Studia Polityczne 2024, vol. 52, no. 3
ISSN 1230-3135
DOI: 10.35757/STP.2024.52.3.03



**BARBARA KIJEWSKA**
University of Gdańsk
ORCID: 0000-0002-5334-0928
barbara.kijewska@ug.edu.pl

**SYLWIA MROZOWSKA**
University of Gdańsk
ORCID: 0000-0003-3032-9504
sylwia.mrozowska@ug.edu.pl

**DOBROSŁAW MAŃKOWSKI**
University of Gdańsk
ORCID: 0000-0001-5113-0743
dobroslaw.mankowski@ug.edu.pl

# (META)ANALYSIS OF POLICIES ADDRESSED TO WOMEN DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

A b s t r a c t

During the COVID-19 pandemic, governments took various anti-crisis measures globally to mitigate its social and economic consequences. Studies on the effects of the pandemic confirm the hypothesis that the costs of such crises are borne to a greater extent by women due to their worse socio-economic position. The subject of the study is state policies addressed to women. The analysis was carried out on the basis of the Global Gender Response Tracker database[1] which monitors actions addressed to women taken by governments around the world to combat the pandemic, and covered the relationship between the values of indicators of social, economic and political development of countries and the implementation of government policies aimed at women (gender policies) during the COVID-19 pandemic. The research confirmed that high socio-economic and political development indicators of countries are strongly correlated with the presence of government policies addressed to women. Regardless of the level of the country's development, the most

[1] United Nations, 'COVID-19 Global Gender Response Tracker', UN Women, 2021, https://data.undp.org/insights/covid-19-global-gender-response-tracker.

frequently implemented policy was the one counteracting violence. On the other hand, policies in the field of social protection, the labour market and economic and tax measures were more often pursued in countries with high development indicators.

K e y w o r d s: gender equality, COVID-19, public policy, government.

## INTRODUCTION

The costs of health crises are mostly borne by women due to their worse position in the labour market, and different gender roles and positions in society.[2] This situation results from structural and cultural constraints based on discrimination and stereotyping about the division of female and male roles. The ideal employee remains a 'male breadwinner', who works longer hours, is more ready to work flexible hours and gives priority to work over family. On the other hand, the belief persists among women that family is the most important aspect of their lives and their work only complements the family budget, if it is possible at all, due to the prioritisation of caregiving duties.[3]

Studies indicate that women were much more likely than men to permanently lose their jobs during the pandemic.[4] Moreover, statistics show that worldwide job losses during the pandemic affected women more than men in all regions and income groups.[5] At the same time, women were increasingly burdened with unpaid care work. Indeed, according to Moreira da Silva, around the world, even before the pandemic, women and girls were responsible for doing 75% of unpaid care and domestic work.[6] In addition, data from the International Labour Organisation show that women around the world do 4 hours

[2] Shilpa Viswanath and Lauren Bock Mullins, 'Gender Responsive Budgeting and the COVID-19 Pandemic Response: A Feminist Standpoint', *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 43: 2, 2020, pp. 230–44, https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2020.1814080.

[3] Kim A. Weeden, Youngjoo Cha and Mauricio Bucca, 'Long Work Hours, Part--Time Work, and Trends in the Gender Gap in Pay, the Motherhood Wage Penalty, and the Fatherhood Wage Premium', *Rsf* 2: 4, 2016, pp. 71–102, https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.4.03.

[4] Hai Anh H. Dang and Cuong Viet Nguyen, 'Gender Inequality during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Income, Expenditure, Savings, and Job Loss', *World Development* 140, 2021, pp. 1–10, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105296.

[5] ILO, 'ILO Monitor: COVID-19 and the World of Work. Seventh Edition. Updated Estimates and Analysis (Labour Market Developments)', *Journal Labour Market Development* 4: 7, 2021, pp. 1–35.

[6] Jorge Moreira da Silva, 'Why You Should Care About Unpaid Care Work', OECD Development Matters, 2019, https://oecd-development-matters.org/2019/03/18/why-you-should-care-about-unpaid-care-work/.

and 25 minutes of household work each day, compared to 1 hour and 23 minutes in the case of men.[7]

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the closure of schools and nurseries also burdened women with additional caring responsibilities, which deepened disparities between women and men. In times like these, for most mothers, their careers are pushed to the background due to the increase in household responsibilities and childcare needs—including overseeing remote education.[8] Furthermore, research confirms the upsurge of women's unpaid work due to a large number of people being taken ill, the closure of retirement homes and care activities undertaken at home, the break in the provision of care by nurseries and kindergartens due to staff illnesses, and the transition to remote learning in all age groups at school.[9] In general, women tend to work in lower-paid, female-dominated professions (i.e. healthcare, education) and lower-level positions, regardless of their level of education.[10] Such jobs are often part-time and done on the basis of personal services contracts or self-employment.[11] In times of crisis, women are often the first to lose their jobs or accept lower remuneration. In addition, as entrepreneurs, they usually run small and micro-enterprises that are more affected by economic downturns.[12] Moreover, more women

[7] Monisha Israni and Vikash Kumar, 'Gendered Work and Barriers in Employment Increase Unjust Work–Life Imbalance for Women: The Need for Structural Responses', *The International Journal of Community and Social Development* 3: 3, 2021, pp. 290–95, https://doi.org/10.1177/25166026211040374.

[8] Obja Borah Hazarika and Sarmistha Das, 'Paid and Unpaid Work during the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Study of the Gendered Division of Domestic Responsibilities during Lockdown', *Journal of Gender Studies* 30: 4, 2021, pp. 429–39, https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2020.1863202.

[9] Lyn Craig and Brendan Churchill, 'Working and Caring at Home: Gender Differences in the Effects of Covid-19 on Paid and Unpaid Labor in Australia', *Feminist Economics* 27: 1–2, 2021, pp. 310–26, https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2020.1831039; Daniela Casale and Dorrit Posel, 'Gender Inequality and the COVID-19 Crisis: Evidence from a Large National Survey during South Africa's Lockdown', *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 71, 2021, article: 100569, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2020.100569; Ashwini Deshpande, 'The COVID-19 Pandemic and Gendered Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: Evidence from India', *IZA Discussion Paper* 13815, 2020, http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3722395; Nevena Kulic et al., 'Economic Disturbances in the COVID-19 Crisis and Their Gendered Impact on Unpaid Activities in Germany and Italy', *European Societies* 23: 1, 2021, pp. S400–16, https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1828974.

[10] World Economic Forum, *The Global Gender Gap Report 2016 Insight Report*, *World Economic Forum*, vol. 25, 2016, https://www. 3.weforum.org/docs/GGGR16/WEF_Global_Gender_Gap_Report_2016.pdf

[11] WHO, 'Delivered by Women, Led by Men: A Gender and Equity Analysis of the Global Health and Social Workforce', *Human Resources for Health Observer* 24, 2019, p. 72, https://www.who.int/hrh/resources/health-observer24/en/.

[12] UN Women, 'Whose Time to Care? Unpaid Care and Domestic Work during Covid-19', UN Women, 2020, https://data.unwomen.org/publications/whose-time-care-unpaid-care-and-domestic-work-during-covid-19.

than men resign from their jobs, perhaps as a result of the increased number of extra-professional duties.[13] On the other hand, women work in services that require contact with other people more often than men, where telecommuting is not possible, so the risk of losing jobs and income due to the lockdown such as experienced during the pandemic is high, especially in industries such as retail, catering and tourism,[14] and various types of sex services (sex working).[15] What is more, due to their high representation (70%) in occupations that require face-to-face interaction (nursing or teaching), women are on the front line of countering the pandemic, which directly exposes them to infection.[16]

The lockdown of half the world's population during the pandemic increased the level of social and economic stress. This contributed to a rise in violence against women. Regardless of the level of economic development of a country, there was an increase in reports on domestic violence during the pandemic and a greater need for shelter or support.[17] The economic consequences of this, including loss of jobs and livelihoods, are expected to push millions of people into extreme poverty, with women and girls suffering the most. The UN estimates that 13 percent of all women and girls in the world—469 million people—will live in extreme poverty as a result of the pandemic.[18] It is assumed that the loss of income, the increase in unemployment and the disproportionate burdening of women with care and upbringing responsibilities (the care economy) will deepen gender inequalities.[19]

---

[13] Dang and Viet Nguyen, 'Gender Inequality during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Income, Expenditure, Savings, and Job Loss'.

[14] Claudia Hupkau and Barbara Petrongolo, 'Work, Care and Gender during the Covid-19 Crisis', *Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper* 1723, 2020, https://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/downolad/dp1723.pdf.

[15] Catherine Hakim, 'Economies of Desire: Sexuality and the Sex Industry in the 21st Century', *Economic Affairs* 35: 3, 2015, pp. 329–48, https://doi.org/10.1111/ecaf.12134.

[16] Mathieu Boniol et al., 'Gender Equity in the Health Workforce: Analysis of 104 Countries', *Health Workforce Working Paper* 1, 2019, pp. 1–8, https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/311314/WHO-HIS-HWF-Gender-WP1-2019.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1.

[17] Jinan Usta, Hana Murr, and Rana El-Jarrah, 'COVID-19 Lockdown and the Increased Violence against Women: Understanding Domestic Violence during a Pandemic', *Violence and Gender* 8: 3, 2021, pp. 133–39, https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2020.0069; Nobuhle Judy Dlamini, 'Gender-Based Violence, Twin Pandemic to COVID-19', *Critical Sociology* 47: 4–5, 2021, pp. 583–90, https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520975465; Viswanath and Mullins, 'Gender Responsive Budgeting and the COVID-19 Pandemic Response: A Feminist Standpoint'.

[18] UN Women, 'Whose Time to Care? Unpaid Care and Domestic Work during Covid-19'.

[19] Kate Power, 'The COVID-19 Pandemic Has Increased the Care Burden of Women and Families', *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy* 16: 1, 2020, pp. 67–73, https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2020.1776561; Youngshin Lim et al., 'Men and Women's Different Dreams on the Future of the Gendered Division of Paid Work and Household Work after

Globally, governments of many countries took anti-crisis measures to mitigate the social and economic effects of the pandemic. Government policies specifically addressed to women which were introduced during the pandemic are collected in the UN Global Gender Response Tracker (GGRT) database. The aim of this analysis is to indicate the relationship between the values of various national indicators of socio-economic and political development and the occurrence of government gender-sensitive (gender policies) policies during the COVID-19 pandemic. The following question was posed in this paper: Which indicators of socio-economic and political development increase the probability of initiating support addressed to women and in what areas? In the world, the situation of women, although regionally differentiated, is worse than that of men in terms of selected indicators of socio-economic development, and the pandemic in countries with low development indicators significantly aggravated the situation of women.[20]

## DESCRIPTION OF GENDER-SENSITIVE POLICY

The COVID-19 Global Gender Response Tracker (GGRT) database monitors the gender-sensitive measures that governments around the world are taking to combat the pandemic. In the study, gender policies indexed in 4 dimensions (Figure 1) in accordance with the classification adopted in the Global Gender Response Tracker were analysed: (1) economic, financial and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurs; (2) labour market; (3) social protection and (4) violence against women.[21]

Only 17 of the 193 UN member states are not included in the GGRT database.[22] This means that programmes addressed to women (with a minimum of 1) were implemented in a total of 176 countries

COVID-19 in South Korea', *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 69, 2020, article: 100544, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2020.100544.

[20] Jessica Omukuti et al., 'Systems Thinking in COVID-19 Recovery Is Urgently Needed to Deliver Sustainable Development for Women and Girls', *The Lancet Planetary Health* 5: 12, 2021, pp. E921–28, https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00232-1.

[21] UN Women, 'COVID-19 Global Gender Response Tracker; Methodological Note', 2021, http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii; https//COVID-19 Global Gender Response Tracker: methodological note | UNW WRD Knowledge Hub.

[22] See: https://www.un.org/en/about-us/member-states. Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Democratic Republic of Korea, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Grenada, Guinea--Bissau, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Nauru, Palau, San Marino, St. Kitts and Nevis, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu.

of the world with UN member status. Gender programmes were not implemented in the areas that have the UN observer status (this applies in particular to Palestine, which has had such status since 2012).[23]

FIGURE 1
Dimensions of government policies addressed to women

| Policy dimension | Measures |
|---|---|
| Economic, financial and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurs | Tax cuts/exemptions/reliefs<br>Tax deferral<br>Credit guarantee<br>Capital injection: public sector/corporate loans<br>Postponement of credit/loan repayment<br>Credit lines |
| Labour market | Remuneration subsidies for the self-employed<br>Activation and development of enterprises<br>Adaptation of labour law provisions<br>Reduced working time and telecommuting |
| Social protection | Social assistance<br>Money transfers<br>In-kind support<br>Social pensions<br>Provision of food at schools<br>Utility and housing services, financial assistance, etc. |
| | Social security<br>Paid sick leave<br>Family/parental/care leave<br>Health insurance support<br>Exemption from the obligation to pay social security contributions/ subsidy<br>Unemployment benefit<br>Care services<br>Child care services<br>Long-term care for the elderly and dependent |
| Violence | Incorporating violence into COVID-19 response plans<br>Awareness-raising campaigns<br>Hot-lines and other reporting mechanisms<br>Continuation of operation/expansion of shelters<br>Psychosocial support<br>Police and Justice<br>Health sector response<br>Other services and forms of support<br>Data collection and use |

Source: own study based on Global Gender Response Tracker Methodological Note.[24]

[23] See: By resolution A/RES/67/19 of 29 November 2012, the General Assembly accorded non-Member Observer State status to Palestine, https://www.un.org/en/about-us/non-member-states. A detailed list of policies of individual countries is presented in Annex 1.

[24] UN Women, 'Whose Time to Care? Unpaid Care and Domestic Work during Covid-19'.

## PRESENCE OF GENDER-SENSITIVE POLICIES

In total, around the world 2,935 government programmes addressed to women during the COVID-19 pandemic were identified. Within individual types and regions, these values show large differences (Table 1).

TABLE 1
Programmes implemented under 4 types of gender regulations in the main regions of the world (percentage distribution of programmes within individual regions)

| Region | Economic, financial and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurs | Labour market | Social protection | Violence against women | In total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In total % (N) | 19.3% (567) | 11.4% (334) | 42.2% (1,240) | 27.1% (794) | 100.0% (2,935) |
| Asia % (N) | 13.1% (96) | 11.3% (83) | 52.0% (381) | 23.5% (172) | 100.0% (732) |
| Latin America and the Caribbean % (N) | 11.6% (78) | 13.2% (89) | 43.8% (295) | 31.4% (211) | 100.0% (673) |
| Oceania % (N) | 13.9% (17) | 8.2% (10) | 27.0% (33) | 50.8% (62) | 100.0% (122) |
| Europe and Northern America % (N) | 29.4% (259) | 11.9% (105) | 32.3% (284) | 26.4% (232) | 100.0% (880) |
| Africa % (N) | 22.2% (117) | 8.9% (47) | 46.8% (247) | 22.2% (117) | 100.0% (528) |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

The average number of policies pursued by the state in individual regions differs significantly depending on the continent (Table 2).

TABLE 2
Average number of gender policy programmes per country in 5 regions of the world

| Region | Average |
|---|---|
| Europe and Northern America | 3.72 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | 3.41 |
| Asia | 3.10 |
| Africa | 2.58 |
| Oceania | 2.55 |
| In total | 3.12 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

The preliminary analysis of the programmes broken down by regions made it possible to draw the following conclusions. Among the 4 types of programmes addressed to women in the world, measures in the area of social protection dominate. They account for over 40% of all initiatives of this type carried out globally. This type of programme dominates in the countries of 4 out of 5 regions (Europe, Africa, both Americas and especially Asia, where they account for over 50% of all activities undertaken by countries in this region). The only exception is Oceania, where programmes focused on violence against women dominate (more than 50% of all programmes implemented in countries in this region). Europe is a leader in 3 out of the 4 areas (economic, financial and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurs, labour market and violence against women), which is manifested by the fact that this region is characterised by the highest percentage among the number of programmes run by the countries of the 'old continent' in these 3 areas. For these areas, the indicators for the Europe are 45.7%, 31.4% and 29.2%, respectively. The leader in the field of 'social protection' is Asia (30.7% of all global programmes in this area are assigned to Asian countries).

Europe and Northern America are leaders in the complexity of programme implementation, i.e. launching programmes from different thematic areas at the same time. In this respect, the countries of the 'old continent' introduced procedures in the largest number of thematic areas. For Europe and Northern America, this indicator amounts to 3.72. The subsequent places are occupied by the states of Latin America and the Caribbean (average 3.41), Asia (3.10), Africa (2.58) and Oceania (2.55). The most common gender policy is counteracting violence. The frequency of occurrence of individual policies is presented in the table below (Table 3), which shows in how many countries in the world a specific number of types of policies is present.

TABLE 3
The number of types of policies

| The number of types of policies | Frequency | Percentage of importance |
|---|---|---|
| Economic, financial and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurs | 9 | 5.1 |
| Labour market | 41 | 23.3 |
| Social protection | 45 | 25.6 |
| Violence against women | 81 | 46.0 |
| In total | 176 | 100.0 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT. A detailed breakdown of the intensity of the presence of policies can be found in Annex 1 (Tables 1 and 4).

## METHOD

Several studies suggest a connection between economic growth, the strength of democratic institutions, and social development, on the one hand, and the level of equality and quality of life for women, on the other.[25] Therefore, in the study, it was decided to examine whether there is a relationship between indicators of social, economic, and political development and the presence of gender--sensitive policies. For the study, seven global indicators of social, economic, and political development of countries were chosen. These are the Human Development Index (HDI), Human Capital Index (HCI), Gender Development Index (GDI), Gender Inequality Index (GII), Freedom House Index (FH), Gini Index (GINI) and GDP (Gross Domestic Product, current prices). Due to the aim of the analysis, the most recent indices were not used. Instead, those that allowed the determination of the state of socio-economic development of countries just before the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic were evaluated. As a result of this approach, indices from just before the outbreak of the pandemic were used (i.e. 2019). This was possible in the case of 6 out of 7 indices. However, the Gini index also covers the previous years: 2014–2018, and in the case of one index (HDI), where the data covers only previous years, logistic regression was used for the calculations. Logistic regression does not take into account cases with missing data, therefore countries for which the value of at least one indicator was unavailable were excluded from the study. In this way, 112 countries, for which the values of all indexes were available, were selected for the calculations. Indicator values are attached (Annex 1, Table 5. Values of indexes).

In the work, the country's development indicators were measured on quantitative scales, i.e. with values that can be expressed continuously. They are independent variables. The fact that one of the following policies is present in a given country was introduced as a dependent variable: (1) economic, financial and fiscal support

[25] Thomas Barnebeck Andersen, 'Does Democracy Cause Gender Equality?', *Journal of Institutional Economics* 19: 2, 2023, pp. 210–28, https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744137422000236; Margit Bussmann, 'Political and Socio-Economic Aspects of Gender Equality and the Onset of Civil War', *Themenschwerpunkt: Gender Und Sicherheit / Gender and Security* 28: 1, 2010, 6–12; Ted Piccone, 'Democracy, Gender Equality, and Gender Security', Brookings Policy Brief, September 2017, https://fp_20170905_democracy_gender_security.pdf; Zhenzhen Zheng, 'Gender Equality Progress in a Decade: Health, Education, and Employment', *China Population and Development Studies* 6: 4, 2022, pp. 452–60, https://doi.org/10.1007/s42379-022-00123-y.

for businesses and entrepreneurship; (2) labour market; (3) social protection; (4) violence against women. In this way, four logistic regression models dedicated to four types of policies were created.

Research practice indicates that the model should be properly fitted and there should be no overfitting or erroneous fitting. This means that only relevant variables that have a real impact on the likelihood of adverse events should be included in studies. To achieve this effect, one of two methods of introducing independent variables into the model should be used: progressive selection or backward elimination. In the next steps, the progressive selection method consists in introducing another factor into the model only when its addition significantly improves the statistical significance of the logistic regression parameters in the study. Therefore, as part of this analysis, the decision was made to also use the backward elimination method, in which all variables are introduced into the equation, and then they are successively removed.[26] This approach made it possible to reduce the problem of overcoming the significant correlation of the values of independent variables. Importantly, both input methods generated very similar results in this analysis—the list of independent variables considered significant was the same in both cases, which further validates the obtained results.

## RESULTS

The conclusions from the research are presented for the variant in which 112 countries were included in the calculations. The results are presented and broken down into four types of implemented programmes.

### POLICIES ON ECONOMIC, FINANCIAL AND FISCAL SUPPORT FOR BUSINESSES AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The table below (Table 4) presents correlations between the values of individual indicators and the number of pursued policies.

All correlations are significant. Table 5 shows the parameters of the model. In this case, the adjusted R-square determines the percentage of the variance (volatility) explained by the selected independent variables (development indicator values).

[26] Scott Menard, *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc, 2002).

TABLE 4
Pearson correlations: economic, financial and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurship (N 112)

| | GINI | GDP | HCI | FH | HDI | GDI | GII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Correlation | -.239 | .331 | .508 | .451 | .508 | .256 | -.511 |
| Significance | .006 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .003 | .000 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

TABLE 5
Model parameters

| Model | R | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared | Standard error of measurement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .618[a] | .382 | .341 | 3.612 |
| 2 | .618[b] | .382 | .347 | 3.595 |
| 3 | .618[c] | .382 | .353 | 3.579 |
| 4 | .617[d] | .381 | .358 | 3.565 |
| 5 | .611[e] | .373 | .356 | 3.571 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

The construction of the model was completed in the fifth stage, i.e. after the removal of five variables. The model explains 35.6% of all observed variables. Parameters of individual independent variables included in the model are given in the Annex 1 (Table 7).

The model based on variables related to the size of the economy, the level of democratisation and civil liberties, as well as the level of gender inequality, explains about 35% of all variables between countries, i.e. whether they decided to implement policies focused on economic, financial and fiscal support for business and entrepreneurship of women.

In this case, a lower level of gender inequality (GII) increases the likelihood of policies aimed at economic, financial and fiscal support for women's businesses and entrepreneurship. The situation is very similar when the size of the economy (GDP) is taken into account, i.e. the larger the economy, the greater the likelihood of policies on economic, financial and fiscal support for women's businesses and entrepreneurship.

## LABOUR MARKET

The table below shows the correlations of the values of individual indicators with the number of pursued policies.

TABLE 6
Pearson correlations: labour market

| | GINI | GDP | HCI | FH | HDI | GDI | GII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Correlation | .024 | .102 | .371 | .312 | .435 | .280 | -.334 |
| Significance | .402 | .143 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .001 | .000 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

Correlations of the number of labour market policies with the following indices are significant: HCI, FH, HDI, GDI, GII.

The next table (Table 7) illustrates the parameters of the model. The adjusted R-square shows the percentage of variability (volatility) explained by the selected independent variables (values of development indicators).

TABLE 7
Model parameters

| Model | R | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared | Standard error of measurement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .504[a] | .254 | .203 | 2.256 |
| 2 | .504[b] | .254 | .211 | 2.245 |
| 3 | .503[c] | .253 | .218 | 2.235 |
| 4 | .502[d] | .252 | .225 | 2.226 |
| 5 | .501[e] | .251 | .230 | 2.217 |
| 6 | .493[f] | .243 | .230 | 2.218 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

The construction of the model was completed in the sixth stage, i.e. after removing six variables. The model explains 23.0% of all observed variables. Parameters of individual independent variables included in the model are given in the Annex 1 (Table 8).

The model based on the level of economic inequality and the level of socio-economic development explains about 23% of all variables between countries, i.e. whether they decided to implement labour market programmes. In this case, the larger the size of a country's economy (GDP), the greater the likelihood of policies targeting the labour market. Moreover, a higher standard of gender equality (GDI) in a country increases the occurrence of labour market-focused policies. What is more, a higher level of social capital development (HCI) in a country increases the likelihood of labour market-focused

policies. In addition, a higher level of socio-economic development (HDI) in a country increases the probability of labour market-focused policies, and finally, a higher level of democratisation (FH) and civil liberties in a country raises the likelihood of policies devoted to the labour market.

SOCIAL PROTECTION

The table below (Table 8) shows the correlations of the values of individual indicators with the number of applied policies.

TABLE 8
Pearson correlations – social protection

| | GINI | GDP | HCI | FH | HDI | GDI | GII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Correlation | .015 | .361 | .278 | .102 | .319 | .172 | -.214 |
| Significance | .437 | .000 | .002 | .143 | .000 | .035 | .012 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

Correlations of the number of policies on social protection with the following indices are significant: GDP, HCI, HDI, GDI, and GII.

Table 9 illustrates the parameters of the model, and the adjusted R-square shows the percentage of variability (volatility) explained by the selected independent variables (values of development indicators).

TABLE 9
Model parameters

| Model | R | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared | Standard error of measurement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .500[a] | .250 | .200 | 4.544 |
| 2 | .500[b] | .250 | .207 | 4.522 |
| 3 | .500[c] | .250 | .215 | 4.502 |
| 4 | .496[d] | .246 | .218 | 4.492 |
| 5 | .492[e] | .242 | .221 | 4.483 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

The construction of the model was completed in the fifth stage, i.e. after the removal of five variables. The model explains 22.1% of all observed variables. Parameters of individual independent variables included in the model are given in the Annex 1 (Table 9).

The model based on variables related to the size of the economy and the level of socio-economic development explains about 22% of all variables between countries, i.e. whether they decided to implement programmes in the field of social protection.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The below table shows the correlations of the values of individual indicators with the number of policies on violence against women.

TABLE 10
Pearson correlations: violence against women

| | GINI | GDP | HCI | FH | HDI | GDI | GII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Correlation | -.001 | .044 | .250 | .316 | .295 | .164 | -.223 |
| Significance | .498 | .323 | .004 | .000 | .001 | .042 | .009 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

Correlations of the number of policies in the field of counteracting violence against women with the following indicators are significant: HCI, FH, HDI, GDI, GII.

Table 11 illustrates the parameters of the model. The adjusted R-squared here specifies the percentage of variability (volatility) explained by selected independent variables (values of development indicators).

TABLE 11
Model parameters

| Model | R | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared | Standard error of measurement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .377[a] | .142 | .085 | 4.059 |
| 2 | .377[b] | .142 | .093 | 4.040 |
| 3 | .377[c] | .142 | .102 | 4.021 |
| 4 | .371[d] | .138 | .105 | 4.013 |
| 5 | .364[e] | .132 | .108 | 4.006 |
| 6 | .337[f] | .114 | .097 | 4.031 |
| 7 | .316[g] | .100 | .092 | 4.044 |

Source: own study based on the GGRT.

The construction of the model was completed in the seventh stage, i.e. after the removal of seven variables. The model explains only

9.2% of all observed variables. Parameters of individual independent variables included in the model are given in the Annex 1 (Table 10).

The model based on the level of democratisation and civil liberties variable explains about 9% of all the variables between countries, i.e. whether they chose to implement policies focused on combating violence against women. Accordingly, a lower level of gender inequality (GII) in a country increases the likelihood of policies focused on preventing violence against women.

## CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from the above analyses:

1. A country with fewer gender disparities (GII), a large economy (GDP) and a high level of democratisation and civil liberties (FH) is highly likely to implement policies in the field of economic, financial and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurship. Therefore, the countries of the European Union are leaders in this respect, contrary to countries from other regions. The 'old continent', which has adequate resources, supported economic activities, and provided financial and fiscal support, which differentiates it significantly from the rest of the regions.

2. It is highly probable that a country characterised by a large economy (GDP), a higher standard of gender equality, a higher level of social capital (HCI), of socio-economic development (HDI) and a higher level of democratisation and civil liberties (FH), as well as a lower level of social inequalities in the area of gender (GII), will implement programmes in the field of the labour market. It should be noted that the size of the country's economy combined with the level of gender equality clearly shows that for these countries the participation of women in the labour market is much more important than in the others. The orientation of policies towards the labour market is also interesting from the point of view of the functioning of social capital. Therefore, building social capital seems important for the labour market and gender equality, which may show a change in the context of previous studies showing significant differences in the functioning of social capital of men and women.[27]

[27] Celia Muñoz-Goy, 'Social Capital in Spain: Are There Gender Inequalities?', *European Journal of Government and Economics* 2: 1, 2013, pp. 79– 94, https://doi.org/10.17979/ejge.2013.2.1.4288.

3. It is highly probable that a country characterised by a large economy (GDP) and a higher level of socio-economic development (HDI) will implement programmes in the field of social protection. It should be considered whether countries with a liberal free market economy are not inclined to social democratic solutions towards their citizens as a response to a crisis (e.g. the pandemic) occurring independently of economic activities.

4. A country with a lower level of gender inequality (GII) and a higher level of democratisation and civil liberties (FH) is highly likely to implement programmes in the field of counteracting violence against women. This shows that the main problem for countries with higher levels of democratisation and civil liberties is to further reduce violent behaviour and create VAW policies.[28]

5. An important issue that the analysis showed was the implementation of social welfare policies—as a reminder, they accounted for over 40% of all initiatives introduced in the world. In the context of gender policies, this still indicates that women need more social protection than men. How much they were related to policies on childcare, care support, etc., or to what extent they acted in other areas mentioned above is still to be analysed.

Countries with high rates of economic development (GPD), low levels of gender inequality (GII), high standards of democracy (FH) and large economies (GDP) implemented policies aimed at improving the situation of women in their societies to the greatest extent. Therefore, a hypothesis can be postulated that the higher the socio--economic development of a country, the higher civic awareness, the more sensitive the country is to gender inequality. Moreover, such countries have a greater opportunity to counteract the effects of crises not caused by the actors of the financial (economic) market and act for the benefit of women whose position on the labour market or, more broadly, in societies is lower than that of men.

## STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

The strength of the conducted analyses is evidenced by their global nature and the lack of previous studies, which paves the way for

[28] Amy G. Mazur, Dorothy E. McBride, and Season Hoard, 'Comparative Strength of Women's Movements over Time: Conceptual, Empirical, and Theoretical Innovations', *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4: 4, 2016, pp. 625–76, phttps://doi.org/10.1080/2156550 3.2015.1102153.

further research on gender inequalities, taking into account the socio--economic and political situation of the selected countries or regions. At the same time, this analysis illustrates a certain inequality of the world's regions and states and their societies, as well as their abilities to cope with crisis situations. The conducted analyses emphasise statistical co-variation and do not refer directly to causality, which does not take into account the characteristics of the pursued policy. For example, a policy aimed at combating violence against women may have a financial dimension (subsidies), a material one (opening shelters for victims) or only an affirmative one (information activities), or a procedural one (a change in the way of reporting, or implementation of sanitary procedures in centres for women experiencing violence). In other words, policies in individual dimensions may differ in the manner of implementation and effectiveness. What is more, also actions for the protection of jobs for women may have a financial dimension (subsidies) or be related to tax reliefs, which has a completely different facet. In addition, it should be noted that previous studies could not identify or explain the differences in existing family policies in different European countries in relation to the participation of women with children under the age of three in the labour market,[29] which in the context of the crisis may also complicate the perception of policy objectives and their real results.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The above analysis can be used as a starting point for further in-depth research on how countries cope with health crises and formulate gender-sensitive public policies. It would be important to indicate the characteristics of policies of highly developed countries, as opposed to developing countries, where perhaps the very handling of the crisis disregarded the division into genders, and the main task was to save the country's socio-economic status in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. It is also worth examining to what degree these policies had been planned and the crisis did not prevent their introduction, and to what extent the crisis necessitated the adoption of support policies for women or to what extent the planned policies and activities were modified by the pandemic.

[29] Birgit Pfau-Effinger, 'Women's Employment in the Institutional and Cultural Context', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 32: 9, 2012, pp. 530–43, https://doi.org/10.1108/01443331211257634.

## REFERENCES

Andersen, Thomas Barnebeck, 'Does Democracy Cause Gender Equality?', *Journal of Institutional Economics* 19: 2, 2023, pp. 210–28, https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744137422000236.

Boniol, Mathieu et al., 'Gender Equity in the Health Workforce: Analysis of 104 Countries', *Health Workforce Working Paper* 1, 2019, pp. 1–8, https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/311314/WHO-HIS-HWF-Gender-WP1-2019.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1.

Bussmann, Margit, 'Political and Socio-Economic Aspects of Gender Equality and the Onset of Civil War', *Themenschwerpunkt: Gender Und Sicherheit / Gender and Security* 28: 1, 2010, 6–12.

Casale, Daniela and Dorrit Posel, 'Gender Inequality and the COVID-19 Crisis: Evidence from a Large National Survey during South Africa's Lockdown', *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 71, 2021, article: 100569, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2020.100569.

Craig, Lyn and Brendan Churchill, 'Working and Caring at Home: Gender Differences in the Effects of Covid-19 on Paid and Unpaid Labor in Australia', *Feminist Economics* 27: 1–2, 2021, pp. 310–26, https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2020.1831039.

Dang, Hai Anh H. and Cuong Viet Nguyen, 'Gender Inequality during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Income, Expenditure, Savings, and Job Loss', *World Development* 140, 2021, pp. 1–10, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105296.

Deshpande, Ashwini, 'The COVID-19 Pandemic and Gendered Division of Paid and Unpaid Work: Evidence from India', *IZA Discussion Paper* 13815, 2020, http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3722395.

Dlamini, Nobuhle Judy, 'Gender-Based Violence, Twin Pandemic to COVID-19', *Critical Sociology* 47: 4–5, 2021, pp. 583–90, https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520975465.

Hazarika, Ojba Borah and Sarmistha Das, 'Paid and Unpaid Work during the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Study of the Gendered Division of Domestic Responsibilities during Lockdown', *Journal of Gender Studies* 30: 4, 2021, pp. 429–39, https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2020.1863202.

Hakim, Catherine, 'Economies of Desire: Sexuality and the Sex Industry in the 21st Century', *Economic Affairs* 35: 3, 2015, pp. 329–48, https://doi.org/10.1111/ecaf.12134.

Hupkau, Claudia and Barbara Petrongolo, 'Work, Care and Gender during the Covid-19 Crisis', *Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper* 1723, 2020, https://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/downolad/dp1723.pdf.

ILO, 'ILO Monitor: COVID-19 and the World of Work. Seventh Edition. Updated Estimates and Analysis (Labour Market Developments)', *Journal Labour Market Development* 4: 7, 2021, pp. 1–35.

Israni, Monisha and Vikash Kumar, 'Gendered Work and Barriers in Employment Increase Unjust Work–Life Imbalance for Women: The Need for Structural Responses', *The International Journal of Community and Social Development* 3: 3, 2021, pp. 290–95, https://doi.org/10.1177/25166026211040374.

Kulic, Nevena et al., 'Economic Disturbances in the COVID-19 Crisis and Their Gendered Impact on Unpaid Activities in Germany and Italy', *European Societies* 23: 1, 2021, pp. S400–16, https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1828974.

Lim, Youngshin et al., 'Men and Women's Different Dreams on the Future of the Gendered Division of Paid Work and Household Work after COVID-19 in South Korea', *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 69, 2020, article: 100544, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2020.100544.

Mazur, Amy G., Dorothy E. McBride and Season Hoard, 'Comparative Strength of Women's Movements over Time: Conceptual, Empirical, and Theoretical Innovations', *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4: 4, 2016, pp. 625–76, phttps://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2015.1102153.

Menard, Scott, *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc, 2002).

Muñoz-Goy, Celia, 'Social Capital in Spain: Are There Gender Inequalities?', *European Journal of Government and Economics* 2: 1, 2013, pp. 79––94, https://doi.org/10.17979/ejge.2013.2.1.4288.

Omukuti, Jessica et al., 'Systems Thinking in COVID-19 Recovery Is Urgently Needed to Deliver Sustainable Development for Women and Girls', *The Lancet Planetary Health* 5: 12, 2021, pp. E921–28, https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00232-1.

Pfau-Effinger, Birgit, 'Women's Employment in the Institutional and Cultural Context', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 32: 9, 2012, pp. 530–43, https://doi.org/10.1108/01443331211257634.

Piccone, Ted, 'Democracy, Gender Equality, and Gender Security', Brookings Policy Brief, September 2017, https://fp_20170905_democracy_gender_security.pdf.

Power, Kate, 'The COVID-19 Pandemic Has Increased the Care Burden of Women and Families', *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy* 16: 1, 2020, pp. 67–73, https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2020.1776561.

Shilpa Viswanath, Shilpa and Lauren Bock Mullins, 'Gender Responsive Budgeting and the COVID-19 Pandemic Response: A Feminist Standpoint', *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 43: 2, 2020, pp. 230––44, https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2020.1814080.

Silva da, Jorge Moreira, 'Why You Should Care About Unpaid Care Work', OECD Development Matters, 2019, https://oecd-development-matters.org/2019/03/18/why-you-should-care-about-unpaid-care-work/.

UN Women, 'COVID-19 Global Gender Response Tracker; Methodological Note', 2021, http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii.

UN Women, 'Whose Time to Care? Unpaid Care and Domestic Work during Covid-19', UN Women, 2020, https://data.unwomen.org/publications/whose-time-care-unpaid-care-and-domestic-work-during-covid-19.

United Nations, 'COVID-19 Global Gender Response Tracker', UN Women, 2021, https://data.undp.org/insights/covid-19-global-gender-response-tracker.

Usta, Jinan, Hana Murr, and Rana El-Jarrah, 'COVID-19 Lockdown and the Increased Violence against Women: Understanding Domestic Violence during a Pandemic', *Violence and Gender* 8: 3, 2021, pp. 133–39, https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2020.0069.

Weeden, Kim A., Youngjoo Cha and Mauricio Bucca, 'Long Work Hours, Part-Time Work, and Trends in the Gender Gap in Pay, the Motherhood Wage Penalty, and the Fatherhood Wage Premium', *Rsf* 2: 4, 2016, pp. 71–102, https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.4.03.

WHO, 'Delivered by Women, Led by Men: A Gender and Equity Analysis of the Global Health and Social Workforce', *Human Resources for Health Observer* 24, 2019, p. 72, https://www.who.int/hrh/resources/health-observer24/en/.

World Economic Forum, *The Global Gender Gap Report 2016 Insight Report*, *World Economic Forum*, vol. 25, 2016, https://www. 3.weforum.org/docs/GGGR16/WEF_Global_Gender_Gap_Report_2016.pdf.

Zheng, Zhenzhen, 'Gender Equality Progress in a Decade: Health, Education, and Employment', *China Population and Development Studies* 6: 4, 2022, pp. 452–60, https://doi.org/10.1007/s42379-022-00123-y.

# ANNEX. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE 1
Economic, financial, and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurs

| Number of types of policies | Frequency | Percentage of importance |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 52 | 29.5 |
| 1 | 35 | 19.9 |
| 2 | 19 | 10.8 |
| 3 | 6 | 3.4 |
| 4 | 14 | 8.0 |
| 5 | 13 | 7.4 |
| 6 | 9 | 5.1 |
| 7 | 2 | 1.1 |
| 8 | 7 | 4.0 |
| 9 | 6 | 3.4 |
| 10 | 2 | 1.1 |
| 11 | 3 | 1.7 |
| 12 | 1 | .6 |
| 13 | 1 | .6 |
| 14 | 3 | 1.7 |
| 15 | 1 | .6 |
| 20 | 1 | .6 |
| 22 | 1 | .6 |
| In total | 176 | 100.0 |

TABLE 2
Labour market

| Number of types of policies | Frequency | Percentage of importance |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 63 | 35.8 |
| 1 | 32 | 18.2 |
| 2 | 32 | 18.2 |
| 3 | 20 | 11.4 |
| 4 | 9 | 5.1 |
| 5 | 2 | 1.1 |
| 6 | 7 | 4.0 |
| 7 | 6 | 3.4 |
| 8 | 1 | .6 |
| 9 | 1 | .6 |
| 10 | 2 | 1.1 |
| 11 | 1 | .6 |
| In total | 176 | 100.0 |

TABLE 3
Social protection

| Number of types of policies | Frequency | Percentage of importance |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | .6 |
| 1 | 12 | 6.8 |
| 2 | 14 | 8.0 |
| 3 | 20 | 11.4 |
| 4 | 16 | 9.1 |
| 5 | 19 | 10.8 |
| 6 | 17 | 9.7 |
| 7 | 11 | 6.3 |
| 8 | 9 | 5.1 |
| 9 | 14 | 8.0 |
| 10 | 6 | 3.4 |
| 11 | 8 | 4.5 |
| 12 | 5 | 2.8 |
| 13 | 4 | 2.3 |
| 14 | 5 | 2.8 |
| 15 | 3 | 1.7 |
| 16 | 2 | 1.1 |
| 17 | 3 | 1.7 |
| 19 | 2 | 1.1 |
| 20 | 3 | 1.7 |
| 22 | 1 | .6 |
| 26 | 1 | .6 |
| In total | 176 | 100.0 |

TABLE 4
Violence against women

| Number of types of policies | Frequency | Percentage of importance |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 38 | 21.6 |
| 1 | 12 | 6.8 |
| 2 | 24 | 13.6 |
| 3 | 13 | 7.4 |
| 4 | 12 | 6.8 |
| 5 | 16 | 9.1 |
| 6 | 11 | 6.3 |
| 7 | 11 | 6.3 |
| 8 | 4 | 2.3 |
| 9 | 10 | 5.7 |
| 10 | 6 | 3.4 |
| 11 | 3 | 1.7 |
| 12 | 7 | 4.0 |
| 13 | 4 | 2.3 |
| 14 | 3 | 1.7 |
| 15 | 1 | .6 |
| 16 | 1 | .6 |
| In total | 176 | 100.0 |

TABLE 5
Values of indexes

| Country | Continent | GINI | GDP | HCI | FH | HDI | GDI | GII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Albania | Europe | 33.2 | 41.709 | 0.621321082115173 | 68 | 0.795 | 0.966825371693485 | 0.181 |
| Angola | Africa | 51.3 | 222.459 | 0.361404001712799 | 31 | 0.581 | 0.902946618629717 | 0.536 |
| Argentina | Americas | 42.9 | 1033.456 | 0.610509276390075 | 84 | 0.845 | 0.993451949444983 | 0.328 |
| Armenia | Asia | 29.9 | 42.095 | 0.571733891963958 | 51 | 0.776 | 0.982091599774217 | 0.245 |
| Australia | Oceania | 34.4 | 1345.676 | 0.802738547325134 | 98 | 0.944 | 0.976203560512556 | 0.097 |
| Austria | Europe | 30.8 | 521.336 | 0.792826473712921 | 93 | 0.922 | 0.963932404178508 | 0.069 |
| Bangladesh | Asia | 32.4 | 869.044 | 0.478669285774231 | 41 | 0.632 | 0.904042448507942 | 0.537 |
| Belgium | Europe | 27.2 | 618.928 | 0.756894886493682 | 96 | 0.931 | 0.973807806462793 | 0.043 |
| Benin | Africa | 47.8 | 40.435 | 0.405851066112518 | 79 | 0.545 | 0.854600119643098 | 0.612 |
| Botswana | Africa | 53.3 | 42.660 | 0.423764765262604 | 72 | 0.735 | 0.997729893235184 | 0.465 |
| Brazil | Americas | 53.4 | 3222.990 | 0.559603154659271 | 75 | 0.765 | 0.993476951454000 | 0.408 |
| Bulgaria | Europe | 41.3 | 168.553 | 0.675876438617706 | 80 | 0.816 | 0.994685459171944 | 0.206 |
| Burkina Faso | Africa | 35.3 | 46.379 | 0.369107812643051 | 60 | 0.452 | 0.866707792642374 | 0.594 |
| Cameroon | Africa | 46.6 | 98.362 | 0.394355148077011 | 19 | 0.563 | 0.864019843121015 | 0.560 |
| Canada | Americas | 33.3 | 1920.997 | 0.798846364021301 | 99 | 0.929 | 0.985592902654268 | 0.080 |
| Chile | Americas | 44.4 | 478.771 | 0.674442172050476 | 94 | 0.851 | 0.962758931224451 | 0.247 |
| China | Asia | 38.5 | 23393.004 | 0.673168420791625 | 11 | 0.761 | 0.957499348146619 | 0.168 |
| Colombia | Americas | 51.3 | 772.440 | 0.593478620052337 | 66 | 0.767 | 0.989466029986866 | 0.428 |
| Costa Rica | Americas | 48.2 | 103.339 | 0.619022369384765 | 91 | 0.810 | 0.981297241368427 | 0.288 |
| Côte d'Ivoire | Africa | 41.5 | 139.966 | 0.353483229875565 | 51 | 0.538 | 0.811194394691022 | 0.638 |
| Croatia | Europe | 29.7 | 121.339 | 0.722774386405944 | 85 | 0.851 | 0.990018969479063 | 0.116 |
| Cyprus | Asia | 32.7 | 36.487 | 0.751303136348724 | 94 | 0.887 | 0.979050305488673 | 0.086 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Czechia | Europe | 25.0 | 454.426 | 0.781599044799804 | 91 | 0.900 | 0.985431665502755 | 0.136 |
| Denmark | Europe | 28.2 | 346.733 | 0.774303555488586 | 97 | 0.940 | 0.982565602420218 | 0.038 |
| Dominican Republic | Americas | 41.9 | 206.098 | 0.492353558540344 | 67 | 0.756 | 0.998792473551120 | 0.455 |
| Ecuador | Americas | 45.7 | 205.989 | 0.602448344230651 | 63 | 0.759 | 0.967367575789958 | 0.384 |
| Egypt | Africa | 31.5 | 1230.831 | 0.485894709825516 | 22 | 0.707 | 0.882333227884236 | 0.449 |
| El Salvador | Americas | 38.8 | 59.032 | 0.501215875148773 | 67 | 0.673 | 0.974571097002244 | 0.383 |
| Estonia | Europe | 30.3 | 51.059 | 0.747430562973022 | 94 | 0.892 | 1.016865658667440 | 0.086 |
| Eswatini | Africa | 54.6 | 10.308 | 0.408754229545593 | 16 | 0.611 | 0.996113276444148 | 0.567 |
| Ethiopia | Africa | 35.0 | 263.111 | 0.384510278701782 | 19 | 0.485 | 0.837089381925207 | 0.517 |
| Finland | Europe | 27.3 | 280.024 | 0.814354419708251 | 100 | 0.938 | 0.989919097637948 | 0.047 |
| France | Europe | 32.4 | 3228.039 | 0.764517128467559 | 90 | 0.901 | 0.987152994137522 | 0.049 |
| Gabon | Africa | 38.0 | 33.854 | 0.453311800956726 | 23 | 0.703 | 0.915848182435130 | 0.525 |
| Gambia | Africa | 35.9 | 5.439 | 0.396760642528534 | 45 | 0.496 | 0.845742405623478 | 0.612 |
| Georgia | Asia | 35.9 | 58.213 | 0.613555073738098 | 63 | 0.812 | 0.979544390211603 | 0.331 |
| Germany | Europe | 31.9 | 4672.006 | 0.794893801212310 | 94 | 0.947 | 0.971880477207822 | 0.084 |
| Ghana | Africa | 43.5 | 171.603 | 0.438578307628632 | 83 | 0.611 | 0.910991564830612 | 0.538 |
| Greece | Europe | 32.9 | 338.598 | 0.680501043796539 | 87 | 0.888 | 0.963041817949673 | 0.116 |
| Guatemala | Americas | 48.3 | 149.483 | 0.459549427032471 | 53 | 0.663 | 0.940802357490989 | 0.479 |
| Honduras | Americas | 48.2 | 58.096 | 0.489814341068268 | 46 | 0.634 | 0.978232974538284 | 0.423 |
| Hungary | Europe | 29.6 | 332.203 | 0.703426301479339 | 70 | 0.854 | 0.980789458124435 | 0.233 |
| Iceland | Europe | 26.1 | 21.050 | 0.740187704563140 | 94 | 0.949 | 0.968674036926566 | 0.058 |
| Indonesia | Asia | 38.2 | 3331.872 | 0.534996151924133 | 62 | 0.718 | 0.940357593663396 | 0.480 |
| Iran | Asia | 42.0 | 1044.819 | 0.590542018413543 | 18 | 0.783 | 0.865553872091980 | 0.459 |
| Ireland | Europe | 31.4 | 455.165 | 0.806300640106201 | 97 | 0.955 | 0.981024297613543 | 0.093 |
| Israel | Asia | 39.0 | 378.203 | 0.762917578220367 | 78 | 0.919 | 0.973318359215760 | 0.109 |
| Italy | Europe | 35.9 | 2665.524 | 0.768844127655029 | 89 | 0.892 | 0.967767104697158 | 0.069 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kazakhstan | Asia | 27.8 | 508.501 | 0.746134042739868 | 22 | 0.825 | 0.980266424175516 | 0.190 |
| Kenya | Africa | 40.8 | 237.266 | 0.517685651779174 | 48 | 0.601 | 0.936917463160203 | 0.518 |
| Korea | Asia | 31.4 | 2304.833 | 0.844936728477478 | 83 | 0.916 | 0.936113143664037 | 0.064 |
| Kyrgyzstan | Asia | 29.7 | 35.238 | 0.579813480377197 | 38 | 0.697 | 0.957285458058406 | 0.369 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | Asia | 38.8 | 58.785 | 0.452455818653107 | 14 | 0.613 | 0.927295852011501 | 0.459 |
| Latvia | Europe | 35.1 | 61.465 | 0.723926365375518 | 87 | 0.866 | 1.035955000686090 | 0.176 |
| Lesotho | Africa | 44.9 | 6.164 | 0.371283084154129 | 63 | 0.527 | 1.013559290677810 | 0.553 |
| Liberia | Africa | 35.3 | 7.328 | 0.319469481706619 | 62 | 0.480 | 0.889581087175251 | 0.650 |
| Lithuania | Europe | 35.7 | 107.400 | 0.711871385574340 | 91 | 0.882 | 1.029915630878400 | 0.124 |
| Luxembourg | Europe | 35.4 | 73.968 | 0.691501200199127 | 98 | 0.916 | 0.975942134704792 | 0.065 |
| Malawi | Africa | 44.7 | 20.363 | 0.406827270984650 | 64 | 0.483 | 0.986380166972814 | 0.565 |
| Malaysia | Asia | 41.1 | 944.565 | 0.622254431247711 | 52 | 0.810 | 0.971795890838092 | 0.253 |
| Malta | Europe | 28.7 | 23.160 | 0.701386690139770 | 91 | 0.895 | 0.965690318755337 | 0.175 |
| Mauritania | Africa | 32.6 | 24.499 | 0.352662831544876 | 32 | 0.546 | 0.863657393176387 | 0.634 |
| Mauritius | Africa | 36.8 | 30.171 | 0.625797748565673 | 89 | 0.804 | 0.975621068053823 | 0.347 |
| Mexico | Americas | 45.4 | 2625.895 | 0.607203960418701 | 63 | 0.779 | 0.960081433391167 | 0.322 |
| Moldova | Europe | 25.7 | 36.044 | 0.580140888690948 | 58 | 0.750 | 1.013708538762290 | 0.204 |
| Mongolia | Asia | 32.7 | 41.380 | 0.625953733921051 | 85 | 0.737 | 1.023089170478030 | 0.322 |
| Montenegro | Europe | 38.5 | 13.914 | 0.615234255790710 | 65 | 0.829 | 0.966192053876925 | 0.109 |
| Mozambique | Africa | 54.0 | 40.556 | 0.361038416624069 | 51 | 0.456 | 0.912091034564736 | 0.523 |
| Myanmar | Asia | 30.7 | 266.366 | 0.473420709371567 | 30 | 0.583 | 0.953708515633857 | 0.478 |
| Namibia | Africa | 59.1 | 25.276 | 0.434650391340256 | 75 | 0.646 | 1.007469439663470 | 0.440 |
| Netherlands | Europe | 28.1 | 1028.581 | 0.799700617790222 | 99 | 0.944 | 0.965586666219649 | 0.043 |
| Nicaragua | Americas | 46.2 | 36.889 | 0.530841171741485 | 32 | 0.660 | 1.011648304385350 | 0.428 |
| Niger | Africa | 34.3 | 29.751 | 0.316049337387085 | 49 | 0.394 | 0.723746324681914 | 0.642 |
| North Macedonia | Europe | 33.0 | 35.985 | 0.533845543861389 | 59 | 0.774 | 0.952071890175351 | 0.143 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Norway | Europe | 27.6 | 354.695 | 0.770987212657928 | 100 | 0.957 | 0.989938657961745 | 0.045 |
| Pakistan | Asia | 31.6 | 1065.373 | 0.388697892427444 | 39 | 0.557 | 0.744749566275391 | 0.538 |
| Panama | Americas | 49.8 | 139.237 | 0.532000362873077 | 84 | 0.815 | 1.019027624871360 | 0.407 |
| Paraguay | Americas | 45.7 | 93.141 | 0.532716870307922 | 65 | 0.728 | 0.966283198094048 | 0.446 |
| Peru | Americas | 41.5 | 441.962 | 0.585583865642547 | 73 | 0.777 | 0.957092912163272 | 0.395 |
| Philippines | Asia | 42.3 | 1003.853 | 0.548099815845489 | 61 | 0.718 | 1.006919977563320 | 0.430 |
| Poland | Europe | 30.2 | 1309.450 | 0.747142016887664 | 84 | 0.880 | 1.007110229789810 | 0.115 |
| Portugal | Europe | 33.5 | 372.471 | 0.776341199874877 | 96 | 0.864 | 0.988317410429193 | 0.075 |
| Romania | Europe | 35.8 | 605.792 | 0.601167142391204 | 81 | 0.828 | 0.991381033752718 | 0.276 |
| Russian Federation | Europe | 37.5 | 4135.992 | 0.728552579879760 | 20 | 0.824 | 1.006650897173890 | 0.225 |
| Rwanda | Africa | 43.7 | 29.298 | 0.373600870370865 | 23 | 0.543 | 0.945410295454316 | 0.402 |
| Serbia | Europe | 36.2 | 132.115 | 0.755353212356567 | 67 | 0.806 | 0.977172278156389 | 0.132 |
| Sierra Leone | Africa | 35.7 | 13.898 | 0.350620836019516 | 65 | 0.452 | 0.883789878636776 | 0.644 |
| Slovakia | Europe | 25.0 | 186.417 | 0.693649947643280 | 88 | 0.860 | 0.991814805109839 | 0.191 |
| Slovenia | Europe | 24.6 | 84.196 | 0.787609279155731 | 94 | 0.917 | 1.001408521064190 | 0.063 |
| South Africa | Africa | 63.0 | 761.824 | 0.406424373388290 | 79 | 0.709 | 0.986382149506194 | 0.406 |
| Spain | Europe | 34.7 | 2006.054 | 0.742902219295501 | 94 | 0.904 | 0.985865273801171 | 0.070 |
| Sri Lanka | Asia | 39.3 | 297.201 | 0.583908796310424 | 56 | 0.782 | 0.955327845466463 | 0.401 |
| Sudan | Africa | 34.2 | 178.950 | 0.379367411136627 | 7 | 0.510 | 0.859725953237211 | 0.545 |
| Sweden | Europe | 30.0 | 570.754 | 0.800271391868591 | 100 | 0.945 | 0.982644255467716 | 0.039 |
| Switzerland | Europe | 33.1 | 615.309 | 0.767455101013183 | 96 | 0.955 | 0.967512817907354 | 0.025 |
| Tajikistan | Asia | 34.0 | 32.929 | 0.532733142375946 | 9 | 0.668 | 0.823238913306018 | 0.314 |
| Tanzania | Africa | 40.5 | 159.993 | 0.399587899446487 | 45 | 0.529 | 0.947644954950684 | 0.556 |
| Thailand | Asia | 34.9 | 1339.643 | 0.603891134262084 | 30 | 0.777 | 1.007921417554260 | 0.359 |
| Togo | Africa | 43.1 | 13.394 | 0.412916868925095 | 43 | 0.515 | 0.821541626797863 | 0.573 |
| Tonga | Oceania | 37.6 | 0.616 | 0.512257397174835 | 79 | 0.725 | 0.949780567304435 | 0.354 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tunisia | Africa | 32.8 | 131.087 | 0.507701098918914 | 69 | 0.740 | 0.900129296912583 | 0.296 |
| Turkey | Asia | 41.9 | 2471.660 | 0.625536024570465 | 31 | 0.820 | 0.923928621525018 | 0.306 |
| Uganda | Africa | 42.8 | 105.389 | 0.381712257862091 | 36 | 0.544 | 0.863394930619338 | 0.535 |
| Ukraine | Europe | 26.6 | 560.976 | 0.646792829036712 | 60 | 0.779 | 1.000186388673950 | 0.234 |
| United Arab Emirates | Asia | 26.0 | 683.523 | 0.658846914768218 | 17 | 0.890 | 0.930625872704173 | 0.079 |
| United Kingdom | Europe | 35.1 | 3254.845 | 0.780837237834930 | 93 | 0.932 | 0.969923825628070 | 0.118 |
| United States | Americas | 41.4 | 21433.225 | 0.762271821498870 | 86 | 0.926 | 0.993544801844942 | 0.204 |
| Uruguay | Americas | 39.7 | 77.795 | 0.600251019001007 | 98 | 0.817 | 1.016175058200970 | 0.288 |
| Viet Nam | Asia | 35.7 | 1016.475 | 0.665905654430389 | 20 | 0.704 | 0.997427624811120 | 0.296 |
| Yemen | Asia | 36.7 | 65.088 | 0.368701398372650 | 11 | 0.470 | 0.488238735973736 | 0.795 |
| Zambia | Africa | 57.1 | 64.607 | 0.396109342575073 | 54 | 0.584 | 0.958221605729552 | 0.539 |
| Zimbabwe | Africa | 50.3 | 43.168 | 0.441193997859955 | 31 | 0.571 | 0.931442032343420 | 0.527 |

TABLE 6
Index value correlations

| | | GDP | HCI | FH | HDI | GDI | GII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GINI | Correlation | .009 | **-.517**** | -.149 | **-.423**** | -.029 | **.551**** |
| | Significance | .921 | .000 | .095 | .000 | .747 | .000 |
| | N | 126 | 118 | 126 | 125 | 123 | 119 |
| GDP | Correlation | | **.218**** | .017 | **.186*** | .060 | **-.173*** |
| | Significance | | .007 | .822 | .014 | .449 | .029 |
| | N | | 154 | 174 | 173 | 164 | 159 |
| HCI | Correlation | | | **.555**** | **.945**** | **.577**** | **-.937**** |
| | Significance | | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | | | 154 | 153 | 148 | 141 |
| FH | Correlation | | | | **.532**** | **.464**** | **-.493**** |
| | Significance | | | | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | | | | 175 | 166 | 161 |
| HDI | Correlation | | | | | **.619**** | **-.919**** |
| | Significance | | | | | .000 | .000 |
| | N | | | | | 166 | 161 |
| GDI | Correlation | | | | | | **-.607**** |
| | Significance | | | | | | .000 |
| | N | | | | | | 157 |

Values of indexes are usually highly correlated. This hinders establishing a model, since the impact of variable values can overlap with dependent variables (i.e. here, the number or occurrence of policies). In order to level this error, the method of backward elimination was also applied during the introduction of variables to the establishment of models.

Parameters of particular independent variables were included in the model for policy. The significant variables and the percentage of variability (volatility) of the number of policies they explain have been highlighted* (text marked with * does not concern the article, but the annex, which I have not attached to the translation).

TABLE 7

Coefficients economic, financial, and fiscal support for businesses and entrepreneurs

| Model | Unstandardised | | Standardised | t | Significance | Correlations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | Standard error | Beta | | | Zero-order | Partial | Part (semi-partial) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | 8.529 | 8.255 | | 1.033 | .304 | | | |
| GINI | -.007 | .060 | -.013 | -.120 | .904 | -.239 | -.012 | -.009 |
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .301 | 3.592 | .001 | .331 | .332 | .277 |
| HCI | -2.582 | 8.626 | -.087 | -.299 | .765 | .508 | -.029 | -.023 |
| FH | .050 | .017 | .310 | 2.917 | .004 | .451 | .275 | .225 |
| HDI | 3.761 | 7.976 | .128 | .472 | .638 | .508 | .046 | .036 |
| GDI | -7.205 | 6.561 | -.117 | -1.098 | .275 | .256 | -.107 | -.085 |
| GII | -6.594 | 5.662 | -.292 | -1.164 | .247 | -.511 | -.113 | -.090 |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | 8.636 | 8.168 | | 1.057 | .293 | | | |
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .299 | 3.676 | .000 | .331 | .338 | .282 |
| HCI | -2.283 | 8.221 | -.077 | -.278 | .782 | .508 | -.027 | -.021 |
| FH | .050 | .017 | .309 | 2.938 | .004 | .451 | .276 | .225 |
| HDI | 3.519 | 7.683 | .120 | .458 | .648 | .508 | .045 | .035 |
| GDI | -7.508 | 6.029 | -.122 | -1.245 | .216 | .256 | -.121 | -.096 |
| GII | -6.808 | 5.349 | -.301 | -1.273 | .206 | -.511 | -.123 | -.098 |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | 7.753 | 7.490 | | 1.035 | .303 | | | |
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .295 | 3.701 | .000 | .331 | .338 | .283 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FH | .050 | .017 | .308 | 2.945 | .004 | .451 | .275 | .225 |
| HDI | 2.281 | 6.231 | .078 | .366 | .715 | .508 | .036 | .028 |
| GDI | -7.262 | 5.938 | -.118 | -1.223 | .224 | .256 | -.118 | -.093 |
| GII | -6.026 | 4.527 | -.266 | -1.331 | .186 | -.511 | -.128 | -.102 |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | 9.452 | 5.855 | | 1.614 | .109 | | | |
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .299 | 3.791 | .000 | .331 | .344 | .288 |
| FH | .052 | .016 | .318 | 3.166 | .002 | .451 | .293 | .241 |
| GDI | -6.901 | 5.832 | -.112 | -1.183 | .239 | .256 | -.114 | -.090 |
| GII | -7.420 | 2.443 | -.328 | -3.037 | .003 | -.511 | -.282 | -.231 |
| 5 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | 2.801 | 1.643 | | 1.705 | .091 | | | |
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .297 | 3.758 | **.000** | .331 | .340 | **.286** |
| FH | .048 | .016 | .294 | 2.981 | **.004** | .451 | .276 | **.227** |
| GII | -6.310 | 2.260 | -.279 | -2.792 | **.006** | -.511 | -.259 | **-.213** |

TABLE 8

Coefficients labour market

| Model | Unstandardised | | Standardised | t | Significance | Correlations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | Standard error | Beta | | | Zero-order | Partial | Part (semi-partial) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -9.543 | 5.156 | | -1.851 | .067 | | | |
| GINI | .074 | .038 | .238 | 1.971 | .051 | .024 | .190 | .167 |
| GDP | 1.664E-6 | .000 | .002 | .022 | .983 | .102 | .002 | .002 |
| HCI | 1.058 | 5.387 | .063 | .196 | .845 | .371 | .019 | .017 |
| FH | .003 | .011 | .037 | .318 | .751 | .312 | .031 | .027 |
| HDI | 11.961 | 4.982 | .717 | 2.401 | .018 | .435 | .229 | .203 |
| GDI | -1.924 | 4.098 | -.055 | -.470 | .640 | .280 | -.046 | -.040 |
| GII | 3.221 | 3.536 | .251 | .911 | .365 | -.334 | .089 | .077 |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -9.551 | 5.120 | | -1.865 | .065 | | | |
| GINI | .074 | .037 | .238 | 2.037 | .044 | .024 | .195 | .172 |
| HCI | 1.085 | 5.217 | .065 | .208 | .836 | .371 | .020 | .018 |
| FH | .003 | .010 | .037 | .324 | .746 | .312 | .032 | .027 |
| HDI | 11.955 | 4.949 | .717 | 2.416 | .017 | .435 | .229 | .204 |
| GDI | -1.929 | 4.070 | -.055 | -.474 | .636 | .280 | -.046 | -.040 |
| GII | 3.221 | 3.520 | .251 | .915 | .362 | -.334 | .089 | .077 |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -9.195 | 4.804 | | -1.914 | .058 | | | |
| GINI | .073 | .035 | .232 | 2.060 | .042 | .024 | .196 | .173 |
| FH | .003 | .010 | .037 | .326 | .745 | .312 | .032 | .027 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HDI | 12.586 | 3.889 | .755 | 3.236 | .002 | .435 | .300 | .272 |
| GDI | -1.959 | 4.049 | -.056 | -.484 | .630 | .280 | -.047 | -.041 |
| GII | 2.930 | 3.214 | .228 | .912 | .364 | -.334 | .088 | .077 |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -9.352 | 4.760 | | -1.965 | .052 | | | |
| GINI | .073 | .035 | .235 | 2.099 | .038 | .024 | .199 | .175 |
| HDI | 12.882 | 3.766 | .773 | 3.420 | .001 | .435 | .314 | .286 |
| GDI | -1.811 | 4.007 | -.052 | -.452 | .652 | .280 | -.044 | -.038 |
| GII | 2.862 | 3.194 | .223 | .896 | .372 | -.334 | .086 | .075 |
| 5 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -10.771 | 3.565 | | -3.021 | .003 | | | |
| GINI | .067 | .032 | .214 | 2.109 | .037 | .024 | .199 | .176 |
| HDI | 12.653 | 3.719 | .759 | 3.403 | .001 | .435 | .311 | .283 |
| GII | 3.228 | 3.078 | .251 | 1.049 | .297 | -.334 | .100 | .087 |
| 6 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -7.610 | 1.905 | | -3.994 | .000 | | | |
| GINI | .081 | .029 | .259 | 2.804 | **.006** | .024 | .259 | **.234** |
| HDI | 9.102 | 1.539 | .546 | 5.915 | **.000** | .435 | .493 | **.493** |

TABLE 9

Coefficients social protection

| Model | Unstandardised | | Standardised | t | Significance | Correlations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | Standard error | Beta | | | Zero-order | Partial | Part (semi-partial) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -16.532 | 10.385 | | -1.592 | .114 | | | |
| GINI | .057 | .076 | .090 | .744 | .458 | .015 | .073 | .063 |
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .287 | 3.108 | .002 | .361 | .292 | .264 |
| HCI | 1.022 | 10.851 | .030 | .094 | .925 | .278 | .009 | .008 |
| FH | -.018 | .022 | -.098 | -.838 | .404 | .102 | -.082 | -.071 |
| HDI | 26.307 | 10.034 | .785 | 2.622 | .010 | .319 | .249 | .223 |
| GDI | -1.386 | 8.253 | -.020 | -.168 | .867 | .172 | -.016 | -.014 |
| GII | 12.091 | 7.123 | .468 | 1.697 | .093 | -.214 | .164 | .144 |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -16.200 | 9.721 | | -1.666 | .099 | | | |
| GINI | .054 | .072 | .087 | .753 | .453 | .015 | .073 | .064 |
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .289 | 3.232 | .002 | .361 | .301 | .273 |
| FH | -.018 | .022 | -.098 | -.837 | .404 | .102 | -.081 | -.071 |
| HDI | 26.884 | 7.912 | .802 | 3.398 | .001 | .319 | .315 | .287 |
| GDI | -1.401 | 8.213 | -.020 | -.171 | .865 | .172 | -.017 | -.014 |
| GII | 11.831 | 6.535 | .458 | 1.810 | .073 | -.214 | .174 | .153 |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -17.299 | 7.249 | | -2.387 | .019 | | | |
| GINI | .049 | .066 | .079 | .751 | .454 | .015 | .073 | .063 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GDP | .000 | .000 | .290 | 3.266 | .001 | .361 | .302 | .275 |
| FH | -.018 | .021 | -.099 | -.861 | .391 | .102 | -.083 | -.072 |
| HDI | 26.736 | 7.828 | .798 | 3.415 | .001 | .319 | .315 | .287 |
| GII | 12.109 | 6.299 | .469 | 1.922 | .057 | -.214 | .184 | .162 |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -16.975 | 7.221 | | -2.351 | .021 | | | |
| GDP | .001 | .000 | .301 | 3.432 | .001 | .361 | .315 | .288 |
| FH | -.016 | .021 | -.085 | -.748 | .456 | .102 | -.072 | -.063 |
| HDI | 27.674 | 7.712 | .826 | 3.588 | .001 | .319 | .328 | .301 |
| GII | 14.154 | 5.670 | .548 | 2.496 | .014 | -.214 | .235 | .210 |
| 5 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -16.784 | 7.202 | | -2.331 | .022 | | | |
| GDP | .001 | .000 | .315 | 3.702 | **.000** | .361 | .336 | **.310** |
| HDI | 25.962 | 7.350 | .775 | 3.532 | **.001** | .319 | .322 | **.296** |
| GII | 14.351 | 5.652 | .556 | 2.539 | **.013** | -.214 | .237 | **.213** |

TABLE 10
Coefficients Violence against women

| Model | Unstandardised | | Standardised | t | Significance | Correlations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | Standard error | Beta | | | Zero-order | Partial | Part (semi-partial) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -5.421 | 9.278 | | -.584 | .560 | | | |
| GINI | .064 | .068 | .121 | .939 | .350 | -.001 | .092 | .085 |
| GDP | 2.121E-5 | .000 | .015 | .154 | .878 | .044 | .015 | .014 |
| HCI | -.144 | 9.694 | -.005 | -.015 | .988 | .250 | -.001 | -.001 |
| FH | .035 | .019 | .225 | 1.794 | .076 | .316 | .173 | .163 |
| HDI | 12.984 | 8.964 | .464 | 1.449 | .150 | .295 | .141 | .132 |
| GDI | -5.348 | 7.373 | -.091 | -.725 | .470 | .164 | -.071 | -.066 |
| GII | 4.829 | 6.363 | .224 | .759 | .450 | -.223 | .074 | .069 |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -5.468 | 8.684 | | -.630 | .530 | | | |
| GINI | .064 | .065 | .122 | .990 | .325 | -.001 | .096 | .089 |
| GDP | 2.074E-5 | .000 | .015 | .156 | .876 | .044 | .015 | .014 |
| FH | .035 | .019 | .225 | 1.805 | .074 | .316 | .173 | .163 |
| HDI | 12.903 | 7.068 | .461 | 1.826 | .071 | .295 | .175 | .165 |
| GDI | -5.345 | 7.336 | -.091 | -.729 | .468 | .164 | -.071 | -.066 |
| GII | 4.865 | 5.838 | .226 | .833 | .406 | -.223 | .081 | .075 |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -5.450 | 8.643 | | -.631 | .530 | | | |
| GINI | .066 | .063 | .125 | 1.036 | .303 | -.001 | .100 | .093 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FH | .034 | .019 | .220 | 1.828 | .070 | .316 | .175 | .164 |
| HDI | 13.018 | 6.997 | .465 | 1.860 | .066 | .295 | .178 | .167 |
| GDI | -5.423 | 7.286 | -.093 | -.744 | .458 | .164 | -.072 | -.067 |
| GII | 4.776 | 5.783 | .221 | .826 | .411 | -.223 | .080 | .074 |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -9.717 | 6.456 | | -1.505 | .135 | | | |
| GINI | .047 | .058 | .089 | .806 | .422 | -.001 | .078 | .072 |
| FH | .032 | .018 | .210 | 1.759 | .081 | .316 | .168 | .158 |
| HDI | 12.478 | 6.945 | .446 | 1.797 | .075 | .295 | .171 | .161 |
| GII | 5.828 | 5.596 | .270 | 1.042 | .300 | -.223 | .100 | .094 |
| 5 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -9.438 | 6.436 | | -1.467 | .145 | | | |
| FH | .034 | .018 | .223 | 1.886 | .062 | .316 | .179 | .169 |
| HDI | 13.473 | 6.823 | .481 | 1.975 | .051 | .295 | .187 | .177 |
| GII | 7.748 | 5.056 | .359 | 1.533 | .128 | -.223 | .146 | .137 |
| 6 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | -.047 | 1.979 | | -.024 | .981 | | | |
| FH | .033 | .018 | .215 | 1.810 | .073 | .316 | .171 | .163 |
| HDI | 4.326 | 3.328 | .155 | 1.300 | .196 | .295 | .124 | .117 |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| (Intercept) | 2.198 | .970 | | 2.266 | .025 | | | |
| FH | .049 | .014 | .316 | 3.493 | **.001** | .316 | .316 | **.316** |