, earnings, life expectancy and perceived health (2020 or the latest available year). Data for social support and feeling safe refer to pooled averages from 2010 to 2020.*
Inequalities between age groups in Latvia

Age ratios (distance from parity) for selected indicators of current well-being, 2019 or latest available year

Panel A. Younger and middle-aged people

- Employment rate
- Voter turnout
- Having a say in government
- Adult skills (numeracy)
- Satisfaction with personal relationships
- Feeling safe
- Life satisfaction
- Time off
- Satisfaction with time use
- Social support
- Long-term unemployment rate
- Social interactions
- Long paid working hours
- Job strain

Panel B. Younger and older people

- Long paid working hours
- Employment rate
- Voter turnout
- Time off
- Having a say in government
- Satisfaction with personal relationships
- Adult skills (numeracy)
- Satisfaction with time use
- Social support
- Life satisfaction
- Social interactions
- Feeling safe
- Job strain
- Long-term unemployment rate

Note: Age ranges differ according to each indicator and are only broadly comparable. They generally refer to 15-24/29 years for young people, 25/30 to 45/50 years for the middle-aged and 50 years and over for older people. See the How's Life? Well-being database for further details.

*Grey bubbles denote no clear difference between age groups, defined as age ratios within 0.03 points distance to parity. Data refer to 2019 or the latest available year for all indicators except for the employment rate, long-term unemployment rate, and long paid working hours (2020 or the latest available year). Data for social support and feeling safe refer to pooled averages from 2010 to 2020.
Inequalities between people with different educational attainment in Latvia

Education ratios (distance from parity) for selected indicators of current well-being, 2019 or latest available year

Note: *Grey bubbles denote no clear difference between groups with different educational attainment, defined as education ratios within 0.03 points distance to parity. Data refer to 2019 or the latest available year for all indicators except for the employment rate and perceived health (2020 or the latest available year). Data for social support and feeling safe refer to pooled averages from 2010 to 2020.

For more information

Find the data used in the COVID-19 and Well-being: Life in the Pandemic section of this country profile (pp. 1-3), and more information about indicator definitions, sources and methodology here.


Find the data used in the How’s Life? section (pp.4-8) of this country profile in the How’s Life? Well-being database. For methodological details on how change since 2010 is defined, see the Reader’s Guide of How’s Life? 2020.


Whenever data are available for fewer than all 38 OECD countries, the number of countries included in the calculation of the OECD average is specified in the figure and note (e.g. OECD 33).

Whenever data for the country of this note are not available, only the OECD average is shown.