

Chapter 3 Gender Disparity in Legal Rights and Its Effect on Economic Freedom

Rosemarie Fike

Introduction

Economists have long argued that quantitative economic measures, such as GDP, have an inherent gender bias because they often fail to capture the economic condition of women (Waring, 1988; Folbre, 2006; Nussbaum, 2011). The index published in *Economic Freedom of the World* (EFW) is composed of data from external sources that are not immune to this criticism. As currently measured, the EFW index uses many objective measures that implicitly assume that all members of society have equal access to economic institutions. This is not a reality for women in many countries across the world. This chapter considers several alternative methods to adjust the EFW index to account for gender bias present in the data used in its construction.

Incorporating measures of gender disparity into the EFW index enables us to discuss institutional quality in a way that acknowledges that women in many societies do not have the same access to economic rights as men. Formal legal restrictions to the economic rights of women in many countries prevent a significant portion of the population from engaging in mutually beneficial exchanges. In addition, social norms can place very real barriers in front of women wishing to own property, operate a business, and engage in voluntary exchange. Women may have the guarantee of economic rights written into formal laws but customary courts that settle family and non-criminal legal disputes may pass judgments that undermine these rights. If the prevailing social attitudes and *de facto* behavior make it taboo for women to engage in market activities, their formal economic rights will be diminished and in some cases, completely eroded.

Jordan and Saudi Arabia provide examples of countries for which the data used in calculating the EFW index may lead to an overstatement of economic freedom. In both of these countries, women face many legal obstacles when it comes to owning

Citation Rosemarie Fike (2016). *Gender Disparity in Legal Rights and Its Effect on Economic Freedom*. In James Gwartney, Robert Lawson, and Joshua Hall, *Economic Freedom of the World: 2016 Annual Report* (Fraser Institute): 189–211.

Author Rosemarie Fike is an Instructor of Economics at Texas Christian University.

or inheriting property, opening a bank account, obtaining a line of credit, or pursuing an occupation outside the household. Such regulations restrict the ability of women to make economic choices and become financially independent. In Jordan, though a constitutional right to work is formally granted to women, the legal obligation for women to obey their husbands means that few women work outside the home. This is reflected in Jordan's female labor-force participation rate, which has consistently hovered around 15% during the past two decades. Women are faced with a similar situation in Saudi Arabia, where the labor-force participation rate of women has been between 18% and 20% over the same period.

Failure to account for existing gender disparities in legal rights distorts cross-country comparisons of economic freedom. Current understanding of the relationships between economic freedom and various development outcomes may also be obscured. Adjusting the EFW index to account for gender disparity in legal rights increases our ability to understand how market institutions affect the lives of people.

Description of data

The Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights (GDLR) uses several measures developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) for the *Gender, Institutions, and Development Database* (OECD, 2014) and questions from the World Bank's report, *Women, Business, and the Law* (World Bank, 2013) to capture gender disparities in legal rights.

The first edition of the OECD's *Gender, Institutions, and Development Database* (GID-DB) measured the legal restrictions on women that existed in 2009. It has since been updated to reflect the legal restrictions of 2012 and 2014. The OECD provides a single score reflecting the legal barriers faced by women, but not men, in several areas that significantly influence a woman's ability to own property and participate in voluntary economic exchanges. These variables are: Access to public space; Access to bank loans; Access to property other than land; Access to land; Inheritance of daughters; and Inheritance of widows.¹

For each area, the OECD provides scores of "0" if there are no gender differences under formal or informal rules; "0.5" if there are no gender differences under formal rules but there are norms that restrict women's choices; or "1" if severe gender differences under both formal and informal rules exist. To be consistent with the scale of the EFW index, the GDLR index inverts the OECD's coding so that lower scores represent legal regimes with significant gender disparities, while higher scores represent a legal context that treats men and women more equally.

Data from the World Bank's *Women, Business, and the Law* (WB&L) were also initially published in 2009, with subsequent additions released in 2012, 2014, and 2016.² This dataset is a collection of "yes" or "no" answers to questions of whether men and women are treated the same under the law in various contexts. The "yes" or

1 There are several other areas included in the GID-DB that reflect the difference between men's and women's political and civil liberties as well as other measures capturing other development outcomes relevant to women. Only the areas directly related to economic exchange are included in this study.

2 This study uses the 2014 edition of *Women, Business, and the Law*. The data for the 2014 report reflects the laws in each country as of April 30, 2013.

“no” answers in the WB&L are determined after examining the content of a country’s formal legal doctrine and consulting with legal experts. To be consistent with the coding for the OECD data, answers that indicate there is no difference between the treatment of men and women under the law are coded with a “1”; answers that indicate that men and women are treated differently are coded with a “0”. For example, the question, “Can an unmarried woman apply for a passport in the same way as an unmarried man?” is included in the GDLR index because the answer captures a woman’s ability to move freely outside her country of origin. A “yes” response to this question is coded as “1” and a “no” answer is given a “0”. Forty out of the 41 questions from the WB&L report included in the index are coded in this manner. The remaining question, “Are married women legally required to obey their husbands?” is phrased so that a “yes” response indicates that married women have less autonomy under the law than married men, and therefore this response is coded as a “0”.

Six variables from the GID-DB and 41 questions from the WB&L report are included in the Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights. These sub-components are selected because, like the components of the EFW index, they measure gender disparity in the security of various types of property rights, contract enforcement, and in the ability for individuals to engage in voluntary transactions.³ Gender differences in access to political and civil liberties that do not directly relate to the economic exchange are not considered in the GDLR index. While those freedoms are beyond the scope of this analysis, it is acknowledged that, to the extent that such gender differences in political and civil liberties exist, they limit the scope of choices women face.

The sub-components of the Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights are derived from data that looks at both the formal written law as well as an expert assessment of whether social norms restrict the rights of women even when they are not explicitly restricted under the formal legal framework.⁴ Including measures of informal institutions is not strictly consistent with the approach used to construct the EFW index. This inconsistency is acknowledged but cannot be avoided due to the nature of the available data.

In keeping with the methodology of the EFW index, each sub-component included in the GDLR index reflects gender disparities in legal rights from a negative perspective.⁵ It does not reflect the absence of laws granting women certain entitlements. Thus, laws preventing women from working in certain professions are included in the index, but those mandating various entitlements such as paid maternity leave are excluded.

The sub-components of the Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights fall under five broad components:

-
- 3 See Rabushka, 1991a, 1991b; Walker, 1996; and Gwartney, Lawson, and Block, 1996 for a detailed description of the reasoning behind the Fraser Institute’s EFW index. See Gwartney, Lawson, and Hall, 2015 or chapter one of this edition (pp. 1–6) for an explanation of the current methodology and variables included in the index.
 - 4 The sub-components obtained from OECD’s Gender, Institutions, and Development Database capture the nature of the written law as well as social norms. The World Bank’s Women, Business, and the Law focuses on the content of the formal law and consults legal experts to judge whether the interpretation of the law is accurate. The bulk of the data used to generate the GDLR index comes from the World Bank, and only six of the 47 sub-components are from the OECD’s data.
 - 5 See Berlin, 1958 on the distinction between negative and positive freedom.

A. Freedom of movement

These sub-components reflect legal restrictions on a woman's ability to move freely within her country as well as abroad. For example, restrictions on a woman's ability to travel outside her home in the same way as a man is included in this category.

B. Property rights

This component contains sub-components that measure barriers that women face when it comes to owning property. Laws reflecting inheritance practices as well as land and non-land property rights are included in this category.

C. Financial rights

When a woman cannot open a bank account or obtain a loan without the permission of her spouse or a male relative, her ability to gain financial independence is limited. Women who wish to undertake business ventures of their own, in the way that they choose, would therefore have to appeal to another party for permission. Sub-components imposing limitations on a woman's financial decisions are included in this category.

D. Freedom to work

Any legal restrictions on the choices women can make about how and where they can employ their labor are included in this component. Many countries have restrictions on the number of hours a woman is permitted to work and the type of professions she is allowed to pursue. Such laws reduce a woman's economic freedom.

E. Legal status

This component reflects gender differences in the legal standing of a country's citizens. Measures in this category reflect issues such as whether or not a woman can be a "head of household", whether a woman can confer citizenship to her children, and whether a woman's testimony in court holds the same weight as a man's.

Deriving the Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights

There are 136 countries that are included in both the OECD and WB&L datasets in 2014. The correlation coefficient between the average of the six OECD variables and the average of the 41 World Bank variables is 0.673.⁶ This correlation is quite high considering that the OECD data does not include indicators that fall into the components, A. Freedom to work and E. Legal Status. The WB&L report provides data on legal restrictions on women's ability to contract their labor in the manner that they choose, as well as data indicating the legal status of women relative to men. This indicates that, while the two sources of data are measuring different aspects of women's legal rights, there are still substantial commonalities between them.

The scores for each of the sub-components in a component are averaged together to provide a single score for the component. Next, the scores of the five components are averaged to arrive at a summary index score. This summary score is the Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights. Country summary scores range from 0.50 to 1.

⁶ This correlation increases to 0.675 if the countries not contained in the EFW index are dropped from the sample.

The appendix to this chapter provides an alphabetical list of all of the countries included in the index, the average score for each of the five components, and an overall summary score.

Table 3.1 (p. 194) provides a list of all countries included in the GDLR index ranked by summary score. There are 129 countries with both GDLR and EFW data. Twenty-four of these countries have a score of 1.0000 on the GDLR index, indicating that there is no differential treatment between men and women in the eyes of the law. This does not necessarily mean that men and women are economically free in these countries. It simply means that men and women have equal access to economic institutions, regardless of the consistency of those institutions with economic freedom. Most of these countries are high-income, OECD-member countries in Western Europe, the Americas, Australia, New Zealand, and a few other locations. These countries generally have high initial unadjusted EFW scores. There are other notable countries with a GDLR index score of 1.000, such as Russia and Venezuela. While these countries are not bastions of economic freedom, women face no additional legal barriers.

At the other end of the spectrum, countries with the lowest scores on the Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights are mostly countries located in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) regions. These countries include Saudi Arabia (0.50), Jordan and Niger (0.54), United Arab Emirates (0.55), and Yemen (0.59). Most countries with scores between 0.70 and 0.90 are Asian countries and countries formerly part of the Soviet bloc.

EFW ratings adjusted for gender disparity

The Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights is used to adjust the scores for 2013 published in *Economic Freedom of the World: 2015 Annual Report* (Gwartney, Lawson, and Hall, 2015). To arrive at an overall EFW score that reflects the experience of women, the unadjusted EFW summary score is multiplied by the GDLR index score (equation 1.1).

1.1 Women's EFW score_{All} = EFW score × GDLR score

While it is clear that the components of the Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights measure gender differences in the property rights and legal structure of a country, it is not clear that all areas of the EFW index are in need of adjustment for gender disparity. For example, even when there are large gender differences in the property rights or legal status, there is no strong argument to suggest that the size of government and the monetary regime treat individuals differently according to gender. Thus, adjusting all areas of the EFW index may result in an understatement of a country's true level of economic freedom. To acknowledge this point, in addition to adjusting overall the EFW score for gender disparity, three alternative indexes are calculated. **Equation 1.2** adjusts only Area 2 of the EFW index for gender differences, and averages the adjusted Area 2 score with the unadjusted scores for the remaining four areas. **Equation 1.3** adjusts both Areas 2 and 5. **Equation 1.4** adjusts Areas 2, 4, and 5.

1.2 Women's EFW score_{Area 2} = average (Area 1, GDLR score × Area 2, Area 3, Area 4, Area 5)

Table 3.1: Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights, Summary Scores, 2014

Country	Summary Score	Country	Summary Score	Country	Summary Score
Australia	1.0000	United Kingdom	0.9542	Nicaragua	0.8430
Austria	1.0000	Turkey	0.9533	Vietnam	0.8424
Belgium	1.0000	Georgia	0.9500	Honduras	0.8415
Canada	1.0000	Paraguay	0.9500	Papua New Guinea	0.8392
Denmark	1.0000	Peru	0.9500	Moldova, Republic	0.8358
Dominican Republic	1.0000	Bulgaria	0.9467	Tajikistan	0.8358
Estonia	1.0000	Uruguay	0.9417	Uganda	0.8274
Finland	1.0000	Korea, Republic	0.9350	Ethiopia	0.8233
Germany	1.0000	Jamaica	0.9340	India	0.8233
Hungary	1.0000	Poland	0.9333	Philippines	0.8174
Iceland	1.0000	Mexico	0.9292	Azerbaijan	0.8132
Ireland	1.0000	Mongolia	0.9275	Madagascar	0.8058
Italy	1.0000	Ecuador	0.9225	Tanzania	0.8024
Latvia	1.0000	Colombia	0.9190	Kyrgyz Republic	0.7957
Lithuania	1.0000	Namibia	0.9167	Nepal	0.7774
Netherlands	1.0000	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.9092	Nigeria	0.7707
New Zealand	1.0000	Albania	0.9090	Congo, Republic	0.7646
Norway	1.0000	Mozambique	0.9090	Morocco	0.7542
Portugal	1.0000	Chile	0.9067	Bangladesh	0.7540
Romania	1.0000	Sri Lanka	0.8975	Guinea	0.7471
Slovak Republic	1.0000	China	0.8967	Gabon	0.7445
Sweden	1.0000	Macedonia	0.8967	Algeria	0.7407
United States	1.0000	Brazil	0.8950	Tunisia	0.7374
Venezuela	1.0000	Argentina	0.8942	Mali	0.7371
Armenia	0.9875	Russian Federation	0.8933	Lebanon	0.7274
Cambodia	0.9875	Ghana	0.8875	Pakistan	0.7140
Serbia	0.9875	Lesotho	0.8858	Benin	0.7005
Spain	0.9875	Botswana	0.8824	Senegal	0.6971
Switzerland	0.9875	Kenya	0.8783	Chad	0.6941
Greece	0.9750	Zambia	0.8774	Malaysia	0.6702
South Africa	0.9750	Bolivia	0.8758	Cameroon	0.6496
Croatia	0.9733	Ukraine	0.8733	Mauritania	0.6267
France	0.9733	Burundi	0.8690	Kuwait	0.6086
Japan	0.9733	Haiti	0.8689	Yemen, Republic	0.5893
Panama	0.9733	Côte d'Ivoire	0.8650	Egypt, Arab Republic	0.5845
Slovenia	0.9733	Fiji	0.8650	Oman	0.5660
Hong Kong, China	0.9625	Indonesia	0.8607	United Arab Emirates	0.5493
Singapore	0.9625	Rwanda	0.8571	Iran, Islamic Republic	0.5440
Guatemala	0.9608	Togo	0.8567	Congo, Democratic Republic	0.5420
Czech Republic	0.9600	Thailand	0.8558	Jordan	0.5402
Israel	0.9590	Kazakhstan	0.8540	Niger	0.5395
Mauritius	0.9550	Malawi	0.8524	Saudi Arabia	0.4988
El Salvador	0.9542	Angola	0.8433		

- 1.3 Women's EFW score_{Areas 2, 5} = average (Area 1, GDLR score × Area 2, Area 3, Area 4, GDLR score × Area 5)
- 1.4 Women's EFW Score_{Areas 2, 4, 5} = average (Area 1, GDLR score × Area 2, Area 3, GDLR score × Area 4, GDLR score × Area 5)

After arriving at a Women's EFW score for each method, the adjusted EFW scores are calculated. Several countries have population ratios that are disproportionately male according to the World Bank's *World Development Indicators*. For example, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait have female populations ranging from 26% to 44%. Because the migrant-worker population skews the female/male ratio for countries like these, the adjusted EFW scores for all countries are calculated assuming a female population of 50%.⁷ **Equations 2.1 to 2.4** show that the gender-adjusted EFW scores are calculated by taking an average of the unadjusted EFW score with the women's EFW score.

- 2.1 Adjusted EFW score_{All} = (50% male population × unadjusted EFW score) + (50% female population × women's EFW score_{All})
- 2.2 Adjusted EFW score_{Area 2} = (50% male population × unadjusted EFW score) + (50% female population × women's EFW score_{Area 2})
- 2.3 Adjusted EFW score_{Areas 2, 5} = (50% male population × unadjusted EFW score) + (50% female population × women's EFW score_{Area 2, 5})
- 2.4 Adjusted EFW score_{Areas 2, 4, 5} = (50% male population × unadjusted EFW score) + (50% female population × women's EFW score_{Areas 2, 4, 5})

The adjusted EFW score calculated in Equation 2.1 can be interpreted as a lower bound for the gender-adjusted measure of institutional quality because all areas of the EFW index are adjusted downward for gender differences. Equation 2.2 provides a downward adjustment only for Area 2 of the EFW index. As such, the results of Equation 2.2 can be viewed as an upper bound to the gender-adjusted measure of economic freedom.

The Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights is composed of measures that reflect gender differences in law regarding property rights, financial transactions, and regulation of labor and business operations. The process in Equation 2.3 adjusts both Areas 2 and 5 of the EFW index—the two areas that measure the rule of law and business environment in a country. For this reason, and because it presents a mid-range estimate, multiple adjustment methods are presented in table 3.2, but the results for Equation 2.3 are presented in bold. Adjusting for gender disparity is an ongoing area of discussion, and extensions of this research may present compelling reasons to use a different adjustment procedure.

7 As a robustness check, the scores were re-calculated using actual population statistics. The male and female percentages of the population are fairly equal for the vast majority of countries in this analysis, usually within three percentage points. The scores differ substantially only for the four countries with skewed population distributions.

Gender-adjusted EFW scores

Table 3.2 (pp. 197–199) presents the gender-adjusted EFW index scores. Column 1 provides the list of countries in order from highest to lowest by unadjusted EFW scores. Column 2 shows the unadjusted EFW scores for 2013. Column 3 provides the lower-bound estimate in which all areas of the EFW index are adjusted for gender differences, while column 4 provides the upper-bound estimate in which only Area 2 of the EFW index is adjusted. Columns 5 and 6 provide intermediate estimates based on adjustments for Areas 2 and 5 and Areas 2, 4, and 5.

The results shown in table 3.2 reflect several key points. First, the EFW scores of countries with scores of 1.0000 on the GDLR index will not be altered, as their EFW scores already capture women’s access to economic institutions. With the exception of Russia and Venezuela, these countries are largely highly developed members of the OECD that have high unadjusted EFW scores. This is true regardless of the adjustment process used.

Second, the countries most affected by the adjustment process are generally located in the Middle East, Africa, and parts of Asia. For example, the EFW scores for Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Niger, Kuwait, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iran, Egypt, and Yemen all drop by 20% or more when the entire index is adjusted. On the lower boundary, when only Area 2 of the EFW index is adjusted, the scores for these eight countries decrease between 2% and 5%. When Areas 2 and 5 are adjusted, the scores for these countries drop by between 5% and 10%.

Third, several Southeast Asian countries also have substantial gender disparities in terms of access to economic rights. Bangladesh, Nepal, Malaysia, and the Philippines all experience a decrease in EFW scores of between 9% and 16% when the overall index is adjusted, and between 1% and 3% when only Area 2 is adjusted. When Areas 2 and 5 are adjusted, the scores for these countries decline by between 3% and 7%.

Fourth, many countries in Latin America and former Soviet-bloc countries have GDLR index scores between 0.8500 and 0.9500. As a result, these countries experience a decline in their EFW score between 1% and 5% when all areas of the EFW index are adjusted, and a decline of approximately 1% when the GDLR index adjusts only Area 2. When both Areas 2 and 5 are adjusted for gender disparity, the EFW scores for these countries fall by between 0.5% and 2.5%.

Gender-adjusted EFW ranking

One of the most useful aspects of the EFW index is the ability to compare how economically free one country is relative to others. Many countries drop substantially in the rankings once gender disparities are taken into consideration. **Table 3.3** (pp. 201-203) presents the gender-adjusted EFW rankings. Columns 1 and 2 provide the list of countries and their ranking in order from highest to lowest based on the unadjusted EFW ratings. Column 3 provides the rankings when all areas of the EFW index are adjusted for gender differences, while column 4 provides the rankings when only Area 2 of the EFW index is adjusted. Columns 5 and 6 provide the rankings after Areas 2 and 5, and Areas 2, 4, and 5 are adjusted.

The ranking data of table 3.3 follow a pattern similar to that of the ratings data of table 3.2. When the overall EFW score is adjusted for gender disparity in legal rights (column 3), Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Oman, and United Arab Emirates drop significantly—30 positions or more—in the rankings. Jordan experiences the largest decline, falling by 75 positions from seventh to 82nd. Like Jordan,

Table 3.2: Unadjusted and Adjusted EFW Scores, 2013

Country	Unadjusted EFW Score	Adjusted EFW score			
		All Areas	Area 2	Areas 2 and 5	Areas 2, 4, and 5
Hong Kong, China	8.97	8.80	8.94	8.91	8.87
Singapore	8.52	8.36	8.49	8.46	8.42
New Zealand	8.19	8.19	8.19	8.19	8.19
Switzerland	8.16	8.11	8.15	8.14	8.13
United Arab Emirates	8.15	6.31	7.80	7.43	7.05
Mauritius	8.08	7.90	8.05	8.02	7.98
Jordan	7.93	6.10	7.64	7.27	6.91
Ireland	7.90	7.90	7.90	7.90	7.90
Canada	7.89	7.89	7.89	7.89	7.89
Chile	7.87	7.50	7.80	7.73	7.66
United Kingdom	7.87	7.69	7.83	7.80	7.76
Australia	7.83	7.83	7.83	7.83	7.83
Georgia	7.83	7.63	7.80	7.76	7.72
United States	7.73	7.73	7.73	7.73	7.73
Romania	7.69	7.69	7.69	7.69	7.69
Armenia	7.67	7.62	7.66	7.65	7.64
Finland	7.61	7.61	7.61	7.61	7.61
Lithuania	7.61	7.61	7.61	7.61	7.61
Denmark	7.58	7.58	7.58	7.58	7.58
Estonia	7.58	7.58	7.58	7.58	7.58
Japan	7.52	7.42	7.50	7.48	7.46
Norway	7.51	7.51	7.51	7.51	7.51
Germany	7.50	7.50	7.50	7.50	7.50
Netherlands	7.48	7.48	7.48	7.48	7.48
Austria	7.46	7.46	7.46	7.46	7.46
Kuwait	7.46	6.00	7.20	6.90	6.61
Guatemala	7.45	7.30	7.43	7.40	7.37
Rwanda	7.43	6.90	7.33	7.22	7.11
Latvia	7.42	7.42	7.42	7.42	7.42
Portugal	7.42	7.42	7.42	7.42	7.42
Nicaragua	7.40	6.82	7.33	7.21	7.09
Israel	7.38	7.23	7.36	7.33	7.29
Korea, Republic	7.38	7.14	7.34	7.30	7.25
Peru	7.34	7.16	7.32	7.28	7.24
Bulgaria	7.33	7.14	7.31	7.26	7.22
Czech Republic	7.33	7.18	7.31	7.28	7.25
Jamaica	7.33	7.09	7.30	7.25	7.20
Sweden	7.33	7.33	7.33	7.33	7.33
Uganda	7.30	6.67	7.22	7.08	6.94
Poland	7.29	7.05	7.25	7.20	7.15
Slovak Republic	7.29	7.29	7.29	7.29	7.29
Honduras	7.27	6.69	7.21	7.10	6.98
Panama	7.27	7.17	7.26	7.24	7.22
Spain	7.27	7.22	7.26	7.25	7.24

Table 3.2, continued: Unadjusted and Adjusted EFW Scores, 2013

Country	Unadjusted EFW Score	Adjusted EFW score			
		All Areas	Area 2	Areas 2 and 5	Areas 2, 4, and 5
Belgium	7.26	7.26	7.26	7.26	7.26
Cambodia	7.26	7.21	7.25	7.25	7.24
Kazakhstan	7.26	6.73	7.17	7.05	6.97
El Salvador	7.25	7.08	7.23	7.20	7.16
Hungary	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25
Dominican Republic	7.23	7.23	7.23	7.23	7.23
Malaysia	7.22	6.03	6.99	6.72	6.46
Oman	7.21	5.65	6.89	6.54	6.19
Macedonia	7.19	6.82	7.13	7.05	6.97
Mongolia	7.19	6.93	7.15	7.09	7.04
Albania	7.18	6.85	7.14	7.08	7.01
Uruguay	7.18	6.97	7.15	7.11	7.06
Kenya	7.16	6.72	7.10	7.01	6.93
Philippines	7.14	6.49	7.05	6.91	6.78
Botswana	7.13	6.71	7.06	6.97	6.89
Italy	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13	7.13
France	7.12	7.03	7.10	7.08	7.06
Papua New Guinea	7.11	6.54	7.04	6.90	6.78
Indonesia	7.01	6.52	6.94	6.86	6.76
Lebanon	7.01	6.05	6.90	6.73	6.54
Bosnia and Herzegovina	6.98	6.66	6.93	6.86	6.79
Zambia	6.97	6.54	6.90	6.82	6.73
Saudi Arabia	6.95	5.21	6.59	6.19	5.85
Tanzania	6.92	6.23	6.81	6.67	6.53
Turkey	6.92	6.76	6.90	6.87	6.83
Croatia	6.91	6.82	6.89	6.87	6.85
Greece	6.87	6.78	6.85	6.84	6.82
Iceland	6.87	6.87	6.87	6.87	6.87
Fiji	6.86	6.40	6.78	6.66	6.57
Paraguay	6.85	6.68	6.83	6.80	6.76
Haiti	6.83	6.38	6.80	6.70	6.59
Tajikistan	6.81	6.26	6.73	6.62	6.51
Mexico	6.79	6.55	6.76	6.71	6.66
South Africa	6.74	6.65	6.72	6.71	6.69
Kyrgyz Republic	6.73	6.04	6.63	6.49	6.35
Madagascar	6.71	6.06	6.65	6.52	6.39
Russian Federation	6.69	6.33	6.63	6.56	6.49
Namibia	6.68	6.40	6.63	6.56	6.51
Serbia	6.65	6.61	6.64	6.63	6.63
Moldova, Republic	6.63	6.09	6.55	6.43	6.32
Thailand	6.63	6.16	6.56	6.46	6.36
Sri Lanka	6.57	6.23	6.52	6.45	6.39
Colombia	6.56	6.30	6.53	6.47	6.41
Nepal	6.56	5.83	6.46	6.31	6.17

Table 3.2, continued: Unadjusted and Adjusted EFW Scores, 2013

Country	Unadjusted EFW Score	Adjusted EFW score			
		All Areas	Area 2	Areas 2 and 5	Areas 2, 4, and 5
Bolivia	6.52	6.12	6.47	6.39	6.30
Morocco	6.46	5.66	6.31	6.16	5.99
Vietnam	6.46	5.95	6.38	6.27	6.17
China	6.44	6.11	6.38	6.32	6.25
Nigeria	6.44	5.70	6.36	6.19	6.03
Slovenia	6.44	6.36	6.42	6.41	6.39
India	6.43	5.86	6.34	6.22	6.11
Bangladesh	6.42	5.63	6.35	6.18	6.01
Tunisia	6.39	5.55	6.24	6.07	5.89
Lesotho	6.36	5.99	6.30	6.21	6.14
Azerbaijan	6.34	5.75	6.23	6.10	5.97
Brazil	6.34	6.00	6.29	6.23	6.16
Cameroon	6.34	5.23	6.20	5.96	5.75
Egypt, Arab Republic	6.34	5.02	6.16	5.95	5.68
Senegal	6.32	5.36	6.18	6.00	5.79
Mali	6.29	5.47	6.19	6.02	5.83
Pakistan	6.28	5.38	6.16	5.98	5.79
Yemen, Republic	6.28	4.99	6.12	5.90	5.62
Ghana	6.20	5.85	6.14	6.07	5.99
Ukraine	6.20	5.80	6.14	6.06	5.97
Benin	6.05	5.15	5.93	5.71	5.54
Côte d'Ivoire	6.03	5.62	5.97	5.88	5.80
Ecuador	5.99	5.76	5.96	5.91	5.85
Malawi	5.87	5.44	5.80	5.70	5.61
Mozambique	5.87	5.61	5.84	5.78	5.72
Burundi	5.85	5.46	5.80	5.70	5.63
Mauritania	5.79	4.71	5.63	5.38	5.15
Niger	5.79	4.45	5.60	5.28	5.06
Gabon	5.72	4.99	5.62	5.44	5.28
Togo	5.71	5.30	5.67	5.58	5.49
Ethiopia	5.68	5.18	5.59	5.48	5.39
Congo, Democratic Rep.	5.65	4.36	5.54	5.24	5.01
Guinea	5.62	4.91	5.53	5.35	5.22
Iran, Islamic Republic	5.43	4.19	5.19	4.98	4.79
Angola	5.37	4.95	5.32	5.23	5.14
Algeria	5.20	4.52	5.07	4.93	4.80
Argentina	5.20	4.92	5.16	5.10	5.06
Chad	5.13	4.35	5.05	4.87	4.72
Congo, Republic	4.72	4.17	4.66	4.51	4.38
Venezuela	3.23	3.23	3.23	3.23	3.23

the United Arab Emirates has an unadjusted EFW rank within the top 10. Starting in fifth position, the UAE falls to 74th after the gender adjustment, a drop of 69 positions. Chile is the only other country that starts in a top-ten position, but does not retain that position after gender is taken into consideration. Chile falls from 10th to 19th in the rankings. Kuwait falls by 63 positions, while Oman falls by 48. Saudi Arabia declines by 45 positions, and Malaysia falls by 36.

When only Area 2 is adjusted for gender disparity (column 4), the changes in the rankings are much less pronounced. The United Arab Emirates falls five positions, moving from fifth to 10th. Jordan is pushed out of the top ten, declining from seventh to 16th.

Column five of table 3.3 presents the rankings after Areas 2 and 5 have been adjusted for gender disparity. Because many will prefer this intermediate adjustment, these figures are presented in bold. When the index is altered in this manner, the United Arab Emirates and Jordan no longer occupy a top-ten position in the rankings. The United Arab Emirates falls from fifth to 24th, and Jordan drops from seventh to 34th. The unadjusted EFW scores for the United Arab Emirates and Jordan are similar to the scores for Switzerland and Ireland, respectively. However, after Areas 2 and 5 of the EFW index have been adjusted for gender disparity, the scores for the UAE and Jordan are similar to those of Latvia and Peru.

Several other countries experience a notable decline in rank after Areas 2 and 5 have been adjusted. The EFW scores for Kuwait, Rwanda, Nicaragua, and Uganda all decline enough to push them out of the top 40. Kuwait drops from 25th to 59th, Rwanda declines from 28th to 43rd, Nicaragua falls from 29th to 44th, and Uganda moves from 39th to 51st. Saudi Arabia and Malaysia also experience large decreases, falling from 67th to 95th, and from 51st to 70th, respectively.

A few countries, mostly located in Latin America and Europe, increase in the rankings after Areas 2 and 5 are adjusted for gender differences. Italy's rank increases by 12 positions, moving from 59th to 47th. Sweden moves from 35th to 28th and the Slovak Republic moves from 40th to 31st. Other countries experiencing notable increases in rank include Spain, Belgium, Iceland, France, and Hungary.

Column six provides the rankings after Areas 2, 4, and 5 have been adjusted for gender disparity in legal rights. Eight countries fall in the rankings by 10 positions or more, while five countries rise in the rankings by 10 positions or more. Iceland, Belgium, France, Italy, and Hungary are the countries with the largest improvements in their rankings under this adjustment method. The countries with the largest decreases in their rankings are Jordan, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, and Saudi Arabia.

With the exception of Jordan and the United Arab Emirates, the countries starting in the top 20 positions in the unadjusted EFW rankings remain in the top 20 regardless of which method of adjustment is used. There is a similar level of stability at the other end of the spectrum. Most of the countries occupying the bottom 20 positions in the unadjusted rankings remain there regardless of the adjustment method used.

The correlations between the rankings for the unadjusted EFW index and the rankings when the EFW index is adjusted for gender disparity are fairly high (between 0.8154 and 0.9884), showing that for the vast majority of countries adjusting for gender disparity does not have a significant effect on the EFW rankings. There are 24 countries where there is no disparity between men's and women's access to economic institutions. There are an additional 38 countries with minimal

Table 3.3: Unadjusted and Adjusted EFW Rankings, 2013

Country	Unadjusted EFW Rank	Adjusted EFW Rank			
		All Areas	Area 2	Areas 2 and 5	Areas 2, 4, and 5
Hong Kong, China	1	1	1	1	1
Singapore	2	2	2	2	2
New Zealand	3	3	3	3	3
Switzerland	4	4	4	4	4
United Arab Emirates	5	74	10	24	48
Mauritius	6	5	5	5	5
Jordan	7	82	16	34	56
Ireland	8	5	6	6	6
Canada	9	7	7	7	7
Chile	10	19	10	11	13
United Kingdom	10	10	8	9	9
Australia	12	8	8	8	8
Georgia	12	12	10	10	11
United States	14	9	13	11	10
Romania	15	10	14	13	12
Armenia	16	13	15	14	14
Finland	17	14	17	15	15
Lithuania	17	14	17	15	15
Denmark	19	16	19	17	17
Estonia	19	16	19	17	17
Japan	21	23	22	21	22
Norway	22	18	21	19	19
Germany	23	19	22	20	20
Netherlands	24	21	24	21	21
Austria	25	22	25	23	22
Kuwait	25	88	49	59	71
Guatemala	27	27	26	27	26
Rwanda	28	47	31	43	44
Latvia	29	23	27	25	24
Portugal	29	23	27	26	24
Nicaragua	29	50	31	44	45
Israel	32	31	29	28	28
Korea, Republic	32	38	30	30	31
Peru	34	37	34	32	34
Bulgaria	35	38	35	35	38
Czech Republic	35	35	35	32	31
Jamaica	35	41	37	37	40
Sweden	35	26	31	28	27
Uganda	39	60	47	51	54
Poland	40	43	42	45	42
Slovak Republic	40	28	38	31	29
Honduras	42	58	48	49	51
Panama	42	36	39	41	38
Spain	42	33	39	37	34

Countries are sorted by unadjusted EFW rank.

Table 3.3, continued: Unadjusted and Adjusted EFW Rankings, 2013

Country	Unadjusted EFW Rank	Adjusted EFW Rank			
		All Areas	Area 2	Areas 2 and 5	Areas 2, 4, and 5
Belgium	45	29	39	35	30
Cambodia	45	34	42	37	34
Kazakhstan	45	55	50	54	52
El Salvador	48	42	45	45	41
Hungary	48	30	42	37	31
Dominican Republic	50	31	45	42	37
Malaysia	51	87	61	70	79
Oman	52	100	67	80	89
Macedonia	53	50	54	54	52
Mongolia	53	46	51	50	49
Albania	55	49	53	51	50
Uruguay	55	45	51	48	46
Kenya	57	56	56	56	55
Philippines	58	68	59	58	63
Botswana	59	57	58	57	57
Italy	59	40	54	47	43
France	61	44	56	51	46
Papua New Guinea	62	65	60	59	63
Indonesia	63	67	62	64	65
Lebanon	63	85	64	69	74
Bosnia and Herzegovina	65	61	63	64	62
Zambia	66	65	64	67	67
Saudi Arabia	67	112	83	95	102
Tanzania	68	77	72	74	75
Turkey	68	54	64	61	60
Croatia	70	50	67	61	59
Greece	71	53	70	66	61
Iceland	71	48	69	61	58
Fiji	73	69	74	75	73
Paraguay	74	59	71	68	65
Haiti	75	71	73	73	72
Tajikistan	76	76	76	77	76
Mexico	77	64	75	71	69
South Africa	78	62	77	71	68
Kyrgyz Republic	79	86	80	82	85
Madagascar	80	84	78	81	81
Russian Federation	81	73	80	78	78
Namibia	82	69	80	78	76
Serbia	83	63	79	76	70
Moldova, Republic	84	83	85	86	86
Thailand	84	79	84	84	84
Sri Lanka	86	77	87	85	81
Colombia	87	75	86	83	80
Nepal	87	94	89	90	90

Countries are sorted by unadjusted EFW rank.

Table 3.3, continued: Unadjusted and Adjusted EFW Rankings, 2013

Country	Unadjusted EFW Rank	Adjusted EFW Rank			
		All Areas	Area 2	Areas 2 and 5	Areas 2, 4, and 5
Bolivia	89	80	88	88	87
Morocco	90	99	96	98	97
Vietnam	91	91	91	91	90
China	92	81	91	89	88
Nigeria	92	98	93	95	95
Slovenia	92	72	90	87	81
India	95	92	95	93	94
Bangladesh	96	101	94	97	96
Tunisia	97	104	99	100	101
Lesotho	98	90	97	94	93
Azerbaijan	99	97	100	99	99
Brazil	99	88	98	92	92
Cameroon	99	111	101	106	108
Egypt, Arab Republic	99	115	104	107	110
Senegal	103	109	103	104	106
Mali	104	105	102	103	104
Pakistan	105	108	104	105	106
Yemen, Republic	105	116	108	109	112
Ghana	107	93	106	100	97
Ukraine	107	95	106	102	99
Benin	109	114	111	112	114
Côte d'Ivoire	110	102	109	110	105
Ecuador	111	96	110	108	102
Malawi	112	107	113	113	113
Mozambique	112	103	112	111	109
Burundi	114	106	113	113	111
Mauritania	115	121	116	118	119
Niger	115	123	118	120	121
Gabon	117	116	117	117	117
Togo	118	110	115	115	115
Ethiopia	119	113	119	116	116
Congo, Democratic Rep.	120	124	120	121	123
Guinea	121	120	121	119	118
Iran, Islamic Republic	122	126	123	124	125
Angola	123	118	122	122	120
Algeria	124	122	125	125	124
Argentina	124	119	124	123	121
Chad	126	125	126	126	126
Congo, Republic	127	127	127	127	127
Venezuela	128	128	128	128	128

Countries are sorted by unadjusted EFW rank.

gender disparity as their EFW scores decrease between 0.5% and 5% when the overall EFW score is adjusted. The remaining 66 countries have a decrease in EFW scores of greater than 5%. When only Areas 2 and 5 of the EFW index are adjusted, 34 countries have no notable change in their economic freedom (less than 0.5%), 77 countries experience a moderate decrease in their scores (between 0.5% and 5%), and 16 countries have a decrease in score of over 5%.

Conclusion

The Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights allows us to address the feminist critique of quantitative measures by accounting for the barriers women face when it comes to exercising the same economic freedoms as men. In this way, the potential gender bias of the EFW index is mitigated.

After the adjustment for gender disparity, the difference in the level of economic freedom for many countries, such as Oman, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan is staggering—over one full point for some estimates. A handful of similar countries in the EFW dataset are much less economically free once gender differences in legal rights are taken into account. The magnitude of the changes in EFW scores and rankings of these countries suggest that there is a systematic overstatement of economic freedom if only the unadjusted EFW ratings are considered. In general, countries located in the Middle East and parts of Asia and Africa tend to erect greater barriers limiting the ability of women to exercise economic rights. An objective measure of institutional quality should take these differences into consideration.

After adjusting the EFW index for gender disparity in legal rights, it is clear that men and women do not face the same set of rules when it comes to owning property and participating in the formal economy in several countries. Use of the gender-adjusted index will lead researchers to a better understanding of the role of economic freedom as a determinant of income levels, growth, health outcomes, reductions in poverty, and other development outcomes. Further, adjusting for gender differences in legal rights will potentially enhance our understanding of the relationship between economic institutions and the differences in the educational attainment, life expectancy, and job opportunities of men relative to women.

Appendix 1: Components and Sub-components, Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights

A. Freedom of Movement (7 sub-components)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Access to Public Space (OECD)¹ ii. Can an unmarried woman travel outside the country in the same way as an unmarried man? iii. Can a married woman travel outside the country in the same way as a married man? iv. Can an unmarried woman travel outside her home in the same way as an unmarried man? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. Can a married woman travel outside her home in the same way as a married man? vi. Can an unmarried woman choose where to live in the same way as an unmarried man? vii. Can a married woman choose where to live in the same way as a married man? |
|--|---|
-

B. Property Rights (8 sub-components)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Inheritance Daughters (OECD) ii. Inheritance Widows (OECD) iii. Access to Land (OECD) iv. Access to Property other than Land (OECD) v. Do unmarried men and unmarried women have equal ownership rights to property? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. Do married men and married women have equal ownership rights to property? vii. Do sons and daughters have equal rights to inherit assets from their parents? viii. Do female and male surviving spouses have equal rights to inherit assets? |
|---|--|
-

C. Financial Rights (3 sub-components)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Access to Credit/Financial Services (OECD) ii. Can an unmarried woman open a bank account in the same way as an unmarried man? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Can a married woman open a bank account in the same way as a married man? |
|--|--|
-

D. Freedom to Work (18 sub-components)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Can an unmarried woman get a job or pursue a trade or profession in the same way as an unmarried man? ii. Can a married woman get a job or pursue a trade or profession in the same way as a married man? iii. Can an unmarried woman sign a contract in the same way as an unmarried man? iv. Can a married woman sign a contract in the same way as a married man? v. Can an unmarried woman register a business in the same way as an unmarried man? vi. Can a married woman register a business in the same way as a married man? vii. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work the same night hours as men? viii. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women do the same jobs as men? ix. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in jobs deemed hazardous in the same way as men? x. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in jobs deemed morally or socially inappropriate in the same way as men? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> xi. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in jobs deemed arduous in the same way as men? xii. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in mining in the same way as men? xiii. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in factories in the same way as men? xiv. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in construction in the same way as men? xv. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in the same occupations as men? xvi. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women work in metalworking in the same way as men? xvii. Can nonpregnant and nonnursing women engage in jobs requiring lifting weights above a threshold in the same way as men? xviii. Can non-pregnant and non-nursing women do the same job-related tasks as men? |
|--|---|
-

¹ (OECD) indicates components based on OECD data; all other components are from the World Bank.

E. Legal Status (11 sub-components)

- i. Can an unmarried woman apply for a passport in the same way as an unmarried man?
- ii. Can a married woman apply for a passport in the same way as a married man?
- iii. Can an unmarried woman obtain a national ID card in the same way as an unmarried man?
- iv. Can a married woman obtain a national ID card in the same way as a married man?
- v. Can an unmarried woman confer citizenship on her children in the same way as an unmarried man?
- vi. Can a married woman confer citizenship on her children in the same way as a married man?
- vii. Can an unmarried woman be "head of household" or "head of family" in the same way as an unmarried man?
- viii. Can a married woman be "head of household" or "head of family" in the same way as a married man?
- ix. Can a married woman confer citizenship to a non-national spouse in the same way as a man?
- x. Does a woman's testimony carry the same evidentiary weight in court as a man's?
- xi. Are married women legally required to obey their husbands?²

² All variables from the World Bank's *Women, Business, and the Law* report are coded as Yes = 1 and No = 0 with the exception of this question. This question is coded as Yes = 0 and No = 1.

Appendix 2: Summary and Component Scores, Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights

Country	Summary Score	Component 1 Freedom of Movement	Component 2 Property Rights	Component 3 Financial Rights	Component 4 Freedom to Work	Component 5 Legal Status
Albania	0.9090	0.9286	0.7500	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Algeria	0.7407	0.9286	0.3750	0.8333	0.8667	0.7000
Angola	0.8433	1.0000	0.7500	0.8333	0.7333	0.9000
Argentina	0.8942	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	0.5333	1.0000
Armenia	0.9875	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Australia	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Austria	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Azerbaijan	0.8132	0.9286	0.9375	0.8333	0.4667	0.9000
Bangladesh	0.7540	0.9286	0.3750	0.8333	0.7333	0.9000
Belgium	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Benin	0.7005	0.7857	0.7500	0.8333	0.4667	0.6667
Bolivia	0.8758	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	0.6667	0.9000
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.9092	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	0.7333	1.0000
Botswana	0.8824	0.9286	0.7500	0.8333	1.0000	0.9000
Brazil	0.8950	1.0000	0.8750	0.8333	0.8667	0.9000
Bulgaria	0.9467	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.7333	1.0000
Burundi	0.8690	0.9286	0.5833	1.0000	1.0000	0.8333
Cambodia	0.9875	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Cameroon	0.6496	0.7857	0.5625	0.8333	0.4000	0.6667
Canada	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Chad	0.6941	0.7857	0.5000	0.8333	0.5333	0.8182
Chile	0.9067	1.0000	0.7500	1.0000	0.8667	0.9167
China	0.8967	1.0000	0.7500	1.0000	0.7333	1.0000
Colombia	0.9190	0.9286	1.0000	1.0000	0.6667	1.0000
Congo, Democratic Republic	0.5420	0.7143	0.5625	0.3333	0.2667	0.8333
Congo, Republic	0.7646	0.7857	0.6875	1.0000	0.6000	0.7500
Côte d'Ivoire	0.8650	1.0000	0.6250	0.8333	0.8667	1.0000
Croatia	0.9733	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Czech Republic	0.9600	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.8000	1.0000
Denmark	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Dominican Republic	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Ecuador	0.9225	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	0.8000	1.0000
Egypt, Arab Republic	0.5845	0.7143	0.3750	0.8333	0.4000	0.6000
El Salvador	0.9542	1.0000	0.9375	0.8333	1.0000	1.0000

Appendix 2, cont'd: Summary and Component Scores, Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights

Country	Summary Score	Component 1 Freedom of Movement	Component 2 Property Rights	Component 3 Financial Rights	Component 4 Freedom to Work	Component 5 Legal Status
Estonia	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Ethiopia	0.8233	1.0000	0.7500	0.8333	0.5333	1.0000
Fiji	0.8650	1.0000	0.7500	0.8333	0.8667	0.8750
Finland	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
France	0.9733	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Gabon	0.7445	0.7143	0.6250	0.8333	0.8000	0.7500
Georgia	0.9500	1.0000	0.7500	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Germany	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Ghana	0.8875	1.0000	0.6875	0.8333	1.0000	0.9167
Greece	0.9750	1.0000	0.8750	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Guatemala	0.9608	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Guinea	0.7471	0.7857	0.7500	0.8333	0.6667	0.7000
Haiti	0.8689	0.8571	0.6875	1.0000	1.0000	0.8000
Honduras	0.8415	0.9286	0.8125	0.8333	0.8000	0.8333
Hong Kong, China	0.9625	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Hungary	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Iceland	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
India	0.8233	1.0000	0.7500	0.8333	0.5333	1.0000
Indonesia	0.8607	0.9286	0.6250	0.8333	1.0000	0.9167
Iran, Islamic Republic	0.5440	0.4286	0.3750	0.8333	0.6667	0.4167
Ireland	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Israel	0.9590	0.9286	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Italy	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Jamaica	0.9340	0.9286	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	0.8750
Japan	0.9733	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Jordan	0.5402	0.6429	0.3750	0.8333	0.6000	0.2500
Kazakhstan	0.8540	0.9286	0.8750	1.0000	0.4667	1.0000
Kenya	0.8783	1.0000	0.6250	0.8333	0.9333	1.0000
Korea, Republic	0.9350	1.0000	0.8750	1.0000	0.8000	1.0000
Kuwait	0.6086	0.6429	0.5000	1.0000	0.4000	0.5000
Kyrgyz Republic	0.7957	0.9286	0.7500	0.8333	0.4667	1.0000
Latvia	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Lebanon	0.7274	0.9286	0.3750	0.8333	0.8000	0.7000
Lesotho	0.8858	1.0000	0.6875	1.0000	0.8667	0.8750

Appendix 2, cont'd: Summary and Component Scores, Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights

Country	Summary Score	Component 1 Freedom of Movement	Component 2 Property Rights	Component 3 Financial Rights	Component 4 Freedom to Work	Component 5 Legal Status
Lithuania	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Macedonia	0.8967	1.0000	0.7500	1.0000	0.7333	1.0000
Madagascar	0.8058	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	0.4667	0.7500
Malawi	0.8524	0.9286	0.7500	0.8333	1.0000	0.7500
Malaysia	0.6702	0.6429	0.3750	1.0000	0.7333	0.6000
Mali	0.7371	0.7857	0.7500	1.0000	0.4000	0.7500
Mauritania	0.6267	1.0000	0.2500	0.8333	0.4667	0.5833
Mauritius	0.9550	1.0000	0.8750	1.0000	1.0000	0.9000
Mexico	0.9292	1.0000	0.8125	0.8333	1.0000	1.0000
Moldova, Republic	0.8358	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	0.4667	0.9000
Mongolia	0.9275	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	0.8000	0.9000
Morocco	0.7542	1.0000	0.4375	0.8333	0.6667	0.8333
Mozambique	0.9090	0.9286	0.7500	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Namibia	0.9167	1.0000	0.7500	0.8333	1.0000	1.0000
Nepal	0.7774	0.9286	0.6250	0.8333	1.0000	0.5000
Netherlands	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
New Zealand	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Nicaragua	0.8430	0.7857	0.8125	0.8333	0.8667	0.9167
Niger	0.5395	0.7143	0.2500	0.5000	0.4000	0.8333
Nigeria	0.7707	0.9286	0.6250	0.6667	0.7333	0.9000
Norway	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Oman	0.5660	0.5714	0.3750	0.8333	0.8000	0.2500
Pakistan	0.7140	0.9286	0.3750	1.0000	0.6667	0.6000
Panama	0.9733	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
Papua New Guinea	0.8392	1.0000	0.6875	0.8333	0.8000	0.8750
Paraguay	0.9500	1.0000	0.7500	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Peru	0.9500	1.0000	0.7500	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Philippines	0.8174	0.9286	0.6250	0.8333	1.0000	0.7000
Poland	0.9333	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.6667	1.0000
Portugal	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Romania	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Russian Federation	0.8933	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.4667	1.0000
Rwanda	0.8571	0.7857	0.7500	0.8333	1.0000	0.9167
Saudi Arabia	0.4988	0.2857	0.3750	0.8333	0.7333	0.0000

Appendix 2, cont'd: Summary and Component Scores, Index of Gender Disparity in Legal Rights

Country	Summary Score	Component 1 Freedom of Movement	Component 2 Property Rights	Component 3 Financial Rights	Component 4 Freedom to Work	Component 5 Legal Status
Senegal	0.6971	0.7857	0.5000	1.0000	0.5333	0.6667
Serbia	0.9875	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Singapore	0.9625	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Slovak Republic	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Slovenia	0.9733	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	1.0000
South Africa	0.9750	1.0000	0.8750	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Spain	0.9875	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Sri Lanka	0.8975	1.0000	0.6875	1.0000	0.8000	1.0000
Sweden	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Switzerland	0.9875	1.0000	0.9375	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Syrian Arab Republic	0.5107	0.4286	0.3750	0.8333	0.3333	0.5833
Tajikistan	0.8358	1.0000	0.8125	1.0000	0.4667	0.9000
Tanzania	0.8024	0.9286	0.3750	0.8333	1.0000	0.8750
Thailand	0.8558	1.0000	0.8125	0.8333	0.7333	0.9000
Togo	0.8567	1.0000	0.7500	0.8333	0.8667	0.8333
Tunisia	0.7374	0.9286	0.3750	0.8333	0.8000	0.7500
Turkey	0.9533	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.8667	0.9000
Uganda	0.8274	0.9286	0.5000	0.8333	1.0000	0.8750
Ukraine	0.8733	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.4667	0.9000
United Arab Emirates	0.5493	0.5714	0.3750	0.8333	0.4667	0.5000
United Kingdom	0.9542	1.0000	0.9375	0.8333	1.0000	1.0000
United States	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Uruguay	0.9417	1.0000	0.8750	0.8333	1.0000	1.0000
Venezuela	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Vietnam	0.8424	0.9286	0.7500	1.0000	0.5333	1.0000
Yemen, Republic	0.5893	0.5714	0.3750	0.8333	0.6667	0.5000
Zambia	0.8774	0.9286	0.6250	0.8333	1.0000	1.0000

References

Berlin, I. (1958/1969). Two Concepts of Liberty. In Isaiah Berlin , *Four Essays on Liberty* (Oxford University Press, 1969): 118–172.

Folbre, N. (2006). Measuring Care: Gender, Empowerment, and the Care Economy. *Journal of Human Development* 7, 2: 183–199.

Gwartney, J. D., R.A. Lawson, and W. Block (1996). *Economic Freedom of the World: 1975–1995*. Fraser Institute.

Gwartney, J. D., R.A. Lawson, and J. Hall (2015). Economic Freedom Dataset, published in *Economic Freedom of the World: 2015 Annual Report*, Fraser Institute. <http://www.freetheworld.com/datasets_efw.html>.

Gwartney, J. D., R.A. Lawson, and J. Hall (2015). *Economic Freedom of the World: 2015 Annual Report*. Fraser Institute.

Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Belknap Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2014). *Gender, Institutions, and Development Database*. OECD.

Rabushka, A. (1991). Preliminary Definition of Economic Freedom. In Walter E. Block, ed., *Economic Freedom: Toward a Theory of Measurement* (Fraser Institute): 87–108.

Rabushka, A. (1991). Philosophical Aspects of Economic Freedom. In Walter E. Block, ed., *Economic Freedom: Toward a Theory of Measurement* (Fraser Institute): 23–37.

Walker, M.A. (1996). Introduction: The Historical Development of the Economic Freedom Index. In J.D. Gwartney, R.A. Lawson, and W. Block, eds., *Economic Freedom of the World: 1975-1995* (Fraser Institute): 1–7.

Waring, M. (1988). *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics*. Harper & Row.

World Bank (2013). *Women, Business, and the Law 2014: Removing Restrictions to Enhance Gender Equality*. World Bank. <<http://wbl.worldbank.org/reports/~/media/FPDKM/WBL/Documents/Reports/2014/Women-Business-and-the-Law-2014-FullReport.pdf>>.

