

## Gender Equality and Economic Inequality as Cultural Foundations of Political Support: Evidence from the World Values Survey (Wave 7)

<sup>1</sup>Kashmala Ashfaq (CA)

<sup>2</sup>Iqra Kanwal

<sup>3</sup>Misbah Bibi

<sup>4</sup>Shaqib Ullah Khan

<sup>1</sup>Department Management Science, MBA Marketing, NUML University Faisalabad Campus

<sup>2</sup>Department of Economics, National College For Business Administration and Economics, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup>M.Phil Economics, Department of Economics, National College For Business Administration and Economics, Pakistan

<sup>4</sup>BS Political Science, Department of Political Science, University of Science and Technology, Bannu, Pakistan

[kashmalashfaq2709@gmail.com](mailto:kashmalashfaq2709@gmail.com) [kanwalmalik135@gmail.com](mailto:kanwalmalik135@gmail.com) [misbahjavedo27@gmail.com](mailto:misbahjavedo27@gmail.com)

[shaqibkhanoo77@gmail.com](mailto:shaqibkhanoo77@gmail.com)

This study examines the combined effects of economic inequality and gender equality on political support, using data from the World Values Survey, Wave 7. The conceptualization of gender equality as a cultural foundation that shapes individuals' views of economic inequality is itself a move beyond purely materialist frameworks. Using mixed-effects multilevel regression models, the findings show that perceptions of economic inequality are strongly positively associated with political support, and this relationship depends on gender-egalitarian attitudes. Specifically, high levels of economic inequality are likely to promote inclusive and redistributive policies, thereby advancing gender equality. The stability of these results is supported by robustness tests that examine a variety of model specifications and countries. These results highlight the need to incorporate gender norms into studies of inequality and political behavior, and imply that redistributive reform policies designed to promote gender equality can increase the political legitimacy of such reforms and strengthen support for democracy.

**Keywords:** Socioeconomic factors, Political Supports, World Value Survey, Mixed-effects multilevel regression

### Article Details:

Received on 20 Jan, 2026

Accepted on 09 Feb, 2026

Published on 11 Feb, 2026

Corresponding Authors\*

## 1. Introduction

Economic and gender inequality are two of the most intractable problems of the twenty-first century, shaping the well-being of individuals and global unity. Increasing income and wealth inequalities have captured the attention of policymakers, researchers, and international agencies because unequal societies are associated with greater social instability, reduced trust in institutions, and lower life satisfaction (Erdolek Kozal and Gunal, 2023; Edwards, Romero and Naanwaab, 2022; Stiglitz, 2017). Although macro-economic factors like the per capita income, unemployment rate, and the female representation in the administration are valuable analytical variables, modern research tends to emphasize the applicability of cultural values and norms to understand the perceptions of the inequality (Poverty, health, education, etc.) held by people and the preferences towards the redistributive policies (Ahmad et al., 2025; Gul et al., 2020; Ben-Nun Bloom, 2020).

At the same time, gender equality has been recognized as a decisive factor in human rights and social and economic progress. Empirical studies in a variety of national settings have shown that the participation of women in the full-time workforce, further education, and political participation is very deeply dependent on the historically established gender norms that define the socially approved roles of both males and females (Khan et al., 2023; Cislighi et al., 2022; Ben-Nun Bloom, 2020). These norms interplay with institutional variables, including labour laws, access to educational opportunities, and economic globalization processes in general, thus influencing the scope of opportunities that women have and the perceived legitimacy of those opportunities in both the public and private realms (Safdar et al., 2026; Cislighi et al., 2022).

Recent studies have consistently focused on the interplay among cultural orientations, economic conditions, and gender norms in shaping social and political attitudes. Research based on the World Values Survey (WVS) shows that public support for income equality is not only dependent on material welfare and institutional trust but also on the broader cultural and social context in which people operate (Erdolek Kozal & Gunal, 2023). Equally, economic globalizations influences gender equality by exposing people to other norms and values; the more socially globalized a society is, the more it adopts egalitarian beliefs and policies (Ben-Nun & Bloom, 2020). The cultural dimensions (secularism versus traditionalism and individualism versus collectivism) and the level of national income interact to shape inequality and political preferences, which explain the importance of considering cultural heterogeneity in the context of political support (Edwards et al., 2022). Therefore, in modern era COVID-19 changed the entire economic, political and cultural system (Akhtar et al., 2020). This paper argues, based on these insights, that gender equality and economic inequality are cultural pillars of political support; therefore, they shape citizens' tendencies to redistribute, to support social welfare programs, and to adopt general political systems. Based on the results of the World Values Survey (Wave-7), we examine individual- and society-level explanations of approval of egalitarian policies, tolerance toward gender norms, and attitudes toward politics in general, using cross-national differences as predictors. This research is expected to promote a refined understanding of how economic and social inequalities are internalized in cultural worldviews and vice versa, by incorporating empirical evidence on income inequality, gender norms, and cultural orientations.

### Hypothesis

H<sub>1</sub>: The higher the level at which people think that economic inequity is unnecessary, the higher the probability that they will support the governmental policies meant to reduce income disparities.

H<sub>2</sub>: The more gender-equal people are in their espousal, the more likely they are to support the policies aimed at promoting equality and social wellbeing.

H<sub>3</sub>: The correlation between political support and economic inequality is enhanced in societies where gender equality is more widely accepted.

After the introductory part, Section 2 presents a literature review, and Section 3 presents the research method and model to be used in the current study. Section 4 reports the results of the empirical analysis. Lastly, Section 5 presents the conclusion and policy recommendations.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Economic inequality, Perceptions, and Political Support

The study of the relationship between economic inequality and political opinion has a long-standing tradition of analyzing the impact of disparities in income and wealth on electoral decisions in favor of redistribution and egalitarian regimes. According to the classical paradigm of political economy, inequality was inherently linked to institution-building and political stability (Smith, 1776; Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012), but modern analysis showed that inequality has severe political implications, including income concentration (Piketty, 2013). One of the most powerful theoretical models in this area is the median-voter theory; according to it, individuals' redistributive preferences depend on their relative income status (Meltzer and Richard, 1983; Corneo and Gruner, 2002). According to this model, increased inequality should lead to greater support for redistribution, as an increasing number of people cannot afford the median income. However, empirical studies, both comparing and within countries, Kenworthy and McCall (2008); Finseraas (2009); Moene and Wallerstein (2003) do not show definite conclusions that the economic framework is enough to explain political preferences. As a result, the current academic community has begun to pay attention to the subjective notions of inequality and justice. Opinions on redistribution are also significantly influenced by beliefs about economic mobility, distributive justice, and government performance, as reported in survey-based research (Bartels, 2008; Kenworthy and McCall, 2008, Jamal et al., 2024). The cross-national evidence also establishes that perceived inequality is mediated by material well-being, life satisfaction, and institutional trust in the relationship between perceived inequality and political preferences (Erdolek Kozal and Gunal, 2023). Similarly, the World Values Survey indicates that cultural values, especially trust and life satisfaction, influence how inequality is viewed and how much state intervention should be evaluated (Hu, 2023). Institutional trust is particularly decisive; people are more likely to support redistribution as a solution to a problem when they have a lower opinion of governmental agencies, since they expect policies will not be implemented efficiently and equitably (Uslaner, 2002; Rothstein, 2011). In addition, preferences are determined by life satisfaction and perceived economic security, which support the norms of equity and social stability (Easterly, 2001; Acemoglu and Robinson, 2006). This body of literature, in its entirety, indicates that inequality is a determinant of support for political agendas grounded in subjective and cultural processes rather than in material self-interest. Besides, the poverty, inequality, and gender inequality simultaneously in societies that have experienced past inequality and low political trust in developing countries (Gul et al., 2022). The hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) is that the perception of economic inequality increases support for redistribution, and that this connection is mediated by material well-being, life satisfaction, and institutional trust.

### 2.2. Norms and Political Support

The principle of gender equality has increasingly become recognized as a development goal and an important political and social consequence (Fredman et al., 2016; Jayachandran, 2020).

Gender norms, which are defined as common expectations regarding the proper division of labour between men and women, have evidently shaped the labour market participation of both genders, public policy preferences, and trends in political representation (Cislaghi & Heise, 2019). Empirical studies, such as the World Values Survey, indicate a strong correlation between gender-egalitarian norms and greater numbers of women engaging in full-time work, among other gender-equity indicators (Cislaghi et al., 2022). Patterns of political support are moulded by such conventions in a number of ways. In the first place, social role consonance with gender equivalence creates greater support for egalitarian welfare policies and institutions. Empirical research indicated that increased labour-force participation by women is often matched by an attitudinal shift in support for the expansion of child care services, welfare-state expenditure, and representative inclusivity (Inglehart and Norris, 2003). The example of normalizing women's employment by Cislaghi et al. (2022,) and Gul et al., (2023) showed that it correlates with better health and more balanced economic performance, demonstrating how the channeling effect of norms on individual behaviour and policy preferences works. Second, beliefs about gender equality are concomitant with broader ideological commitments to egalitarianism, power distribution, and leadership. Advocates of gender equality are found to have an overriding tendency to support inclusive systems of governance and a broad social welfare agenda (Ben-Nun Bloom, 2020). This standpoint is consistent with the cultural-values theoretical framework, which conceptualizes equality and social role expectancies as part and parcel of an overall value system that provides an orderly structure for the formation of political attitudes (Ullah et al., 2023; Inglehart, 1997; Tabellini, 2008). Third, the effects of structural and cultural changes reinforce each other in a loop of feedback: increased labour-force participation by women solidifies, socially, the equality between the sexes in institutional structures and, in turn, induces changes in social policy and the overall redistributive preferences of citizens (Goldin, 2006; Jayachandran, 2020). Empirical data on gender inequality worldwide showed a progressive movement towards gender-egalitarian standards, though at varying speeds across diverse institutional and cultural settings (Cislaghi et al., 2022). Taken together, the academic debate assumes that gender norms are the cultural underpinning of political support, shaping normative conceptualizations of equality and expectations regarding governmental responsibilities. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 argues that the existence of gender-egalitarian norms and a higher female labour force are consistent with greater support for gender-equity policies and social welfare more broadly.

### **2.3. Economic Inequality and Gender Norms Interaction**

The social phenomena of economic inequality and gender norms are traditionally perceived as independent; nevertheless, modern empirical studies reveal that attentive, politically oriented lenses overlap across broad cultural milieus. The cultural-political theory stated that people understand the inequality by means of socially constructed ideals of righteousness, stratification, and division of roles (Welzel and Inglehart, 2005; Tabellini, 2008). It is therefore through interpretive frameworks that inequality propagates redistributive downstream effects or reproduces the status quo of reproduction in society. Comparative politics indicated that cultural orientations, i.e., individualism, collectivism, traditionalism, and secularism, mediate the connection between inequality and policy preferences (Edwards et al., 2022). In environments where egalitarianism is praised, economic disparities are more likely to give rise to a strong desire to promote redistributive, inclusive policies. However, in cultures with strong hierarchical social principles or conservative gender ideals, inequality is often viewed as reasonable or even natural, thereby softening the pressure to redistribute (Ben-Nun Bloom, 2020). The mediating effect of gender norms has also been relevant, as it reflects greater



gender (coded as female = 1) education level (ISCED, Q275), level of income (Q288R), and the value they have attached to religion (Q164). Then to test the theoretical hypothesis that gender-equality norms determine how individuals make sense of economic inequality, the research models an estimated mixed-effects multilevel regression that allows both individual and country variability. To establish the contribution of the two attitude variables towards gender and economic inequality, the model includes the interaction term between attitude towards gender equality and attitude towards economic inequality. This methodological framework goes further than the purely materialist accounts, in that cultural attitudes are also included in the analysis of the political legitimacy and redistribution preferences, which allows the research to generate empirical evidence about how social norms and views of inequality contribute to the support of political institutions.

**Table 1:** *Description of Variables with Code & Categories*

Variable	Code	Categories
Political support	Constructed from Q250, Q251, Q252	Continuous scale (1–10, averaged index)
Gender equality attitudes	Q29P, Q30P, Q31P, Q33P	Continuous scale (1–5, averaged index)
Income inequality attitudes	Q106	1 = Income equality preferred ... 10 = Larger income differences preferred
Age categories	Q262	1 = 18–24; 2 = 25–34; 3 = 35–44; 4 = 45–54; 5 = 55–64; 6 = 65–74; 7 = 75+
Female		0 = Male; 1 = Female
Education (ISCED)	Q275	0 = Early childhood; 1 = Primary; 2 = Lower secondary; 3 = Upper secondary; 4 = Post-secondary non-tertiary; 5 = Short-cycle tertiary; 6 = Bachelor; 7 = Master; 8 = Doctoral
Income level	Q288R	1 = Low; 2 = Medium; 3 = High
Importance of religion	Q164	1 = Not at all important ... 10 = Very important

**Table 2:** *Country List*

Country	Freq.	%	Country	Freq.	%	Country	Freq.	%
Andorra	1,004	1.07	Indonesia	3,200	3.41	Pakistan	1,986	2.12
Argentina	1,003	1.07	Iran	1,499	1.60	Peru	1,400	1.49
Australia	1,795	1.91	Iraq	1,200	1.28	Philippines	1,200	1.28
Bangladesh	1,200	1.28	Japan	1,353	1.44	Puerto Rico	1,125	1.20
Armenia	1,223	1.30	Kazakhstan	1,276	1.36	Romania	1,240	1.32
Bolivia	2,067	2.20	Jordan	1,203	1.28	Russia	1,810	1.93
Brazil	1,761	1.88	Kenya	1,259	1.34	Serbia	1,043	1.11
Myanmar	1,200	1.28	South Korea	1,245	1.33	Singapore	2,012	2.15
Canada	4,018	4.29	Kyrgyzstan	1,200	1.28	Slovakia	1,200	1.28
Chile	1,000	1.07	Lebanon	1,200	1.28	Vietnam	1,200	1.28
China	3,036	3.24	Libya	1,185	1.26	Zimbabwe	1,211	1.29
Taiwan ROC	1,222	1.30	Macau SAR	813	0.87	Tajikistan	1,200	1.28
Colombia	1,520	1.62	Malaysia	1,313	1.40	Thailand	1,499	1.60
Cyprus	1,000	1.07	Maldives	1,036	1.10	Tunisia	1,205	1.29
Czechia	1,200	1.28	Mexico	1,739	1.85	Turkey	2,414	2.57
Ecuador	1,200	1.28	Mongolia	1,638	1.75	Ukraine	1,289	1.37

Ethiopia	1,230	1.31	Morocco	1,200	1.28	Egypt	1,200	1.28
Germany	1,528	1.63	Netherlands	2,145	2.29	Great Britain	2,469	2.63
Greece	1,200	1.28	New Zealand	1,028	1.10	United States	2,596	2.77
Guatemala	1,229	1.31	Nicaragua	1,200	1.28	Uruguay	1,000	1.07
Hong Kong SAR	2,058	2.19	Nigeria	1,237	1.32	Venezuela	1,190	1.27
-	-	-	-	-	-	Northern Ireland	416	0.44




Figure 2: countries frequency analysis




Figure 3: Frequency with countries base.

### 3.1 Methodology

To study investigate the macro determinants of the economic (Economic inequality), Socio (Gender Equality and cultural Foundations) on political support from the WVS. The general econometric model is specified as:

$$Political\_Support_i = \delta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n=7} \delta_k X_{\sigma,i} + \varepsilon_i \dots (1)$$

Where  $Political\_Support_i$  represents the political support index for individual  $i$ ,  $\delta_k X_{\sigma,i}$  denotes the explanatory variables, and  $\varepsilon_i$  is the error term.

$$u_i \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

And the individual error term:

$$\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$$

Where,

$i$ = indexes individuals and  $j$  indexes countries,

$u_j$  = is the country-level random intercept, and

$\varepsilon_i$ = is the individual-level error term

The baseline econometric description models political support as a function of gender equality attitudes, economic inequality attitudes, and socio-demographic control variables:

The econometric specification is as follows:

*Political supports<sub>i</sub>*

$$= \delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{Gender Equality}_i + \delta_2 \text{Economic Inequality}_i + \delta_3 \text{Age}_i + \delta_4 \text{Gender}_i + \delta_5 \text{Education}_i + \delta_6 \text{Income}_{it} + \beta_7 \text{Importance of Religion}_i + \varepsilon_i \dots (2)$$

Now the Interaction term included into the general model. Thus:

*Political supports<sub>i</sub>*

$$= \delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{Gender Equality}_i + \delta_2 \text{Economic Inequality}_i + \delta_3 (\text{Gender Equality}_i * \text{Economic Inequality}_i) + \delta_4 \text{Age}_i + \delta_5 \text{Gender}_i + \delta_6 \text{Education}_i + \delta_7 \text{Income}_{it} + \beta_8 \text{Importance of Religion}_i + \varepsilon_i \dots (3)$$

The models are estimated using below model, treating political support as a continuous dependent variable. Including the interaction term allows the marginal effect of economic inequality attitudes on political support to vary depending on individuals' gender equality attitudes.

### 3.2 Mixed-Effects Multilevel Regression Models

The World Values Survey (WVS) is represented by the hierarchical structure with individuals and countries. This study uses the mixed-effects multilevel regression models, that is, the linear mixed models, to measure the relationships between gender-equity attitudes, perceptions of economic inequality, and political support. When the data will have clustered form, it is justified to use multilevel models since data observed in one country will most likely be correlated and shaped by similar institutional, cultural or economic milieus. Similarly, the ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression, which assumes that observations are independent, mixed-effects models permit the concomitant estimation of fixed and random effects (at the individual level, gender-equity attitudes, economic-inequality perceptions, age, gender, education, income and the relevance of religion) and random effects, which indicate the heterogeneity among countries that is unobservable. This two-level model enables both within-country and between-country variance to be modelled simultaneously to give higher quality standard error approximations and eliminate the information loss that would otherwise result when survey data are aggregated to the national scale. Mixed-effects models suit most especially cross-national survey information, longitudinal designs, or multistage probability samples, where hierarchical dependence is expected. To determine the sufficiency of the modelling strategy, the analysis follows the standard procedures of goodness of fit of mixed-models. Nakagawa and Schielzeth (2013) by reported that marginal R<sup>2</sup> (variance explained by fixed effects) and conditional R<sup>2</sup> (variance explained by both fixed and random effects), alongside model comparison statistics such as AIC (Zafar et al., 2025; Muhammad et al., 2025)

## 4. Findings and Discussions

The section presents the empirical findings of mixed-effects multilevel regression analyses of the World Values Survey Wave 7 data. The analysis examines the independent as well as cooperative effects of economic inequality and gender equality on the political support, holding other individual-level covariates constant and cross-national heterogeneity. Special attention is given to the clarification of the connection between the equality between men and women and economic inequality, as well as to detailed model diagnostics and robustness tests to evaluate the reliability and integrity of the established relations.

Table 3 shows the estimates of mixed-effects multilevel regression models used to analyses the relationships between the perceptions of economic inequality, gender equality, and political support using data of the World Values Survey Wave 7. The baseline specification suggests that increased perceptions of economic inequality and reduced perceptions of egalitarian gender

relations are both negatively and statistically significantly related to political support, indicating that respondents with higher perceptions of economic inequality or lower perceptions of egalitarian gender relations have lower levels of political support at baseline. The correlation between the cross-product effect of gender equality and economic inequality is positive and statistically significant, therefore, providing empirical evidence to Hypothesis 3. Such interplay indicates that the unhealthy relationship between perceived economic inequality and political support is mitigated when gender equality is strongly supported (Gul et al., 2026), and therefore, gender suffrage norms seem to mediate the effects of perceived economic inequality on political attitudes. The control variables are aligned with the theory. A positive relationship with age, female gender, and income is found within high-income subgroups; however, significant support is indicated in political support. Education level, at the bachelor's or master's level, also positively influences political support. Further, the greater the ratings of religion, the greater the manifestations of political support. All these findings, taken together, emphasizes the delicate nature of the interaction between socioeconomic perceptions and political dispositions, and how gender-egalitarian principles can buffer the negative effects that perceived economic inequality may have on support for political actors or institutions. Moreover, the random-effects estimates of the model without the interaction term are reported in Table 4. The statistically significant country-level variance, as verified by the variance-components test, shows that there is substantial cross-country heterogeneity in political support, and therefore it is justifiable to use a multilevel analytical framework rather than a single-level one. As shown in Table 5, the country-level variance does not decrease significantly when the interaction term is introduced. This observation reveals that, despite the moderating effect of gender equality on the existence of inequality-resolving political support, there is an effect of national cultural and institutional predispositions that persist, hence the thesis statement of the study, with reference to the cultural underpinning.

**Table 3: Mixed-effects ML Regression**

Model without interaction		Model with Interaction Term [Gender Equality× Economic Inequality]			
<b>Other Statistics</b>					
Number of obs.		87,542			
Number of groups		63			
Min		35 <sup>1</sup>			
Max		3,997			
Avg		1,389.6			
Log likelihood		-169619.35	Log likelihood		-169593.65
Wald chi2(28)		2677.49	Wald chi2(28)		2730.44
Prob > chi2		0.0000	Prob > chi2		0.0000
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Coef.</b>	<b>Std. Err.</b>	<b>Coef.</b>	<b>Std. Err.</b>
Gender equality	-	-0.0218	0.0095**	-0.1131	0.0159***
Economic inequality	-	-0.0362	0.0020***	-0.0924	0.0081***
[GEqual× ECOIneq.]	Interaction	-	-	0.0196	0.0027***
Age (Ref: 18–24)					
	25–34	-0.0914	0.0197***	-0.0907	0.0197***
	35–44	0.0347	0.0202*	0.0363	0.0202*



	45-54	0.1042	0.0210***	0.1060	0.0210***
	55-64	0.1808	0.0222***	0.1828	0.0222***
	65-74	0.2566	0.0254***	0.2591	0.0254***
	75+	0.0035	0.0116	0.0032	0.0116
Sex (Ref: Male)					
	Female	0.4200	0.0358***	0.4234	0.0358***
Education (Ref: Early childhood education)					
	Primary education	0.0943	0.0316***	0.0939	0.0316***
	Lower secondary education	0.0125	0.0312	0.0115	0.0312
	Upper secondary education	0.0131	0.0302	0.0118	0.0301
	Post-secondary non-tertiary education	-0.0816	0.0347***	-0.0826	0.0347***
	Short-cycle tertiary education	-0.0247	0.0352	-0.0249	0.0352
	Bachelor or equivalent	0.1187	0.0321	0.1167	0.0321***
	Master or equivalent	0.1862	0.0374***	0.1837	0.0374***
	Doctoral or equivalent	0.0905	0.0623	0.0892	0.0623
Income (Ref: Low)					
	Media	0.2095	0.0141***	0.2085	0.0141***
	High	0.5987	0.0224***	0.5976	0.0224***
Importance scale (Ref: Not at all important)					
	2	0.0520	0.0351	0.0553	0.0351
	3	-0.0423	0.0351	-0.0373	0.0351
	4	-0.1933	0.0393***	-0.1860	0.0393***
	5	-0.2427	0.0283***	-0.2375	0.0283***
	6	-0.1203	0.0310***	-0.1144	0.0310***
	7	0.0919	0.0302***	0.0960	0.0302***
	8	0.2018	0.0288***	0.2055	0.0287***
	9	0.3045	0.0314***	0.3076	0.0314***
Very important		0.3553	0.0236***	0.3587	0.0236***
Constant		6.3014	0.1092***	6.5590	0.1147***

**Table 4: Random-effects parameters without Interaction**

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Error	[95% CIL -95% CIU]
Country-level variance (var(_cons))	0.6014067	0.107633	[0.4234771 0.854096]
Residual variance	2.80846	0.0134286	[2.782263 2.834903]
<b>Test</b>	<b>Statistic</b>		<b>p-value</b>
LR test vs. linear model	chibar <sup>2</sup> (1) = 14825.71		0.0000

**Table 5: Random-effects parameters with Interaction Term [Gender Equality x Economic Inequality]**

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Error	[95% CIL -95% CIU]
Country-level variance (var(_cons))	0.6045	0.1082	[0.4256 0.8584]
Residual variance	2.8101	0.0134	[2.7839 2.8366]
<b>Test</b>	<b>Statistic</b>		<b>p-value</b>



**Table 8: VIF Results**

Model	Model without Interaction	of Model With of Interaction	Model Without Interaction	of Model With of Interaction
Variable	VIF	1/VIF	VIF	1/VIF
Gender equality	1.11	0.898913	3.49	0.286797
Economic inequality [GEqual× ECOIneq.]	1.03	0.972778	7.46	0.127283
	-	-	8.42	0.108967
25-34	2.03	0.492615	2.03	0.492615
35-44	1.98	0.505216	1.98	0.505202
45-54	1.89	0.528760	1.89	0.528744
55-64	1.80	0.555777	1.80	0.555773
65-74	1.56	0.640758	1.56	0.640756
75+	1.23	0.811841	1.23	0.811841
Female	1.03	0.968531	1.03	0.968505
Primary education	3.03	0.330264	3.03	0.330260
Lower secondary education	3.51	0.284783	3.51	0.284770
Upper secondary education	4.83	0.206959	4.83	0.206891
Post-secondary non-tertiary education	2.70	0.370387	2.70	0.370175
Short-cycle tertiary education	2.55	0.391632	2.55	0.391568
Bachelor or equivalent	4.06	0.246216	4.06	0.246123
Master or equivalent	2.32	0.430630	2.32	0.430218
Doctoral or equivalent	1.26	0.793843	1.26	0.793741
Media	1.34	0.745168	1.34	0.745139
High	1.34	0.746853	1.34	0.746815
2	1.26	0.790831	1.26	0.790684
3	1.27	0.786378	1.27	0.785996
4	1.21	0.823703	1.22	0.822991
5	1.55	0.644681	1.55	0.643914
6	1.43	0.699500	1.43	0.698595
7	1.46	0.686056	1.46	0.685513
8	1.55	0.644685	1.55	0.644148
9	1.45	0.689702	1.45	0.689252
Very important	2.93	0.341619	2.93	0.340987
<b>Mean VIF</b>	1.95	-	3.24	

**Table 9: Influence diagnostics (Cook's distance)**

Model	Model without Interaction Value	of Model With of Interaction Value
Observations	87,542	87,542
Mean Cook's D	0.000011	0.000011
Median Cook's D	0.000005	0.0000051
95th percentile	0.000040	0.0000408
Maximum Cook's D	0.000477	0.0004579
Threshold (4/n)	0.000046	0.0000458

**Table 3-9** reveals that the stability and validity of the approximate relationship between the economic inequality, gender equality, and political support are strong. Mixed-effects multilevel models indicate statistically significant influences of economic inequality and gender equality on political support, and the positive, statistically significant interplay between the two variables supports the theoretical prediction that the two gender-egalitarian norms mediate the effect of economic inequality. According to the diagnostic tests, the residuals follow a normal distribution and are centered at zero, which is a good specification of the model. Random-effect estimates and intraclass correlation coefficients indicate significant and persistent inter-country heterogeneity, and therefore a multilevel design would be appropriate, with national cultural and institutional contexts relevant. The indices of model comparison (AIC and BIC) also favor the interaction model, indicating a better fit. Diagnostic test results indicate that there is no Multicollinearity and that the diagnostic results are not biased. Taken together, these results provide strong empirical evidence that gender equality and economic inequality are intertwined cultural bases of political support.

The hypothesis of the mutual interdependence of economic disparities and gender equality as cultural factors of political support is supported by the empirical results. In line with earlier research, the views on economic inequality have a high contextual relationship with political dispositions, which reinforces the argument on the conditionality of the political preferences to material conditions as well as assessments on fairness, life satisfaction, and institutional performance (Bartels, 2008; Kenworthy and McCall, 2008; Erdoak, Kozal and Gunal, 2023). Such observations are consistent with the World Values Survey, which suggests that cultural values and social trust mediate responses to inequality (Edwards et al., 2022; El Hussieny et al., 2023). Moreover, the findings support the dominance of gender-egalitarian values, which are closely associated with greater political support for egalitarianism and redistributive policies. The fact is consistent with previous findings that indicate a positive relationship between gender equality and inclusive political orientations, as well as welfare-seeking preferences (Inglehart and Norris, 2003; Cislighi and Heise, 2019). It is important to note that the positive correlation between gender equality and economic inequality is observed, thus suggesting that gender norms mediate inequality into political attitudes translation, thus supporting theoretical predictions that cultural orientations (i.e. egalitarianism, individualism, and secularism) elicited redistributive impulses (Welzel and Inglehart, 2005; Tabellini, 2008; Edwards et al., 2022). The large cross-national inequalities, taken as a whole, indicate the critical role of institutional and cultural milieus in shaping political support and that there is a high level of response to the issue of inequality in situations where the social legitimacy of gender equality is established. The findings highlight the need to incorporate gender norms into empirical research on economic inequality and political behaviour, thereby fostering a more nuanced understanding of how cultural values shape contemporary trends in political support.

## 5. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

The current research shows that economic inequality and gender equality are intermediary cultural pillars that support political support rather than independent determinants. Using Wave 7 data from the World Values Survey and a multilevel modelling approach, the analysis finds that perceptions of economic inequality have a considerable effect on political support, and this correlation is mediated by the norms of gender egalitarianism. In the presence of gender egalitarianism with high levels of acceptance, economic inequalities increase people's tendency to support redistributive and inclusive political agendas. The hypothesis that political attitudes towards inequality are ingrained in an extensive system of cultural values is

supported by empirical evidence, thereby justifying the suggestion that subjective norms, institutional trust, and social equality are factors that influence any given political behaviour. On the policy side of things, the results suggest that the policy measures aimed at alleviating economic inequality cannot rely solely on material redistribution. Increasing gender equality, in terms of education, participation in labour markets and politics, enhances the social legitimacy of redistributive and inclusive policies and governance structures. As a result, policymakers ought to consider holistic approaches capable of managing poverty, inequality, and gender inequality simultaneously in societies that have experienced past inequality and low political trust. With this more integrated approach, it is hoped that political support, institutional stability, and social cohesion will be strengthened, resulting in more sustainable and equitable developmental outcomes.

## 6. References

1. Abdulwahab, L. O., Daniel, O., Gul, A., & Bubari, H. U. (2026). The Economic Impact of Digital Health Innovations on Disease Prevention: Cost-Effectiveness, ROI, and Policy Implications. In S. Costa & J. Remondes (Eds.), *Reshaping Health Promotion and Disease Prevention through Digital Innovation* (pp. 29-56). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-3531-5.ch002>
2. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2005). *Economic origins of dictatorship and democracy*. Cambridge university press.
3. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2013). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Currency.
4. Ahmad, N., Raid, M., & Gul, A. (2025). Regional insights into poverty among women-headed households in Pakistan. *Development in Practice*, 1-10.
5. Akhtar Gul, S. H., Ali, H., & Zahra, F. (2020). COVID-19 impact on poverty and unemployment levels: A case Pakistan. *Journal of Research and Reviews in Social Sciences Pakistan*, 3(2), 879-893.
6. Bartels, L. M. (2016). Unequal democracy: The political economy of the new gilded age.
7. Ben-Nun Bloom, P. (2016). State-level restriction of religious freedom and women's rights: A global analysis. *Political Studies*, 64(4), 832-853.
8. Beugelsdijk, S., Kostova, T., Kunst, V. E., Spadafora, E., & Van Essen, M. (2018). Cultural distance and firm internationalization: A meta-analytical review and theoretical implications. *Journal of management*, 44(1), 89-130.
9. Cislighi, B., & Heise, L. (2019). Using social norms theory for health promotion in low-income countries. *Health promotion international*, 34(3), 616-623.
10. Cislighi, B., Bhatia, A., Hallgren, E. S. T., Horanieh, N., Weber, A. M., & Darmstadt, G. L. (2022). Gender norms and gender equality in full-time employment and health: A 97-country analysis of the world values survey. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 689815.
11. Corneo, G., & Grüner, H. P. (2002). Individual preferences for political redistribution. *Journal of public Economics*, 83(1), 83-107.
12. Easterly, W. (2001). The elusive quest for growth.
13. Edwards, J. A., Romero, A., & Naanwaab, C. (2022). Income inequality, the World Values Survey, and the interaction of cultural dimensions. *Applied Econometrics and International Development*, 22(2), 5-24.
14. Finseraas, H. (2009). Income inequality and demand for redistribution: A multilevel analysis of European public opinion. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 32(1), 94-119.

15. Fredman, S., Kuosmanen, J., & Campbell, M. (2016). Transformative equality: Making the sustainable development goals work for women. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 30(2), 177-187.
16. Goldin, C. (2006). The quiet revolution that transformed women's employment, education, and family. *American economic review*, 96(2), 1-21.
17. Gul, A., Khan, I. H., Safdar, S., & Redjil, A. (2026). Impact of Climate Change on Energy and Health: Poverty Multivariate Decomposition Analysis Using Evidence From Pakistan DHS 2012-2018. In *Advancing Climate Change Mitigation and Resilience Through Innovation and Policy* (pp. 93-124). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
18. Gul, A., Khan, S. U., & Abbasi, R. A. (2023). Vicious Circle of Health Expenditure: Time Series Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Contemporary Macroeconomic Issues*, 4(1).
19. Gul, A., Shabeer, M. G., Abbasi, R. A., & Khan, A. W. (2022). Africa's poverty and famines: Developmental projects of China on Africa. *Perennial journal of history*, 3(1), 165-194.
20. Gul, A., Zahra, F., Iqbal, A., Ghaffoor, T., & Hussain, M. (2020). Linkage between poverty, inequality, and income distribution: a case on Bannu District, Pakistan. *Asian Dev Policy Rev*, 8(4), 330-9.
21. Hu, Y. (2023). The Impact of Gender and Inequality Perception on Subjective Well-being An Empirical Study Based on World Values Survey. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 178, p. 01018). EDP Sciences.
22. Inglehart, R. (1997). Modernization, postmodernization and changing perceptions of risk. *International Review of Sociology*, 7(3), 449-459.
23. Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge University Press.
24. Jamal, F., Zhijun, Y., Khan, U. U., Zubair, M., Ahmad, S., Sultan, F., & Ullah, I. (2024). The impact of finance, infrastructure and training on the performance of SMEs in Pakistan. *South Asian J Soc Stud Econ*, 21(4), 4.
25. Jayachandran, S. (2020). *Social norms as a barrier to women's employment in developing countries* (No. w27449). National Bureau of Economic Research.
26. Kenworthy, L., & McCall, L. (2008). Inequality, public opinion and redistribution. *Socio-Economic Review*, 6(1), 35-68.
27. Khan, U. S., Khan, Z. M., & Gul, A. (2023). Democracy's Role in Shaping Pakistan's Economic Growth: An Empirical Evidence from Pakistan. *International Journal of Contemporary issues in social sciences*, 2(3), 356-367.
28. Kozal, Ö. E., & Günal, G. G. (2023). Kicking Away the Ladder or Not? Unraveling Income Inequality Perceptions in the World. *Ege Academic Review*, 23(4), 709-726.
29. Meltzer, A. H., & Richard, S. F. (1981). A rational theory of the size of government. *Journal of political Economy*, 89(5), 914-927.
30. Moene, K. O., & Wallerstein, M. (2003). Earnings inequality and welfare spending: A disaggregated analysis. *World Politics*, 55(4), 485-516.
31. Muhammad, N., Khan, Z. U., Iqbal, M. A., Ullah, I., & Ahmad, N. (2025). Impact of Energy Consumption and Economic Growth on Environmental Degradation: Evidence from South Asian Countries. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 14(1), 320-334.
32. Nakagawa, S., & Schielzeth, H. (2013). A general and simple method for obtaining R<sup>2</sup> from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in ecology and evolution*, 4(2), 133-142.
33. Piketty, T. (2013). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*.
34. Rothstein, B. (2011). *The quality of government: Corruption, social trust, and inequality in international perspective*. University of Chicago Press.

35. Safdar, S., Gul, A., & Khan, S. U. (2026). The Role of Green Finance in Advancing Sustainable Development: An Analysis of Financial Instruments and Their Impact on Economic and Environmental Goals. In *Green Policies for a Sustainable World* (pp. 295-330). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
36. Shahid S, Ullah, I., & Munib, (2025). Asian Countries Analysis on Climate Change Impact on Growth of Economy and Food Security. *Review of Economic Trends*, 2(2), 11-21.
37. Smith, A. (1776). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*.
38. Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future*. WW Norton & Company.
39. Tabellini, G. (2008). Institutions and culture. *Journal of the European Economic association*, 6(2-3), 255-294.
40. Ullah, I., Nosheen, M., Shah, K. R., & Ahmad, N. (2023). Nexus between economic growth, energy consumption and environmental degradation: empirical evidence from economic cooperation organization countries. *PAKISTAN ISLAMICUS (An International Journal of Islamic & Social Sciences)*, 3(2), 310-334.
41. Uslaner, E. M. (2002). The moral foundations of trust. Available at SSRN 824504.
42. Welzel, C., & Inglehart, R. (2005). Liberalism, postmaterialism, and the growth of freedom. *International Review of Sociology*, 15(1), 81-108.
43. Zafar, S., Ullah, I., Khan, K. S., & Khattak, H. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Patents and Economic Growth: A Growth Framework for OECD Countries. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 14(4), 35-44.

Appendixes:



Figure 6: 3D representation of Gender Equality, Economic inequality and Cultural






Figure 7: Effect of the Scale and Education effects



**Figure 8: Interaction Term and conditional Marginal Effects**



**Figure 9: Coefficient Comparison with and without interaction**




Figure 10: Margins Effect Main model




Figure 11: Margins Effect with interaction Term




Figure 12: Marginal Effect of Gender Equality by Economic inequality




Figure 13: Random Effect with SE