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ABSTRACT

Gender inequalities have received increased attention over the last century largely because of the international women's movement. While research demonstrates that social, economic, political, and personal indicators influence gender role attitudes, less attention has been paid to contextual-level variables. I studied cross-national differences in gender role attitudes among individuals in 39 countries, all with diverse socio-economic, political, and religious backgrounds. In particular, I explained the effects of welfare state effort and type of welfare state regime on gender role attitudes. I found that measures of the welfare state have a significant, negative effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes. In addition, I found that almost all of the contextual-level variables have a significant effect on attitudes towards gender roles outside of the home. Therefore, I argue that individual effects alone cannot account for cross-national differences in attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere.
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INTRODUCTION

Throughout the past few decades, a women’s movement seeking equality on economic, political, and personal fronts has challenged traditional gender roles. This international movement has made substantial strides in the twentieth century, but the struggle for equality in attitudes, as well as in behavior, is far from over. An increasing proportion of women (married and single) entering the labor force, decreasing fertility rates, rising divorce rates, an increasing proportion of female-headed households, as well as high inflation rates, have all contributed to the changing roles of women throughout the world (Morgan and Walker 1983). Traditional gender roles that place women within the home and family have been challenged in most societies throughout the past few decades; however, many traditional beliefs are still maintained (Chafetz and Dworkin 1986). The extent of conservativeness of these gender role attitudes varies across countries and groups of individuals (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993; Crompton and Harris 1997; O’Conner, Orloff, and Shaver 1999).
There are a few sociological studies that look at gender role attitudes, however these studies lack some key components. Most prior research, such as Baxter and Kane (1995), Crompton and Harris (1997), and Treas and Widmer (2000), have looked at only a handful of countries. In addition, these countries are almost always Western and industrialized. Moreover, studies that have used a scale to measure gender role attitudes have examined these attitudes from a perspective of appropriate roles within the home, such as Morgan and Walker (1983), or a general combination of roles within both public and private spheres, such as Baxter and Kane (1995) and Crompton and Harris (1997), rather than focusing on gender roles specifically within the public sphere. Furthermore, prior research has rarely included contextual variables in analyses. The inclusion of contextual variables is an integral part of a cross-national comparison of gender role attitudes because country-specific environments and historical experiences generate distinct national cultures (i.e. attitudes, values, morals, and norms) (Treas and Widmer 2000). Finally, analyses of cross-national differences in gender role attitudes have not empirically incorporated information from previous studies of gender and the welfare state. There has been no previous empirical analysis exploring the role that the type of welfare state regime may play in affecting the attitudes of that country.

In this thesis, I examine cross-national differences in gender role attitudes in thirty-nine countries. In an increasingly global world it is important to include a wide variety of countries, not just Western and industrialized
countries. My sample includes countries with diverse political, economic, and religious systems and histories. In addition, by building on previous research, I will propose a new scale for measuring gender role attitudes that focuses on appropriate roles for women and men within the public sphere (politics, business, etc.). The complexity of gender role attitudes makes separating the dependent variable into categories, such as gender roles within the public sphere as opposed to in the home, necessary. In the future, I hope to include two dependent variables in this study, one measuring gender role attitudes in the public sphere and the other in the private sphere. However, for the scope of this research analysis I will focus exclusively on gender role attitudes in the public sphere.

Incorporating contextual effects into this analysis will highlight the structural and cultural roots of gender role attitudes. Previous research has theoretically discussed the influence of the welfare state on gender role attitudes, and I intend to empirically analyze this relationship. The data I utilize come from several different sources, including the World Values Survey (1995), the World Development Report (1990-1995), and the Women in Development Index (1990-1995), among others. A large cross-national analysis will allow me to look at both individual and contextual sources of gender role attitudes.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Every society bases at least some of their social organization on
gender. However, the extent and form of this organization varies greatly across
countries. Ideas about gender roles and the expectations associated with those
roles have some roots in culturally specific histories, mythologies, folklore, and
political systems (Treas and Widmer 2000). Due to the cultural variability of
gender roles and their associated attitudes, it is necessary to engage in a cross-
national analysis in order to fully understand the complex array of influencing
factors (Schlegel 1996).

**Attitudes**

Attitudes about gender roles are, of course, attitudes, and the study of
attitudes has a long and rich history in sociological research. With such an
abundant, and often times diverse, collection of studies, there has been
extensive debate over everything from the definition of attitudes, to how to
measure them, and even to the implications attitudes can have on behavior (Hill
1992). Daniel Katz (1960: 168) defines attitudes as “the predisposition of the
individual to evaluate some symbol or object or aspect of his world in a
favorable or unfavorable manner.” Although this is a popular definition of
attitudes, Richard Hill (1992) notes that there are conceptual disagreements
about the definition of attitudes. For example, Gergen (1974:620) notes that
an attitude is “the disposition to behave in particular ways toward specific objects,” while Edwards (1957:2) offers that an attitude is “the degree of positive or negative affect associated with some psychological object.” Although the operationalization of attitudes differs depending on the researcher's school of influence, I will rely on Katz's (1960) definition in this analysis. These conceptual disagreements, however, are not the only area of debate within the study of attitudes.

Another issue in the study of attitudes concerns methodological problems in measurement. According to Hill (1992: 348), “there remains little or no consensus on which, if any, of these techniques is most appropriate for use when a substantive issue is of central concern.” Thurstone (1928) suggests using a set of 25-30 opinion statements, each of which is assigned a value, and then the average of all of the values is taken as the respondents' final score on the attitude scale. Other researchers, such as Herek (1987), rely on the respondents to self-report their attitudes. In his study on the functions of attitudes, Herek (1987) asks undergraduate students to write essays on their attitudes towards gays and lesbians. Through content analysis, Herek analyzes these essays, coding them for specific attitude patterns. Most scholars, however, approach the measurement of individuals' attitudes by locating them at some point on a continuum (Hill 1992). Based on this discussion, I have chosen to follow a model similar to Thurstone’s (1928) and have created a gender role attitude scale using scores from opinion statements found in the
World Values Survey (1995). This general discussion of attitudes, however, can be more finely tuned to a discussion concerning attitudes specifically about gender roles.

**Gender Role Attitudes**

In addition to the general sociological work on attitudes, there are several studies that have focused specifically on attitudes pertaining to gender roles (Morgan and Walker 1983; Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983; Baxter and Kane 1995; Panayotova and Brayfield 1997; Crompton and Harris 1997; Treas and Widmer 2000). These previous studies suggest two relevant issues for the current project: the indicators used to create a gender role attitude scale and the independent variables included in each analysis.

In examining prior studies on gender role attitudes, I have found that researchers rely on an index or scale, comprised of anywhere from 3 to 8 questions, to measure attitudes towards gender roles. The previous literature offers a few different models by which gender role attitudes can be measured.

One approach, taken by previous researchers, is to concentrate solely on women and men's roles within the home. For example, Morgan and Walker (1983) employ a scale that concentrates on the wife/mother role for women versus women as paid workers. Their scale is comprised of five questions: one concentrating on whether or not it is a problem if a woman earns more than her husband, and the other four pertaining to the effect women working outside the
home has on the family. This scale measures gender role attitudes by looking at women’s roles within the home and how these roles are affected by women’s participation in the paid labor force.

A second type of scale used by previous researchers to measure gender role attitudes combines questions pertaining to women and men’s roles within the home with questions related to their roles in the public sphere. Baxter and Kane (1995) include only three questions in their scale, but the questions cover a very diverse ground of issues concerning gender roles. Their first question measures attitudes regarding the traditional arrangement of men as breadwinners and women as housewives. The second question gages attitudes about the division of housework, while the third concerns sex representation in politics and business. This scale covers the spectrum of the public and private lives of women and their acceptable roles. Another example is Crompton and Harris’ (1997) study that uses two different scales to compare gender role attitudes in Britain, Norway, and the Czech Republic. Their first scale combines three questions measuring attitudes about the domestic consequences of women in the labor force. The second scale measures attitudes towards the gendered division of labor. Since there are many aspects of gender role attitudes and expectations (i.e. public vs. private), these researchers divide the questions into two separate scales. As well as using two separate gender role attitude scales as their dependent variables, this is one of two previous cross-national comparisons of gender role attitudes that examine a non-Western
country (the Czech Republic). The only other study to do so is Panayotova and Brayfield’s (1997) study comparing attitudes towards employment in the U.S. and Hungary.

A final possible method of measuring gender role attitudes is to concentrate solely on gender roles outside of the home. However, I have found no examples in previous research that concentrate exclusively on questions related to attitudes concerning appropriate gender roles outside of the home. With an increasing number of women entering the labor force, lower fertility rates, and rising divorce rates, women are leaving the confines of the home and entering the public sphere in large numbers. This more recent trend makes the concentration on gender role attitudes in the public sphere extremely relevant to modern day society.

Most researchers (Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983; Panayotova and Brayfield 1997; Treas and Widmer 2000) focus on attitudes towards women's roles within the home or a combination of their private and public roles. Topics such as the effect of working mothers on the home and family or the division of housework have been the foci of previous scales measuring gender role attitudes. Although important, these scales do not address issues concerning gender roles solely in the public sphere, regardless of their effect on the family. Although Baxter and Kane (1995) include a measure of attitudes towards women in politics, it is in combination with questions measuring attitudes towards women's roles within the home. This single question,
although valid and reliable, does not provide a complete picture of women's roles within the public sphere. Crompton and Harris (1997) attempt to address this issue by employing two scales as their dependent variables. Their second scale addresses issues of appropriate public roles for women, however, it does so in relation to its affect on their roles within the home and family.

**Explaining Gender Role Attitudes**

**Individual-Level Factors:**

While employing different scales to measure the dependent variable (gender role attitudes), many studies do share the use of several common independent variables to explain gender role attitudes. Most previous studies on gender role attitudes look at individual-level factors affecting such attitudes. I break down the influential factors at the individual level into three subcategories: personal resources, demographic characteristics, and religious/religiosity characteristics.

**Personal Resources:**

According to Baxter and Kane (1995), resources at the individual level show how independent and self-sufficient a person is. The amount of resources one has determines her/his position in the societal power hierarchy. Wealth and resources equal power, and power affects one's representation in and control
over the societal structure in which they live. Individuals are influenced by their environments (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993). Therefore, personal resources such as education, marital status, labor force participation, and social class, factors that help make up one's social environment, affect the ways in which individuals view and experience gender, in turn affecting their attitudes concerning appropriate gender roles.

Previous literature (such as: Morgan and Walker 1983; Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983; Banaszak and Plutzer 1993; Baxter and Kane 1995) has shown that two of the most important factors shaping one's gender role attitudes are education and employment status. Individuals with higher education are more likely to be exposed to alternative gender roles. Also, women with higher levels of education tend to have more employment opportunities. Exposure in professional settings gives women (and men) first hand experience with gender inequities (Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983).

However, according to Banaszak and Plutzer (1993), education may not matter when controlling for labor force participation because, as they see it, the key role of education is in determining future occupational status. I feel that both variables, however, are important to include in my analyses.

Women who are employed and men who are married to women in the paid labor force are more likely to have less rigid gender role attitudes than women who stay at home and men whose wives don't work. Women who work outside the home are exposed to alternatives to traditional gender roles more
than women who are not involved in the paid labor force (Morgan and Walker 1983). Similarly, women who work outside the home are exposed to direct experience with gender inequalities in hiring, earnings, and promotion (Davis and Robinson 1991). Work also increases women's economic independence, thereby decreasing their economic reliance on men, and leading to greater (purchasing) power in society (Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983; Banaszak and Plutzer 1993; Baxter and Kane 1995). Little attention has been paid to the effect of men's employment on gender role attitudes mainly because employment for men is considered a norm (Davis and Robinson 1991).

However, I believe that employment exposes men to women's capabilities in the work force and can dispel myths about women's incompetence working outside of the home. Previous literature has found both participation in the paid labor force and higher levels of education to have a negative affect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes.

Women of higher socio-economic classes not only tend to have higher levels of education, but also have more resources for alternatives to child care and housekeeping, thus freeing them from their traditional responsibilities to the home and family. Previous literature has found that belonging to the upper classes has a negative effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes for both women and men (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993; Baxter and Kane 1995). However, Davis and Robinson (1991) offer a competing hypothesis based on the underdog thesis. This hypothesis predicts that members of disadvantaged
groups are not only more aware of inequalities, but are more active in trying to change these inequalities than members of privileged groups. In other words, belonging to lower class groups would have a negative effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes.

Morgan and Walker (1983) and Baxter and Kane (1995) have found that married and cohabiting people are more likely to have more invested in the traditional division of labor when compared to divorced, single, and widowed people. Women and men in traditional marriages may have more at stake in holding on to conservative gender role attitudes, with men as breadwinners and women as homemakers. Single, widowed, and divorced women, often times out of necessity, are part of the paid labor force and less economically dependent on men, both of which may contribute to more egalitarian gender role attitudes. Although Morgan and Walker’s 1983 study is not cross-national, I feel that there is enough evidence to support applying this theory to cross-national analyses.

**Demographic Characteristics:**

Individuals’ reaction to their social environment depends on their own status (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993). The ways in which one perceives society are affected by her/his experience in that society, much of which is determined by their demographic characteristics. Previous research has found demographic
characteristics such as sex, political affiliation, age and geographical location (urban vs. rural) to be significant.

One’s sex, being female or male, has a large effect on one’s experiences from birth. Men, socialized from an early age to be productive, wage-earning members of society, tend to see their role as predominantly in the public sphere (Chafetz 1980; Chafetz 1999). Women are also socialized early in childhood to become wives and mothers. Although progress is being made, people have been socialized for hundreds of years that men are breadwinners and women are wives and mothers (Chafetz 1980). Previous research, such as Thornton, Alwin, Camburn (1983), Banaszak and Plutzer (1993), Baxter and Kane (1995), Crompton and Harris (1997), and Panayotova and Brayfield (1997), finds that being female has a negative affect on conservative gender role attitudes. In other words, women tend to hold more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles than men. Age has also been found to be a very significant variable in predicting attitudes about appropriate gender roles. Older generations tend to be more conservative and traditional, especially with gender roles, than younger generations. On the political front, liberal and leftist politics have a long history of supporting gender equity, while individuals with more conservative political affiliations tend to advocate traditional “family values.” A person who identifies as liberal or leftist is less likely to hold conservative gender role attitudes (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993). Finally, individuals living in urban areas are more likely to have access to and be exposed to diverse ideas.
and lifestyles. They are also more likely to work outside of the home because the higher cost of living in urban versus rural areas, all of which contribute to more egalitarian gender role attitudes (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993).

**Religious Characteristics:**

Religious institutions are among the most powerful institutional constants cross-nationally. Most organized religions reinforce traditional gender roles. In fact, Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) argue that religion has been used to justify the unequal treatment of the sexes and women’s subordinate (traditional) roles for centuries. Religious doctrine usually reinforces, not only women’s secondary role within the church, but also the importance of their primary roles as wife and mother. Definitions of womanhood and manhood are constantly being reiterated throughout religious doctrine. These definitions often center on traditional roles for both women and men (women as wives and mothers and men as breadwinners).

Previous literature, such as Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn (1983) and Banaszak and Plutzer (1993), has included indicators for religious identification and for whether or not the respondent feels they are a religious person. Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) find that religious identification has a weak, positive relationship with conservative gender role attitudes and the indicator used to measure religiosity was found to be insignificant. In order to measure religiosity among individuals, Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) relied on a question
that asks respondents if they identify as a religious person or not. This variable, however, was not significant in the researchers' analysis of pro-feminist attitudes.

**Summary:**

Previous research on gender role attitudes has found that education and participation in the labor force have a significant negative effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes. In other words, higher education and participation in the paid labor force should correlate with more egalitarian gender role attitudes. Previous research has also found that being female and living in urban areas has a negative effect on conservative attitudes. The results of prior inquiries on the effects of social class are split. One hypothesis is that those belonging to the upper classes will hold more egalitarian gender role attitudes because of their greater amounts of resources to pursue alternatives to traditional gender roles. A competing theory is that those belonging to disadvantaged groups (i.e. working and lower classes) are more aware of inequalities and have more at stake in changing existing structural inequalities than those belonging to privileged groups. By including a measure of social class I intend to test both hypotheses.

Previous research has found several individual-level variables to have a positive effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes. Identifying with an organized religion, holding highly religious beliefs, being married, and age
have been found to have positive and significant effects on the conservatism of
gender role attitudes. Due to the constraints of my dataset, I am not able to
include a variable for political affiliation in this analysis. The data did have a
self-reported measure of Left-Right placement, but this data was missing in over
40% of the countries sampled. I will include all of the indicators found by
previous research to be important, and I expect to replicate these findings.

*Explaining Gender Role Attitudes*

**Contextual-Level Factors:**

Contextual level variables are important in this analysis because they
highlight the structural and cultural roots of gender role attitudes. Previous
research has found that cross-national differences in gender role attitudes cannot
be accounted for by individual characteristics alone (Banaszak and Plutzer
1993). In what follows, I distinguish 5 types of contextual-level factors.
Somewhat rooted in existing theories and literature, the five groups of
contextual-level factors examined here are: economic characteristics, population
characteristics, political characteristics, religious characteristics, and measures
of welfare state effort.

**Economic and Population Characteristics:**
The social and economic composition of a society has important consequences for gender role attitudes (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993). Individuals in economically well-off countries are less consumed by day-to-day survival than those in developing nations. Consequently, these individuals often live in countries that are more likely to engage in theoretical discourse that challenge traditional gender role ideologies. Demographic composition of a society influences the types of issues relevant in any given country. Economic and population characteristics of a society, therefore, influence the ways in which gender is constructed and experienced (Chafetz 1980).

A few of the aforementioned studies include contextual-level variables in their analyses. Two of these variables are the ratio of female to male economic activity and the ratio of female to male third level students. According to Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) and Treas and Widmer (2000), the ratio of women compared to men in the labor force provides an indicator of women’s status and opportunities. Treas and Widmer (2000) find that a country that has a relatively equal amount of women and men in the paid labor force would tend to offer women more alternatives to the roles of wife and mother. Also, children who grow up seeing women as part of the paid labor force should be socialized with more egalitarian gender role attitudes than children in countries where women are discouraged (or barred) from paid work. Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) argue that the ratio is an indicator of women’s economic dependence on men because it highlights the proportion of women in the country that do not work and
therefore are economically tied to another person (usually a husband or father). However, contrary to their initial hypothesis, Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) find that people who live in regions where a large percent of women work tend not to support feminist ideologies.

The rate of female to male third level (tertiary) students is also an indicator of women’s status. In the global world, where information is a valuable resource, higher education empowers people and gives them a chance to compete in a global market. Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) maintain that the greater the number of women in higher education, the more women that society should see entering the paid workforce, and the more the society becomes infused with female role models in alternative positions. In addition, a larger pool of highly educated women means more women with personal resources to facilitate change within gender role structures. For example, a society with highly educated women may witness the formation of more organizations involved in creating public support for women’s equality in both the public and private spheres. These two variables, included in previous studies, are important indicators of women’s dependence on men and society’s exposure to alternative role models and opportunities.

Two other factors that are important in the lives of women are fertility rates and religiosity. Baxter and Kane (1995) argue that fertility rates can show how tied women are to the home and how dependent they are on men for their daily survival. Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) contend that religiosity of the
country is also a telling indicator of the society’s latent attitudes, values, and morals. Most organized religions reinforce traditional gender roles; therefore, greater numbers of religious people should correlate with more conservative gender role attitudes. Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) note that religion and religious institutions have great implications for politics and gender attitudes. Therefore, increased secularization should be correlated to less traditional or conservative gender role ideologies. However, Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) found the aggregated religiosity measure to have no significant affect.

Unemployment rates have been included in prior studies (but not studies on gender role attitudes) as a measure of economic distress. High levels of unemployment create greater competition for resources (jobs). The economic distress and resulting competition for scarce resources limits the job opportunities, which I believe will cause many individuals to view women entering the paid labor force as taking jobs away from men. Therefore, as the level of economic distress increases, the more conservative I expect gender role attitudes to be.

Another economic characteristic I believe to be important is the degree of development of the country. Industrialization and development affect what resources are available, how much information is being disseminated to the public, and how individuals experience their environment. Women’s roles differ depending on the development (or lack thereof) of the country (i.e. whether or not they are responsible for spending their entire morning fetching
water for daily survival). Without certain luxuries, women’s roles revolve more around tasks necessary for survival, and therefore gender roles will tend to reflect more conservative ideas tying women to the home and family.

A final indicator measuring population characteristics is the percent of the total population that are women. According to Guttentag and Secord (1983), skewed sex ratios have an effect on gender attitudes and relations. More women than men causes greater competition among women to find a husband. Women in these situations tend to become more traditional and conservative in order to compete for the role of wife and mother. The opposite is true when there are more men than women because the competition is not as fierce and women can afford to follow their own desires.

**Welfare State and Gender:**

Upon examining the previous literature I have found that a theoretical relationship exists between the degree of conservatism of gender role attitudes and the welfare state and state policies in general. Although many mainstream scholars simply assume that the role of the welfare state is to promote a more egalitarian society, others argue that it, in fact, is a catalyst for reproducing patriarchy by enforcing policies that tie women to the home and family (Orloff, 1993). Based on the research by Orloff (1993), I surmise that depending on how the welfare state is structured, it can both aide in making society more egalitarian or work to reproduce patriarchy. This occurs through the inclusion
or exclusion of women within the social policies of the welfare state. Traditionally, the welfare state privileges full time workers over those who do unpaid or part-time work (Orloff 1993). Unless social policies exist enabling women to enter the labor force, it is men who are privileged in this system.

In her analysis of gender and the welfare state, Orloff (1993) examines welfare state regimes through a gender lens. Using 5 Western countries and regimes as examples, she shows how state policies can affect gender relations, most especially women entering the labor force. Orloff (1993) adds two more dimensions to Esping-Andersen’s (1990) model of welfare state regimes. The significance of this addition is to highlight the neglect by previous researchers to include gender in analyzing the welfare state. In a separate analysis, O’Connor (1993) also includes gender in a comparative analysis of welfare state regimes by reexamining Esping-Andersen’s three dimensions/types of welfare states with a gender perspective. O’Connor (1993) notes that most comparative studies of the welfare state do not look at gender, while most feminist analyses of the welfare state are not comparative.

No analysis of gender and the welfare state extends their research to the study of attitudes. The welfare state, with its ascribed social policies, creates a social environment based on what the laws/policies highlight as important. For example, the welfare state throughout much of Scandinavia provides families with universal childcare. In doing this, the state is making it clear that women are welcome in the workforce and, in fact, the state enables
this by providing these services. This should create a social environment in which people are socialized to believe women should be part of the paid labor force, thereby having a large effect on the society’s attitudes. This potential connection between the welfare state and gender role attitudes has been left virtually untouched by sociologists. Therefore, I intend to include variables measuring the welfare state as a possible explanation for national differences in gender role attitudes.

**Political and Religious Characteristics:**

In addition to the contextual variables mentioned above, variables measuring political and religious characteristics of the countries are important. Political, ideological, and institutional differences among countries are important indicators of the economic, political, and social regimes (Treas and Widmer 2000). These differences affect the ways in which people experience gender. I include a measure for the percent of women in lower level government positions and the presence of a Left Party. I hypothesize that those countries with more women occupying seats in the government will have individuals that hold more egalitarian gender role attitudes. Visibility of women in important political and decision-making positions provides society with evidence of women’s competency in public matters, as well as role models of women in non-traditional positions. Another political indicator is the presence of a Left party in the political structure of a country’s government. The
presence of a Left party is an indicator of the availability of support for issues affecting gender roles (and especially women) in policy making. Left parties have historically supported feminist ideals, and with an active Left party in the political structure, I believe that more attention will be paid to women's rights, therefore causing gender role attitudes in these countries to be more egalitarian.

Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) include a measure of religiosity at the country level as an aggregate measure of individuals' attitudes towards the importance of religion in their daily lives. They hypothesize that countries where the political structure is infused with the dominant religious institution often base their gender role attitudes and policies that effect gender on these religious doctrines. However, Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) find that the variable measuring the mean religiosity is insignificant.

Summary:

Research on explanatory measures affecting gender role attitudes has been conducted primarily at the micro-level. However, there are a handful of studies that discuss the effects of contextual-level variables, although principally on a theoretical basis. Women's labor force participation and the ratio of female/male tertiary students have been found to have a negative effect on gender role attitudes (become more egalitarian), while the effect of fertility rates and religiosity is positive (become more traditional). Previous studies (not on gender role attitudes) have included unemployment rates as measures of
economic distress. I predict that as the level of this distress increases, attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere will become more conservative, mainly because the competition for jobs will create a feeling of resentment towards women in the paid labor force (i.e. women taking jobs away from men). In addition, I will test for the effect of countries’ mean level of religiosity on gender role attitudes. I expect this variable to have a positive effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes.

Previous research has theoretically discussed the importance of the welfare state in shaping attitudes about gender roles. According to some researchers, such as Orloff (1993), O’Connor (1993), and O’Connor, Orloff, Shaver (1999), gender has been affected by the structuring of the welfare state from the beginning. However, previous literature has not examined this relationship empirically. I empirically examine theories of gender and the welfare state in order to analyze the effect of welfare state regimes and state policies on attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere. I explore this using two separate variables measuring welfare state effort. I expect these variables to have a negative effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes.

In addition to the variables mentioned above, I will include social context variables that have not been included in previous research on gender role attitudes. I will include variables measuring the economic, demographic, political, and religious characteristics of the countries included in this study. I expect that the variables measuring the percent of women in lower-level
government positions, the percent of the total population that are women, energy consumption per capita, and a dummy variable for whether or not there is a Left party will all have negative effects on attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere.
DATA AND METHODS

The previous literature on gender role attitudes suggests several sets of variables as possible explanations for gender role attitudes. Based on this research I have identified a number of variables to include in my analysis. In addition, I include some contextual level variables based in gender stratification theory and work on gender and the welfare state. The independent variables can be divided into two main categories: individual level and contextual variables. These two categories can be broken down further into seven sub-categories: demographic characteristics, personal resources, religious characteristics, economic characteristics, population characteristics, political and religious characteristics, and welfare state effort. The dependent variable is a scale comprised of three questions. The selection of these three questions is based on previous studies, confirmatory factor analysis, and theoretical support.

The dataset I use to obtain the individual-level variables and the questions comprising the scale for the dependent variable is the 1995 World Values Survey. The 1995 wave of this survey was conducted in over 50 independent countries. The survey includes both women and men, and is
representative of the world's population (i.e.: class, race, religion, etc.).

Contextual level variables used in this analysis have been collected from the World Development Indicators (1999 and 2000), the United Nations Statistics Division (Web page 2000), UNESCO (Web page 2000), WISTAT (Version 4), Derbyshire (1996), and the International Labour Organization (Website 2000).

*Dependent Variable*

The dependent variable in my analysis is a scale measuring attitudes toward appropriate gender roles. When a concept cannot be directly observed, it is most beneficial to identify a set of indicators, rather than a single indicator, which would be related to the latent, theoretical concept, could it be examined (Przeworski and Tenue 1970). Gender role attitudes are based on a complex set of ideas about appropriate roles for women and men in all aspects of life. Therefore, creating a scale of gender role attitudes can be approached in a few different ways.

In this thesis, I propose a new scale, building on the work of previous researchers, but concentrating specifically on attitudes towards appropriate gender roles for women outside the home. To provide a better picture of attitudes concerning gender roles in the public sphere I have created an index, comprised of three questions, measuring such attitudes. My index covers women's participation in tertiary education, women's competency in political positions, and women's abilities in the paid labor force. The attitudes measured in these three questions relate to appropriate gender roles in these three sectors of the public sphere, without
regard to the affect on the home and family. The questions that comprise the index are designed to measure the respondents’ views on appropriate roles for women (and to some degree men) outside the home. Table 1.1 shows the exact wording of these three questions.

**MENJOBS:** When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women

**MENUNIV:** A university education is more important for a boy than a girl

**MENPOL:** On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do

Table 1.1: Exact Questions used in Gender Role Attitudes Scale

*Source: World Values Survey (1995)*

For the statements regarding women in politics and university educations, respondents were asked if they strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, or strongly agree with each of the statements listed above. For the statement concerning job priorities during times of economic distress, respondents were asked if they agreed, disagreed, or felt neither. I
coded all statements so that a higher score equals more conservative gender role attitudes.

The resulting index ranges from 0 (corresponding to egalitarian gender role attitudes) to 8 (corresponding to very conservative gender role attitudes). The majority of the cases range between 2 and 4, although individuals fall within the entire range of this variable.

In creating a scale to measure an abstract concept across multiple countries there are two important factors to pay attention to: selecting indicators that properly measure the latent concept and making sure that these indicators are consistently interpreted across countries. One very beneficial way of assuring cross-national comparability is through factor analysis. After running both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses with a total of 11 questions, I have determined that three of the questions fit nicely into a scale regarding attitudes towards appropriate gender roles outside the home. Table 1.2 shows the factor loading scores for the three questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Component</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MENPOL</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MENUNIV</td>
<td>0.7164</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MENJOBS</td>
<td>0.6104</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Exploratory Factor Analysis for Gender Role Attitude Index
All three variables have factor loading scores above .70, which is a standard cutoff point for indexes. The question regarding men making better political leaders than women has the highest factor loading score (.778), but all three have high enough scores to be considered a good fit for this index. Table 2 shows the operationalization, mean, range, and standard deviation for this index. Although reliability increases with the more variables added to an index, due to data constraints, I have only three variables dealing with women and men’s roles outside the home.

Independent Variables

I will incorporate the variables found by previous research to be important. Although some of the previous literature has explored the importance of contextual-level variables in a comparative analysis of gender role attitudes, these have mostly been theoretical, not empirical, analyses. I empirically examine gender role attitudes from an individual-level as well as from a societal level. This is important to examine the micro and macro-level factors affecting gender role attitudes and their cross-national variation.

Individual-Level:

Individual characteristics, the specific traits and circumstances shaping an individual’s life, have an important bearing on one’s attitudes, values, and morals. Individual-level variables, therefore, are important to include in an
analysis of gender role attitudes. I will include several individual-level variables, most found by previous research to be important. As discussed in the literature review, I will include personal characteristics such as age, sex, and urban/rural location, personal resources such as employment, education, social class, and marital status, as well as religion and religiosity indicators as individual-level variables in this analysis. Although most previous studies have looked at the number of children under 10 living at home, I have chosen not to include this variable because each of these studies have found it to be insignificant (Morgan and Walker 1983; Banaszak and Plutzer 1993; Baxter and Kane 1995).

Geographic location is coded as a dummy variable for whether or not the respondent lives in an urban area. Respondents that indicated they live in areas with a population size of greater than 50,000 are coded as urban, while the rest are coded as rural. Social class is coded as a dummy variable for membership in the working class. Working class respondents are coded as 1 and all other classes are coded as 0. Marital status is also coded as a dummy variable. I combined married and cohabiting respondents, who have a score of 1 for this variable, compared to divorced, single, and widowed people, who have a score of 0. In order to attain a better measure of religiosity, I include three variables dealing with how religious the respondent is. Due to the subjective nature of Banaszak and Plutzer's (1993) indicator, I have added two more variables to get at religiosity. The first variable is a logged measure of the
number of days per year that the respondent attends church. This variable shows the degree to which religious institutions are part of the daily lives of the respondents. The second variable measures how important religion is in the respondent’s daily life, regardless of how often they attend religious services. It is my belief that this variable will get at the individuals who may not physically attend religious services, however base much of their thinking on religious doctrines. By including three variables measuring religiosity I hope to capture the importance of religiosity in determining one’s attitudes towards appropriate gender roles in the public sphere. I hypothesize that these three variables will have a positive, significant relationship on the conservatism of gender role attitudes outside of the home. In other words, the more religious the individual, the more conservative her/his attitudes towards gender roles will be.

I predict that all of these characteristics will have significant influences on the way that individuals experience life both socially and privately. Therefore, they should contribute to the formation of attitudes towards appropriate gender roles in the public sphere. Table 2 shows the operationalization, mean, range, and standard deviation of these variables.

**Contextual-Level:**

In order to best explain cross-national differences in gender role attitudes I will include a number of contextual variables. Some of these variables were chosen based on previous analyses while others are rooted in
existing theories. These variables fall into 4 main groups. Economic characteristics such as the ratio of male to female economic activity, energy consumption per capita, and unemployment rates will be included. Population characteristics such as 3rd level students, religiosity, and fertility rates will also be included. These variables have been shown by previous researchers such as Banaszak and Plutzer 1993, Baxter and Kane 1995, and Treas and Widmer 2000 to be important.

In addition to those found by previous research to be important I include two indicators measuring the political characteristics of the countries. A measure of the percent of women in lower level government positions will be included in this analysis. This is an indicator of women’s roles in society and their access to roles in the public sphere. This variable also correlates directly to one of the questions that is included in the scale comprising my dependent variable. In addition, there has been some previous research on the role that sex ratios of entire populations play in affecting that society (Guttentag and Secord 1983). I will include a measure of the percent of women of the total population because attitudes may be affected when sex ratios are skewed (i.e. more women than men). My sample includes a wide variety of countries and I therefore feel that it is important to include a variable measuring the degree of industrialization and development of each country. Differences among the degree of development of the countries is an important factor in cross-national differences in socio-economic, and even political, structures.
In this thesis I argue that the amount of effort put forth by the welfare state corresponds to the degree to which national policies include women and foster gender equality. Gender differences have been built into the structuring of the welfare state from the beginning (Crompton and Harris 1997).

The state maintains a strong interest in the reproduction and replacement of its population (workforce), and therefore can intervene to try to keep women in the home or by helping women work outside of the home through “family-friendly” policies such as universal childcare and parental leave (Baxter and Kane 1995; Crompton and Harris 1997; Panayotova and Brayfield 1997). I will construct measures of the welfare state based on a similar indicator used by Alexander Hicks (1999). Hicks’ measure is based on the percent of government spending on social services such as health care, as a percent of the GDP.

I include 2 variables in my analysis measuring welfare state effort. One of the variables is the amount of government money spent on health care divided by the total GDP of the country. The second variable is a dummy variable for whether or not the government provides financial compensation for any part of a woman’s maternity leave. I hypothesize that this measure will be the strongest because of its direct correlation to women and their experiences in the public sphere (Orloff 1993). I expect both variables to have a negative
effect on the conservatism of attitudes towards gender roles outside of the home. In other words, the greater the welfare state effort put forth by a country, the more egalitarian will the attitudes towards gender roles be among the individuals in that country.

Finally, since my scale of gender role attitudes will focus on women’s roles outside of the home, I feel it’s important to include an indicator measuring the political regimes of the country, and most especially the presence of women’s rights allies. I will include a measure for the presence of a Left party in the countries’ political regimes. Historically, the Left party has supported feminist issues and equality for women. Countries in which there is an active Left party may be more likely to have an underlying tone of gender equity. It is my belief that these variables will be useful in explaining cross-national differences in gender role attitudes. Table 2 offers the operationalization, mean, range, and standard deviation of the contextual-level variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>OPERATIONALIZATION</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>ST. DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Gender Roles Outside the Home (GENDERATT)</td>
<td>1) Men make better political leaders than women  2) A University education is more important for boys 3) men should have priorities when</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>2.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-Level Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female (1), Male (0)</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Age in Years</td>
<td>2-Digit Age</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>18-95</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location of</td>
<td>Lives in urban area (1), lives in rural</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education</td>
<td>years of educ; truncated categories</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>12-25</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>Yes (1), No (0)</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Yes (1), No (0)</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or Cohabiting</td>
<td>Married/Cohabiting (1), Other (0)</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political and Religious Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Important is Religion in Very Important</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Important is Religion in Not Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days per Year</td>
<td># of Days attended Religious Services per Year (Logged in)</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>0-4.65</td>
<td>1.7129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>Yes (1), No (0)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.3365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Yes (1), No (0)</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.3763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Yes (1), No (0)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.2712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>Yes (1), No (0)</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you Consider Yourself a Religious</td>
<td>Religious (1), Not Religious (0)</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual-Level Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>6.555</td>
<td>0-27.95</td>
<td>4.7812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption</td>
<td>Energy Use per Capita</td>
<td>7.483</td>
<td>5.2-8.9</td>
<td>0.8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Labor Force</td>
<td>% Women in Labor Force (of Total)</td>
<td>40.7925.2-49.8</td>
<td>6.2662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Women</td>
<td>% Women of Total Population</td>
<td>50.91</td>
<td>48-53.7</td>
<td>1.3681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tertiary Education</td>
<td>% Women of Total Tertiary Students</td>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>15.9-57.9</td>
<td>8.6829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility Rate</td>
<td>Fertility Rate</td>
<td>2.527</td>
<td>1.3-6.4</td>
<td>1.1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political and Religious Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Party</td>
<td>Present (1), Not Present (0)</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Government</td>
<td># of Women in Lower-level</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>7.7542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>Aggregated Individual Scores by country for the importance of religion</td>
<td>2.937</td>
<td>1.7-3.9</td>
<td>0.5644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures of Welfare State Effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Expenditures</td>
<td>Public Health Expenditure (% of Government pays for any Maternity</td>
<td>2.986</td>
<td>0.63-7.65</td>
<td>1.6815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.4931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Operationalizations, Means, Range, and Standard Deviations of Dependent and Independent Variables
ANALYSIS

In order to meet the assumptions of multivariate regression analysis, I examined the means and ranges of my variables to ensure good distribution. I found no variables to have an abnormally skewed distribution. Also, based on scatter grams I found that the relationships between each independent variable with the dependent variable were approximately linear. Finally, by checking variance inflation and tolerance, I checked multicolinearity between the independent variables. I found little problem of multicolinearity.

After satisfying the assumptions for multivariate regression analysis I was able to begin specifying my models. My analyses include five models chosen on the basis of previous literature and theory. The first model replicates the individual-level variables used in previous research. In the second model I add the additional individual measures of religiosity, which I theorized would have a significant positive effect on the dependent variable (i.e. attitudes will become more conservative). The third model includes country dummy variables to control for the effect of the individuals coming from the same
country and therefore having similar attitudes. The inclusion of this model shows what effects are from living in any one country and what effects are from the specific contextual level variables included in models 4 and 5. The fourth model includes all of the contextual-level variables except for the measures of welfare state effort, and the final model includes all of the variables. I decided to include all but the welfare state effort variables in the fourth model to highlight the effect of those variables in the fifth model.

In this analysis I approach missing data in three different ways. For the dependent variable I found it necessary to remove two countries because they did not ask two out of the three questions that comprised my scale. Since my scale only had three questions to begin with, I removed the UK and Switzerland, which each only asked one of the three questions. After doing that, the rest of the missing data on the dependent variable was handled through listwise deletion. In other words, individual cases missing values on any of the opinion statements that comprise my scale are deleted from the sample.

I approach the individual and contextual level variables differently in regards to missing data. At the contextual level I did regional mean substitution. For a list of the regional definitions and which variables were replaced please see table A1 in the appendix. Since my analysis began with almost 70,000 respondents, I decided to rely on listwise deletion with the individual level independent variables. Although there are a few drawbacks associated with this method, I am still able to retain a sample size of 38
approximately 40,000. A problem often associated with listwise deletion is the possibility of entirely deleting certain characteristics of the population (i.e. deleting an entire racial or class category). However, I am confident that my large sample size makes the generalizability of my population reliable. For a complete list of possible and actual sample sizes by country please see Table A.2 in the appendix.
FINDINGS

Table 3 shows the regression analysis for the five models using Ordinary Least Squares regression analysis (OLS). There are some interesting patterns within each model as well as across the five models. I will discuss the results of the groups of variables, highlighting the major patterns and other notable findings.

Individual-Level Variables

Demographic Characteristics:

Among the individual-level variables, the respondents' sex is one of the strongest indicators. Being female causes one's attitudes toward gender roles outside of the home to be much more egalitarian than if one is male. This indicator remains strong and highly significant throughout all five models. Even when the contextual variables are added, being female causes gender role attitudes to become more egalitarian by .735 on an 8-point scale (with 8 being the most conservative). Age also remains highly significant throughout the five models, but does not have a large effect size. The direction, however, follows what previous research has found; mainly that as age increases so does the conservatism of gender role attitudes. For each year increase in age, attitudes towards gender roles outside of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-Level Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-718***</td>
<td>-748***</td>
<td>-737***</td>
<td>-734***</td>
<td>-735***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td>0.009***</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Location</td>
<td>-106***</td>
<td>-102***</td>
<td>-098***</td>
<td>-136***</td>
<td>-174***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education</td>
<td>-0.029***</td>
<td>-0.027***</td>
<td>-0.055***</td>
<td>-0.051***</td>
<td>-0.051***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or Cohabiting</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>0.033***</td>
<td>0.093***</td>
<td>0.079***</td>
<td>0.082***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.321***</td>
<td>-0.281***</td>
<td>-0.178***</td>
<td>-0.204***</td>
<td>-0.198***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>-0.128***</td>
<td>-0.081***</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>-0.049***</td>
<td>-0.834***</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-1.07*</td>
<td>1.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>0.768***</td>
<td>0.905***</td>
<td>1.22***</td>
<td>0.185***</td>
<td>0.136***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.899***</td>
<td>0.959***</td>
<td>1.79***</td>
<td>0.565***</td>
<td>0.444***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religious Group</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>0.444***</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.155***</td>
<td>0.105***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Religion in Daily Life</td>
<td>0.182***</td>
<td>0.121***</td>
<td>0.122***</td>
<td>0.117***</td>
<td>0.117***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Per Year Attending Religious Services</td>
<td>0.093***</td>
<td>0.046***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Person</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual-Level Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Female/Male Economic Activity</td>
<td>0.046***</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Use per Capita</td>
<td>-0.371***</td>
<td>-2.13***</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>0.015***</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Female/Male Tertiary Students</td>
<td>-0.07***</td>
<td>0.013***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousity</td>
<td>0.146***</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility Rate</td>
<td>0.123***</td>
<td>0.082***</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women Total Population</td>
<td>0.289***</td>
<td>0.274***</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women in Lower-Level Government</td>
<td>-0.055***</td>
<td>-0.049***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a Left Party</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare State Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Expenditure</td>
<td>-1.168***</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Compensation for Maternity Leave by Government</td>
<td>-0.132***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***P < .001 (two-tailed), **P < .01 (two-tailed), *P < .05 (two-tailed)

Note: Standard Errors in Parentheses

*Model Three includes dummy variables for all countries with Sweden as reference group

***P < .001 (two-tailed), **P < .01 (two-tailed), *P < .05 (two-tailed)

Note: Standard Error in Parentheses

^Model 3 includes dummy variables for all countries with Sweden as the reference group

Table 3.1: Multivariate Ordinary Least Squares Regression Models of Individual and Contextual-Level Variables on Attitudes Towards Gender Roles Outside of the Home
the home become more conservative by .01 on an 8-point scale. Gender role ideologies have changed drastically over the past 50 years.

People born since the resurgence of the women’s movements during the ‘60’s and ‘70’s have come of age during a time that offers a broader array of possibilities and opportunities for women. People born during this time period have had female role models in higher education, politics, and the labor force. Therefore, younger people hold more egalitarian gender role attitudes than older people.

People who live in urban areas (>50,000 people) are more likely to hold egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere than those who live in rural and suburban areas. The effect of this variable increases over the five models indicating that the addition of the contextual-level variables strengthens the effect of geographic location. I believe this is due in part to controlling for economic and political characteristics of the countries. When these issues are controlled, the effect of the region becomes clearer. The diversity of urban areas exposes people to a wide array of ideas and lifestyles. This exposure can lead to individuals being socialized to believe that there are several possible lifestyle choices for women and men. This increased exposure leads to broadened roles for women. According to my model, even when contextual variables are added, people who live in urban areas are more likely to hold more egalitarian gender role attitudes than those who live in rural or
suburban areas. In this case, people who live in urban areas have more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere than those who live in rural areas by .174 on an 8-point scale.

**Personal Resources:**

Education is an important resource in this increasingly global world and economy. In accord with previous studies I found that years of education is a significant indicator of gender role attitudes, with the more highly educated possessing more egalitarian gender role attitudes towards women in the public sphere. The effect of this variable remains significant throughout the five models and increases in strength across them all. In model one the effect of this variable is -.029 and in model five the effect is -.051. In other words, for every year of education, attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere decrease in conservatism by .051. Education exposes women and men to alternative gender roles and offers women employment opportunities, thereby decreasing their economic dependence on men. Banaszak and Plutzer (1993) initially hypothesized that the effect of education would not be significant when controlling for labor force participation, however my findings show otherwise.

Marital status is another important resource that significantly affects gender relations and attitudes towards appropriate roles for women and men in both the public and private spheres. However, the size of this effect is not very large and decreases slightly over the five models. The effect size for people
who are married and people who are cohabiting with a partner, compared to divorced, widowed, and single people is .098 in the first model and decreases slightly with the addition of the contextual variables to .082. Married and cohabiting people hold more conservative attitudes towards gender roles outside of the home than those who are widowed are, divorced, or single, the difference being .082 on an 8-point scale. Not only are the latter almost forced to enter the paid labor force, but women and men who are married or living with a partner have more invested in traditional divisions of labor. Cross-nationally, men’s wages are higher than women’s (even for comparable work), so that people in a traditional marriage would see more sense in men as the breadwinners and women as homemakers. However, people in the paid labor force, even when controlling for marital status, hold more egalitarian gender role attitudes than those who are not employed. Women who work outside of the home are less economically dependent on men; thereby empowering them to break traditional gender role molds and offering them greater power within society. Men who work outside the home are more likely to be in contact with professional women, therefore affecting their attitudes towards women’s abilities in the public sphere. Individuals active in the paid labor force are more likely to hold less rigid attitudes toward gender roles in the public sphere, with an effect size of -.197. In other words, participation in the paid labor force decreases the conservatism of attitudes towards gender roles outside of the home by .197 on an 8-point scale.
Another variable included in these analyses that measure personal resources is status in the working class. At the individual-level, status in the working class is a significant indicator of gender role attitudes, with an effect size of -.081. In other words, members of the working class hold more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere than members of all other classes. The direction of this variable is somewhat surprising. Members of the working class are more likely than other classes to have egalitarian gender role attitudes. This does not follow the findings of most previous literature. There are two possible explanations for this finding. One possibility is the way this variable was coded. It is coded so that working class people are not only being compared to individuals in the upper and middle classes, but the lower classes as well. However, when I ran the analyses with a variable measuring social class that combined working and lower class individuals, the variable was insignificant. A second possible explanation, following the underdog thesis (Davis and Robinson 1991), is that individuals in disadvantaged groups are more likely to be aware of inequalities than those in privileged groups. Not only are people in the working class more exposed to inequalities, but also have more at stake in lessening them. According to this hypothesis, individuals with low incomes or low prestige jobs are more aware of gender inequalities, most especially in the work place. Therefore, members of the working class hold more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere than members of more privileged social classes. The effect,
however, becomes insignificant when the country dummy variables are added; indicating that it's effect is determined by differences across countries in attitudes and class structures.

**Religion and Religiosity:**

Religion is one of the oldest and most influential institutions across the world. Compared to Catholics, Protestants were the only group to hold more egalitarian gender role attitudes. Orthodox, Muslim, and other religious groups all hold more traditional attitudes toward gender roles outside of the home. The effects of these variables are quite strong in the first two models (Protestant, Orthodox and Muslim are all greater than +/- .75); however, once the contextual variables are added their effect dramatically decreases. The effect of being Protestant as opposed to Catholic goes from -1.05 in model 1 to -.138 in model 5. Similarly, being Muslim decreased from .899 in model 1 to .443 in model 5. In model 3, with the inclusion of the country dummy variables, the effect of religious identification is significantly reduced. Religion is often tied closely to the state, and part of what the variables may be picking up in the first two models is differences across countries rather than differences among individuals.

**Except for the variable measuring whether or not the respondent identifies as a religious person, religiosity, or the degree of the importance of religion in the daily lives of the respondents, remains an important and**
significant predictor throughout the five models. The variable measuring whether or not the respondent feels she/he is a religious person is not significant. Banaszak and Plutzer came to the same conclusion in their 1993 analysis of pro-feminist attitudes. The logged variable measuring religiosity by the number of days per year the respondent attends religious services remains at around .059 throughout the five models. The effect of the variable measuring religiosity by the respondent self-reporting how important religion is in her/his daily life is a bit stronger. The greater one sees the importance of religion in their daily lives, the more conservative their attitudes towards gender roles are, with an effect size of .118. In other words, for every level religion increases in importance in an individual’s life, their attitudes towards gender roles outside of the home become more conservative by .118 out of an 8-point scale. The direction of effect supports my hypothesis that greater religiosity indicates more traditional attitudes toward gender roles in the public sphere. The effect of the two significant variables is not altered when the country dummy variables are included; signifying that religiosity in and of itself is an important indicator. Most organized religions encourage traditional gender roles for women and men. In fact, religion (through its emphasis on procreation) has been used to justify women’s responsibility to the home and family for centuries. Therefore, finding the predicted direction of these results is not surprising.
Contextual-Level Variables

In assessing differences in gender role attitudes among the respondents in the World Values Survey (1995), I included several contextual level variables. However, I was also interested in whether or not the effects could be due to differences among countries rather than the specific contextual level variables included in this analysis. In order to test for this relationship, I included country level dummy variables, with Sweden as the reference group. Model 3 in Table 3 shows the results of this analysis. With the addition of the country dummy variables, many of the effect sizes for the individual level variables decreased in strength. The effects of demographic characteristics, however, remained largely the same in effect size and level of significance. Several of the personal resources, on the other hand, decreased in effect size. Status in the paid labor force decreased in size from -.321 in model 1 to -.178 in model 3. This decrease is probably due to the different structures of the paid labor force among countries. Status in the working class became insignificant when the country dummies were added, indicating that its effect is due to differences across countries rather than individuals. The effects of religious affiliation were drastically reduced with the inclusion of the country dummies. In this model, Protestants are no longer significantly different from Catholics, and the same is the case for other religious groups. The effect of being Muslim dropped in strength from .959 in model 2 to .179 in model 3. Likewise, the
effect of being Orthodox dropped from .905 in model 2 to -.122 in model 3. The effect of being Orthodox not only reduced in strength, but also changed direction indicating that compared to Catholics, people who identify as Orthodox have more egalitarian gender role attitudes. The variables measuring religiosity did not change drastically, however, their effect size does decrease slightly. These changes reflect the importance of differences among the countries themselves and show that the effects of the individual level variables are not always due to differences among individuals, but rather differences among the countries.

**Economic Characteristics:**

Cross-nationally, gender is built into the structures of every society. Therefore, country-level data is important in assessing the attitudes towards gender roles among various countries to explain cross-national differences.

Previous research has not empirically considered many contextual-level effects, however, the ratio of female to male economic activity has been found to be an important indicator. Although I found it to be a somewhat weak indicator, with an effect size of .043, it remains highly significant. The direction, however, is somewhat surprising. The greater number of women in the paid labor force, the more conservative are the gender role attitudes of the people in that society. Previous research is split among their findings with this variable with some, such as Banaszak and Plutzer (1993), finding it to have a positive effect on
conservative gender role attitudes, and others, such as Treas and Widmer (2000) finding it to have a negative effect. A possible explanation for this finding is that as more women enter the paid labor force, jobs are being taken away from men, the balance of (purchasing) power becomes more equal, and men are more responsible for activities with the home and children. Historically in the United States, as women began gaining more equality, society experienced a backlash towards gender equality in the 1980’s (Faludi 1991). More women entering the paid labor force causes a shift in traditional roles and responsibilities, which in turn could cause a defensive shift towards more conservative and traditional attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere.

Another surprising finding is that higher unemployment rates correspond with more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles outside of the home. Unemployment rates are a measure of economic distress. I hypothesized that the greater competition for jobs and the higher levels of economic distress would cause people (especially men) to hold more traditional ideas of gender role attitudes, most especially in the public sphere. However, my findings show that the opposite is true. When unemployment increases, women may be forced to enter the labor force in service and menial positions, thereby causing a shift from traditional gender role attitudes mostly out of necessity. The effect size for unemployment rates in model 4 is -.015. However, when measures of the welfare state effort are included, the effect of unemployment rates is no
longer significant. This may be due to mediating or spurious effects such as the structure of the welfare state in response to unemployment.

The final measure of economic characteristics included in my analysis is energy use per capita, a common indicator of country-level industrialization and development. The variable used in this analysis is a logged term. This measure is highly significant and has a strong effect size, however the effect does decrease when measures for the welfare state effort are included. In model 4 the effect size is -.371 and in model 5 it's -.213. The welfare state measures may decrease its effect size because they capture much of the social spending of the country, which can be linked to development as well. Energy use per capita is a measure of development and industrialization. My findings show that countries that are more developed and industrialized hold more egalitarian gender role attitudes than developing nations.

**Population Characteristics:**

Demographic characteristics proved to be significant, yet somewhat weak, indicators of attitudes toward gender roles outside the home. The percent of women involved in tertiary education increases the egalitarian gender role attitudes of individuals within the nation, with an effect size of -.043. A larger pool of highly educated women not only expands the types of role models for children, but also provides a bank of resources in which the women’s movement for equality can be funded. However, the effect size is not very large. For every percent that women’s
participation in tertiary education increases, gender role attitudes decrease in conservatism by .043 out of an 8-point scale.

Religiosity is an important predictor, until the measures of welfare state effort are included, when it becomes an insignificant predictor. The fertility rate of the country is also an important and significant predictor across the models. The higher the fertility rates, the more traditional are the gender role attitudes of the individuals within the country, with an effect size of .082. Fertility rates can show how tied women are to the home. The greater the number of children, the more tied they are to the home, and therefore, the more economically dependent they are on men to provide for them and their children. The strongest predictor among this set of variables is the percent of the total population that are women, with an effect size of .274. Therefore, for every 1% increase in the percent of the population that is women, there is a .274 increase in conservatism of attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere. With more women than men, there is more competition among women for a mate. If women hold the assumption that men are looking for a wife and mother of their children, this situation would cause women to try and fit this mold in order to ensure their future (Guttentag and Secord 1983).

**Political Characteristics:**

The more women that hold positions or seats in the lower-levels of government, the more egalitarian are the gender roles of the population, with an effect size of -.049. Visibility in public positions offers role models to children,
proves competency of women to hold such positions, and gives women a say in policy decisions, which I argue has an effect on attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere. Although feminist and women's organizations are historically aligned with Leftist parties, the presence of a Left party has no significant effect when controlling for all other variables. Since these parties rarely hold any consequential amount of power within countries, the effect of its presence is not significant.

**Welfare State Effort:**

Previous literature has looked at different types of welfare state regimes in relation to gender, but have not empirically studied the welfare state in relation to attitudes towards gender roles. I have found that welfare state effort, as measured by government expenditures and women-friendly policies, have a negative effect on the conservatism of gender role attitudes. Government expenditures on health care is the strongest predictor, with an effect size of -.168. In other words, the more the government spends on health care, the more egalitarian are the gender role attitudes of the population. For every 1% increase in the percent of the GDP spent on health care, attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere decrease in conservatism by .168 on an 8-point scale. Countries that provide health care based on citizenship create an atmosphere where women do not have to be part of the paid labor force or in a traditional marriage to receive health care benefits. This decreases their
economic and social dependence on men. Additionally, countries that provide wage compensation for women during maternity leave have more egalitarian gender role attitudes than those that do not provide such assistance, with an effect size of -.132. This is an example of state policies that enable (or impede) women to enter the labor force, thus increasing their economic independence, which in turn decreases the conservatism of the nation’s attitudes toward gender roles in the public sphere. Welfare states that provide (through state policies) services such as health care, paid maternity leave, and childcare enable, and even encourage, women to enter the paid labor force, thereby increasing their independence. This also creates an environment where children are socialized to believe that women are capable of more than only being wives and mothers.

According to Orloff (1993), policies that directly affect women are more significant in affecting gender relations and roles. My findings follow theories rooted in Orloff’s (1993) work, in that the measures most related to women (health care and maternity leave) are significant in predicting attitudes towards gender roles outside the home.
CONCLUSION

The benefits of studying gender role attitudes cross-nationally are far reaching. Some research shows that attitudes have at least moderate usefulness in predicting behavior (Hill, 1992). There are potential policy implications in studying the roots of gender role attitudes. Policies that promote women’s independence from men, such as those provided by social-democratic welfare states like Sweden and Norway, can help foster more egalitarian attitudes for both women and men (Baxter and Kane, 1995), thereby promoting gender equality on other levels. My study makes a contribution to the existing literature by considering countries that have never before been considered, by proposing a new scale to measure gender role attitudes that builds on existing literature, by introducing several contextual level variables, and by empirically highlighting a potential relationship between welfare states and attitudes.

Welfare state effort, as measured by government expenditures on social services and state policies, has a significant effect on attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere. Welfare states that promote gender equality through female-friendly social policies tend to foster more egalitarian gender role attitudes among its population than those that lack such policies. Scandinavian countries, with universal health care, childcare, and fully paid maternity leave, enable women to enter the workforce, thereby increasing their independence and infusing society with images of women in non-traditional
positions. On the other hand, countries that lack such policies (i.e. the United States) do not foster such egalitarian attitudes among its citizens. The structuring of the welfare state is an important and significant indicator in predicting the conservatism of attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere.

There were several interesting findings at the individual level of this analysis. I found that being female, living in urban areas, being more highly educated, being part of the paid labor force, and being part of the working class all have negative affects on the conservatism of attitudes towards women’s roles in the public sphere. However, once the country dummy variables are added, the effect of one’s membership in the working class becomes insignificant. This indicates that the effect of working class status is determined by differences across countries rather than among individuals. In addition, at the individual level, I found that age, being married or cohabiting, religious affiliation, and religiosity have positive effects on conservative gender role attitudes. However, after the inclusion of the country dummy variables, the effect of religious affiliation and one of the religiosity indicators becomes insignificant. Again, this reflects the importance of differences across countries rather than individuals in determining this effect.

At the contextual level, I found that more highly developed countries, higher unemployment rates, greater health expenditures, government provision for maternity leave, higher percentages of women holding government
positions, and more women in higher education all have a negative affect on the conservatism of these attitudes. On the other hand, more women in the labor market, high education expenditures, and high fertility rates all have a positive affect on conservative attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere.

There were, however, a few limitations to my study. As with any cross-national comparison, concepts and constructs may be culturally bound (Ragin 1996). Education, health, religious, and political institutions differ across countries, and therefore any comparative analysis is difficult. In order to address this problem I tested some of these differences using exploratory factor analysis and found the variables to be comparable.

Additionally, my scale makes it difficult to fully capture the complexity of attitudes toward appropriate gender roles. Ideally, I would prefer to include two separate dependent variables: one scale measuring attitudes towards suitable gender roles within the home and the other measuring attitudes towards proper gender roles outside of the home. Finally, due to constraints with my data, I was not able to include certain measures that I feel would be worthwhile to explore. In the future, relationships between gender role attitudes and political affiliation, as well as occupation of spouse would be interesting to explore. Also, at the contextual level, I would have liked to include measures for whether or not the government provides childcare (and on what basis), the governments’ expenditures on child care, whether or not there is universal health care, and if there is universal health care, how accessible is it. Data for
these variables was difficult to come by, however, in the future I hope to include them in my analyses.

There are possible policy implications to these findings. Since it has been found that state policies affect gender role attitudes, and there is a possible connection between attitudes and behaviors, by adopting policies that promote gender equality countries could achieve more egalitarian societies. In particular, policies that enable women to have economic independence and enter the paid labor force are strongly correlated with more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles in the public sphere.

Overall, I found that attitudes towards gender roles outside of the home are affected by individual and contextual level variables. However, as has been shown in some previous studies, individual effects alone cannot explain cross-national differences. While there is some effect of belonging to any one country, the specific contextual variables are very significant.
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\(^1\) The resulting range for the scale is due to the fact that two of the questions are measured on a 4-point scale and the other on a 3-point scale. I added up the scores, and divided by three in order to arrange that the scale began at 0.

\(^2\) An alternative method of coding is to combine lower and working class groups in comparison to all other groups. Much of the previous literature examines the role of the working class groups in relation to all other groups, however, some literature (Robinson and Davis 1991) discuss non-privileged groups in relation to those with privilege, in this case economic. Both methods of coding are reasonable, and as is indicated in the results section, I included each in my models.

\(^3\) I found some multicollinearity in the fifth model (variance inflation for energy use per capita is 4.8). However, this may be due to the fact that I merged individual-level data with contextual-level data (Kreft and de Leeuw 1998). No other variables have variance inflation scores of over 3.5.

\(^4\) Information was obtained for approximately 20 countries on whether or not they provided universal childcare. Included in the final model of my analysis, the variable has a very strong negative effect on the dependent variable, with a size of -.45. However, the data does not offer insight into whether or not the childcare is actually available to everyone, how accessible it is, or any other possible conditions for its provision. Also, the inclusion of this variable cut out 19 countries from my analysis, which is the main reason why I decided not to include it in the final model.
APPENDIX A:

Auxiliary Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Asia/Middle East</th>
<th>South America</th>
<th>Undeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia/Herzegovina</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Phillipines</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phillipines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Countries in Which Variables were Replaced</th>
<th>Regional Average Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Serbia, Bosnia</td>
<td>3965.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOY</td>
<td>Armenia, Georgia, India, Bosnia, Serbia, Nigeria</td>
<td>E.Europe, 7.55; Middle East, 3.71; Nigeria, 6.45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTHEXPEN</td>
<td>Bosnia, Serbia</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTEREDUC</td>
<td>Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Bosnia, Dominican Repub, Nigeria</td>
<td>S.America, 48.77; E.Europe, 54.27; Undeveloped, 40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCEXPEN</td>
<td>Bosnia, Serbia</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENRG</td>
<td>Bosnia, Croatia, Latvia, Macedonia, Moldova</td>
<td>3285.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTHEDEXPEN</td>
<td>Bosnia, Serbia, Armenia</td>
<td>E. Europe, 10.9; Middle East, 5.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1: Definitions of Regional Categories and Variables that have been Replaced with Regional Means
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Possible N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>2769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>2811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>2593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom. Rep.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herz</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia/Mor</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Sample sizes for models 3 and 4 are the same as model 2

Table A.2: Countries Included in Analyses with Sample Sizes of Each Model
Personal Characteristics
- Female (-)
- Age (+)
- Urban Location (-)

Personal Resources
- Education (-)
- Marital Status (+)
- Part of Paid Labor Force (-)
- Social Class (-)

Religious Characteristics
- Religious Group
- Religiosity (+)
- Frequency of religious service attendance (+)

Attitudes Toward Gender Roles Outside the Home

Table A.3: Individual-Level Analytic Model
Table A.4: Contextual-Level Analytic Model