

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

WORK STATUS AND GENDER IDEOLOGY: A CROSS-SECTIONAL AND  
PANEL ANALYSIS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

CHELSEA ELAM  
Norman, Oklahoma  
2017

WORK STATUS AND GENDER IDEOLOGY: A CROSS-SECTIONAL AND  
PANEL ANALYSIS

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

BY

---

Dr. Ann Beutel, Chair

---

Dr. Martin Piotrowski

---

Dr. Cyrus Schleifer

© Copyright by CHELSEA ELAM 2017  
All Rights Reserved.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Ann Beutel of the Sociology Department at the University of Oklahoma. Through countless emails, late nights, and early mornings, her dedication to helping me produce strong work was never ending.

I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Cyrus Schleifer and Dr. Martin Piotrowski, who also took valuable time to work with me on this thesis. Their knowledge of statistical methods and the literature enhanced the quality of my paper. My entire committee's knowledge in this field and help with writing professionally was extremely helpful and made me a better scholar.

I would also like to thank my parents, Bruce and Pat Elam, for being so supportive throughout my entire academic career. I also wish to acknowledge my cohort members, Amy Miller and Kara Snawder, for being patient, helpful, and friendly over the past two years. Finally, thank you to Cody Yamamoto for keeping me relaxed and motivated through this experience.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Background.....	3
Gender Ideology and Work Status for Women and Men.....	5
Chapter 3: Current Study.....	7
Chapter 4: Methods.....	8
Cross-Sectional.....	9
Panel.....	15
Chapter 5: Results.....	19
Cross-Sectional Data.....	19
Panel Data.....	23
Chapter 6: Discussion.....	26
Strengths and Limitations.....	27
Chapter 7: Conclusion.....	29
References.....	31
Appendix A: Descriptive Statistics.....	35
Appendix B: Cross-Sectional Data Results.....	37
Appendix C: Panel Data Results.....	40
Appendix D: Scale Item Analyses.....	43
Appendix E: Figures.....	44

## List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Cross-Sectional Data.....	35
Table 2. Linear Regression of Gender Ideology and Work Status.....	37
Table 3. Linear Regression of Gender Ideology and Respondent’s Work Status and Spouse's Work Status for Married Individuals.....	39
Table 4. Fixed Effects of Gender Ideology and Work Status.....	40
Table 5. Fixed Effects of Gender Ideology and Work Status by Gender.....	41
Table 6. Hybrid Effects of Gender Ideology and Work Status.....	42
Table S1. Logistic Regression of Each Gender Ideology Scale Item.....	43

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Gender Ideology by Gender and Work Status.....	44
--	----

## **Abstract**

As economic shifts have occurred in the United States (e.g., the type of work available ) it has become more difficult for men to enact the breadwinner or sole-provider role; men might respond to these changes by either holding more tightly to traditional gender ideology or by becoming more egalitarian in their gender ideology. This study used cross-sectional and panel data from the General Social Survey (GSS) to look at the relationship between current work status and a change in work status and gender ideology. Both the respondent's and, if married, the respondent's spouse's work status were examined. Cross-sectional results show that men who are working part-time, are unemployed, or are keeping house have more egalitarian gender ideologies than men who work-full time and that wives working more than husbands is associated with more egalitarian gender beliefs for both men and women. Panel results show a change in work status has an influence on an individual's gender ideology, with those who become unemployed becoming more traditional in their gender beliefs. Mixed results were found in the panel data analysis for the effect of entering part-time work on gender ideology.



## Chapter 1: Introduction

Recent decades have seen important changes in the U.S. economy, from being manufacturing to service based. With this shift, the United States saw a decrease in the number of union-protected, well-paying jobs with benefits (or what could be considered “good jobs”) that employed large numbers of men (Kalleberg, Reskin, and Hudson 2000) and an increase in service-related jobs which tend to be lower-paying, less secure, and offer fewer hours and benefits (or what might be considered “bad jobs”) (Kalleberg et al. 2000). Men’s decreasing ability to find employment that produces enough income to act as sole wage-earners for their families makes it more difficult for them to fulfill the traditional breadwinner or “good provider” role (e.g., Bernard 1986) and has necessitated that more women in married-couple families work for pay, even if they are mothers of young children. At the same time, the second wave of the Women’s Movement and an increase in service work considered suitable for women (i.e., jobs that involve caring for others), also have contributed to the large increases in women’s labor force participation in recent decades.

As a result of these economic and social changes, the proportion of women working full-time increased 19.8% from 1970 to 2013, with 60.5% of women working full-time in 2013, while the number of men who work full-time declined 2.1% from 1970 to 2013, with 85.5% of men working full-time in 2013 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016, Table 23). In addition, there has been a decline in the proportion of married couple households where the man provides all of the income. In 1967, men acted as sole providers for 35.6% of married-couple households; this had declined to 19% by 2013. In contrast, in 1967 1.7% of women were sole earners in married-couple

households and by 2013 this had increased to 6.3% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2016, Table 24). With more men out of the work force and more women in it, there also has been an increase in the proportion of men staying home. The proportion of families with stay-at-home fathers increased from 4% in 1989 to 7% in 2012 (Parker and Livingston 2016).

One outcome that men's and women's work force status (working full-time, part time, or not at all) and changes in work status may influence is their gender ideology (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Cassidy and Warren 1996; Cunningham et al. 2005; Fan and Marini 2000; Vespa 2009; Wilkie 1993). The relationship between work status and gender ideology, that is, an "individuals' level of support for a division of paid work and family responsibilities that is based on the belief of gendered separate spheres" (Davis and Greenstein 2009:87) is the focus of this study.

Using data for men and women from the General Social Survey (GSS), this study looks at how an individual's work force status and spouse's work force status are associated with beliefs about gender. This study will address two research questions using two different forms of data that allow for between-group and within-individual analyses. The first question asks what the relationships are between one's work status and one's spouse's work status (if married) and gender ideology and whether these relationships vary by the respondent's gender. This question will be answered using cross-sectional GSS data. The second question asks if a change in an individual's work status will lead to a change in his/her gender ideology and will be answered using GSS panel data.

## Chapter 2: Background

Gender ideology<sup>1</sup> typically ranges from a traditional to a non-traditional or egalitarian viewpoint. A traditional gender ideology involves endorsing separate spheres for men and women. The male sphere traditionally consists of the work force where money, power, and prestige can be gained. This is referred to as the public sphere. The female sphere traditionally consists of the home and is referred to as the private sphere (Davis and Greenstein 2009). If one believes that women should remain in the home and not work for pay (i.e., be homemakers) and men should be the sole financial providers of the family (i.e., be breadwinners), that is indicative of a traditional gender ideology (Zuo and Tang 2000). The traditional ideology reflects the breadwinner/homemaker ideal that was strongly endorsed in the United States during the 1950s and maintained into the 1970s (Larsen and Long 1988) and still is supported today (e.g., Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2011).

A nontraditional, or egalitarian, gender ideology views women's and men's roles as less opposing and more equal or similar. To a non-traditionalist, women do not have to stay home and men do not have to be the sole providers for the family. There was a broad egalitarian shift in gender ideology beginning in the late 1960s in the United States that has been well-documented (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Brewster and Padavic 2000; Davis and Greenstein 2009; Mason and Lu 1988; Pampel 2011). The trend of rising egalitarianism stalled after the early 1990s (Bolzendahl and Myers

---

<sup>1</sup> Here, I choose to refer to these beliefs as *gender ideology*. Other names include sex role attitudes, gender role attitudes, and gender attitudes (Davis and Greenstein 2009). They all capture the beliefs that an individual holds about the roles (usually work and family roles) men and women should fill in society.

2004; Brewster and Padavic 2000; Cotter et al. 2011), but more recent data suggest that since 2010 the stall has ended and gender ideologies in the United States are again becoming more egalitarian (Cotter et al. 2014).

Rates of egalitarian change in gender ideology have varied by gender. Men are more traditional than women in their gender ideology, and the switch from a traditional to a nontraditional gender ideology is occurring more slowly among men as a group (Cotter et al. 2014; Fan and Marini 2000; Larsen and Long 1988). Because being in the work force allows men access to power, acting as the breadwinner while the wife takes care of home and family is in the best interest of men (Cha and Thébaud 2009), which could be a factor for the slower acceptance of nontraditional ideologies among men.

In addition to gender, past research has found other factors that influence an individual's gender ideology. Educational attainment, mother's education, birth cohort, family income, and time period are positively associated with men's and women's gender ideology, that is, they are related to more egalitarian beliefs (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Brooks and Bolzendahl 2004; Carlson and Lynch 2013; Ciabattari 2001; Cotter et al. 2011; Cunningham et al. 2005; Vespa 2009; Zuo and Tang 2000). Being married, having children when married, race, religious affiliation (e.g., having a conservative Christian faith), having conservative political beliefs, and age are negatively associated with gender ideology (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Fan and Marini 2000; Morgan and Waite 1987; Seguino 2011; Vespa 2009). Performing a greater share of household work is associated with a traditional ideology for women and an egalitarian ideology for men (Carlson and Lynch 2013); under a traditional ideology, housework is considered a woman's job so if a man increases his housework time it is

indicative of a more egalitarian belief system. Labor force (work force) participation (being out versus in the labor force, and the number of hours worked if employed) also has a significant association with gender ideology (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Cassidy and Warren 1996; Cunningham et al. 2005; Fan and Marini 2000; Vespa 2009; Wilkie 1993). I focus on the relationship between work force status and gender ideology in this study.

### Gender Ideology and Work Status for Women and Men

Women in the work force tend to have more egalitarian, or nontraditional, beliefs than women who are not in the work force (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Fan and Marini 2000; Zuo and Tang 2000). Individuals may hold a more egalitarian gender ideology when exposed to situations, such as paid work, that “resonate with feminist ideals,” and gender beliefs may correspond to what is in one’s best interest (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004: 761-762). Women’s presence in the work force can also affect men because they are able to see women within the public sphere (exposure) and benefit from additional earnings if their wife works (interest), both of which should lead to men having a more egalitarian gender ideology.

The research that has been done on men’s gender ideology suggests that men’s work-family situation can influence their gender ideology. Cross-sectional research has found single-earner, or breadwinning, men tend to hold more traditional ideologies while men in dual-earner households have more egalitarian attitudes (e.g., Mason and Lu 1988). Cross-sectional research also has found men who are married to women who work full-time hold more egalitarian beliefs than men married to women who work

part-time or are homemakers (Cassidy and Warren 1996). These studies suggest work status influences gender ideology and that the work status does not have to be one's own; a spouse's work status can also impact gender ideology. Cassidy and Warren (1996) attempted to expand understanding of men's gender ideology, which has been studied less than women's gender ideology, by including men in their study, yet they only included men working full-time in their sample. Among panel studies, some research on men's work status and gender ideology has not found any significant relationships for men (e.g., Cunningham et al. 2005). Other panel analysis has shown men with lower breadwinning status, that is, who are not the sole providers, hold more egalitarian beliefs (Carlson and Lynch 2013; Zuo 1997).

Zuo and Tang (2000) looked at how men's and women's gender ideologies change by using longitudinal data. Both men and women in their study held more nontraditional beliefs when women shared the breadwinner role, especially men who were lower-status breadwinners (i.e., men who provided less than the majority of the income for the family). The men whose role as provider was more cemented in the family, that is, who contributed more to the total income than their wives, held more traditional beliefs about gender. Overall, men were still more traditional than women. These findings suggest how important traditional gender ideologies still are, even though there has been an egalitarian trend overall in the United States.

The direction of the relationship between gender ideology and work status is important, but it can be difficult to tell if a change in work status is due to a shift in ideology or if a shift in ideology is due to a change in work status. Panel data can aid in disentangling directionality by showing whether an individual's gender ideology

changes following a change in his/her work status. The gender ideology discrepancy hypothesis states that when an individual holds an ideology that does not match with his or her current life situation, gender ideology will shift (Kroska and Elman 2009). So, for example, a male breadwinner who loses his job might become more egalitarian in his gender beliefs in order to match his current life circumstances. Not only would this man no longer be acting as the sole provider, but his wife might enter the work force, which also could contribute to a more egalitarian ideology. I primarily use the gender ideology discrepancy hypothesis to theoretically ground my study.

To summarize, women entering the work force and shifting from strictly being a homemaker and mother to also being a paid worker has had huge impacts on them and their families. At the same time, U.S. society in general maintains the expectation for men to be employed full-time and to act as the breadwinner, even though economic changes have led to some men working for pay less than full-time (or not at all) and/or needing their wives to work for pay, which could make it more difficult for individual men to maintain a traditional gender ideology. The current study, described below, will look at relationships between individual's work status, spouse's work status (if married), and gender ideologies.

### **Chapter 3: Current Study**

This study will expand what researchers know about the relationships between gender, work status, and gender ideology by answering two research questions. My first research question asks what the relationships are between one's work status and one's spouse's work status and gender ideology and whether these relationships vary by

the respondent's gender. The first question will be answered using cross-sectional data. Following the gender ideology discrepancy hypothesis, I predict that being employed full-time will be associated with a more egalitarian gender ideology for women while, for men, nontraditional work statuses, including working part-time and keeping house, will be associated with egalitarian attitudes for them. I also predict that spouse's full-time employment will also be associated with more egalitarian beliefs in men because, consistent with the gender discrepancy hypothesis, their ideologies will match their non-traditional family arrangement. By keeping men who work part-time, are unemployed, or keep house in the analysis and assessing how a spouse's work status impacts an individual's gender ideology, my study will be more comprehensive than some prior ones.

While the cross-sectional data that will be used to answer the first research question allow me to analyze between-group differences, panel data will allow me to analyze within-individual differences—which few studies have done—in order to answer the second research question, which asks if a change in an individual's work status will lead to a change in his/her gender ideology. Following the gender ideology discrepancy hypothesis, I predict an individual's gender ideology will shift when his/her work status shifts. For example, if a woman goes from working full-time to being unemployed, her gender ideology might become more traditional to be in line with the change in her work status.

## **Chapter 4: Methods**



As noted above, I will answer my two research questions using cross-sectional and panel data. Both forms of data come from the General Social Survey (GSS; Davis and Smith 1991). The GSS is a nationally representative survey of non-institutionalized adults in the United States. Since 1972, the GSS has asked respondents socio-demographic, attitudinal, and behavioral questions. I will first describe the cross-sectional data, variables, and analysis. Then I will describe the panel data, variables, and analysis.

### Cross-Sectional Data

The GSS is originally and primarily a cross-sectional design; a representative sample of individuals is selected every two years and is given a survey. Because the GSS has been implemented since 1972, researchers can examine a variety of relationships for both older and younger cohorts. I will use all the years of the cross-sectional data that include the variables that I need for my analysis. This is the years of 1977, 1985-86, and 1988-2014 (1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014) which is nineteen years of observations.

### *Variables*

*Outcome variable.* My outcome variable, gender ideology, is an aggregated scale created using three items from the GSS<sup>2</sup>. Respondents were asked to strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree to the three items. The first item asks, (1)

---

<sup>2</sup> Researchers often include an item about women in politics, but I have elected not to include this item in order for my gender ideology scale to focus on paid work and family roles. I ran identical analyses that included the “women in politics” item on the gender ideology scale and they produced very similar results to what I report here.

“It is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.” This is directly related to a traditional gender ideology in that men are supposed to be the breadwinners of the household so agreeing with this statement indicates traditional beliefs. Items two and three focus on the traditional belief that women’s primary role is to raise children and not work. These items are: (2) “A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works,” and (3) “A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.”

Supporting the second statement indicates endorsement of the traditional belief that children are not raised properly if the mother works. Agreeing with the third item indicates a more egalitarian belief and suggests that working women can also be successful mothers. Overall, the intent of these questions is to assess gender ideology in terms of men’s and women’s roles in the work force and in the family. These variables, and a similar aggregate scale, have been used in previous studies to measure gender ideology (Pampel 2011; Zuo and Tang 2000).

Each item is (re)coded so that the lowest, most traditional response option is coded 0. The third item is reverse coded so that strongly disagreeing with the notion that working women can be good mothers is the most traditional response and strongly agreeing with the statement is the most egalitarian response. If a respondent chose the most traditional response option for all three questions, the resulting score is 0. A score of 3 is given to the most egalitarian responses for the three items, resulting in a completely egalitarian score of 9. Therefore, total scores on this gender ideology scale can range from 0 to 9. A total score of 0 indicates that the individual is traditional, that

is, an individual believes that a woman's role is at home and a man's is acting as sole provider and that working mothers cannot be proper mothers to their children. A total score of 9 is considered the most nontraditional, or egalitarian. This scale is normally distributed and has a  $\mu=5.19$  and a Cronbach's Alpha reliability score of 0.74.

*Predictor Variable.* The key predictor variable is the individual's work status. The GSS has seven work status options that a respondent can choose from: working full-time, part-time, temporarily not working, unemployed, retired, in school, or keeping house. I created four categories: full-time, part-time, unemployed, and keeping house. I include keeping house as an option because it is of considerable interest to my study due to the increasing number of men who are keeping house and because past research has coded it as an occupation (Cohen 2004; Pampel 2011). Most of the sample is in the full-time worker category so I use that as the reference category for the other three.

*Controls.* As discussed earlier, there are multiple socio-demographic factors that predict gender ideology. The variables I have chosen to control for include gender, age, race, having children, marital status, level of education, mother's level of education, political beliefs, individual's religious affiliation, family income, spouse's work status, and year of survey.

For gender, I created a binary indicator for men (coded 1) with women as the comparison group (coded 0). Age is treated as a continuous variable and, in this sample, ranges from 18 to 89. The race variable is coded (1) for Black and Other with White as a comparison group (coded 0).

Marital status and number of children both are turned into binary variables. In the GSS, respondents can choose from being married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married. Because I am interested in those who are married versus those who are not married, I created a Married (coded 1) category and a Not Married (coded 0) category. Not Married is comprised of those who are widowed, divorced, separated, and never married. Number of children can range from 0 to 8+ children. I coded this as a binary variable, with those who have no children coded as 0 and those who have at least one child coded as 1.

The education variable in the GSS indicates the highest level of school completed in terms of years. This can range from 0 to 20 years. In this way, twelve years is treated as a high school education and sixteen years is treated as completing a four-year college degree. The mother's education variable indicates the highest year of school that she completed and ranges from 0 to 20. Both the individual's education and mother's education are treated as continuous.

I also control for the respondent's political views, which in the GSS can range from extremely liberal, liberal, or slightly liberal to moderate, slightly conservative, conservative, or extremely conservative. I condensed these categories into a set of dummy variables. I have an indicator for Liberal and one for Conservative and I use Moderate as a reference category.

To control for the respondent's religious affiliation, I use a slightly modified version of the Steensland et al. (2000) measure of six religious affiliations by having four binary measures. I use Evangelical Protestants as the reference category to the four

dummy variables of: mainline Protestants (Mainline), Catholics, those in other traditions (Other), and those not affiliated with any traditions (None). The original GSS measure contains an indicator for those who are of Jewish affiliation and those who are black Protestants. Due to the small number Jewish individuals in the sample and a desire to control for race, these respondents are included in the Other affiliations category (Schleifer and Chaves 2014).

I use the responses of family income converted to 2014 dollars and divided by 1000 for interpretable coefficients (Schleifer and Chaves 2014; Zuo and Tang 2000). I treat this as a continuous variable. I also include a year and year-squared variable to control for the year in which the survey was given.

The GSS allows respondents to indicate if their spouse is working full-time, part-time, unemployed, or keeping house. I use the same four categories for individual's spouse's work status that I did for the respondent's work status. These are full-time, part-time, unemployed, and keeping house. I created indicator variables for part-time, unemployed, and keeping house with working full-time as the reference category. When I use this variable in the analysis, I only include respondents who are married in the sample. This does decrease my sample size but I believe it is a useful analysis.

For all of the variables in my analysis, if the respondent did not know or did not answer, she or he was coded as missing, and I later used listwise deletion in order to not include those cases in the analytic sample leaving a sample size of N=14,336

respondents<sup>3</sup>. Having models containing only married individuals (in order to include a variable for respondent's spouse's work status in the analysis) reduces my sample size to N=7,421. Table 1 in Appendix A displays descriptive statistics of the gender ideology scale, the independent variable, and each control variable. The gender ideology scale has a mean of 5.37. My sample data consists of mostly respondents working full-time. A majority of spouses also work full-time. There are slightly more women in the sample than men. The sample is mostly white and the average age of a respondent is 40.468 years. The average amount of education is 13.691 years, which is approximately a high school diploma with some postsecondary schooling.

### *Methods*

My outcome variable is treated as a continuous variable so I estimate a linear regression model. I look at the relationship between work status and gender ideology using multiple models. My first model is a simple regression of work status and gender ideology. The second includes the socio-demographic controls of age, gender, and race of the respondent. This is to test whether any relationship between work status and gender ideology persists when controlling for those socio-demographics. The third model includes all of my control variables. The additional controls are: having any children, being married, highest level of education reached, political beliefs, mother's highest level of education, religious affiliation, family income, and year and year squared. I include a fourth model that contains work status, all the control variables

---

<sup>3</sup> The gender ideology scale items were not asked of each respondent. These items are included on specific forms and randomly asked of a group of respondents. These cases are considered out of the sample and included with the missing cases.

listed above, and an interaction between gender and work status. By doing this fourth model, I am able to identify whether the relationship between work status and gender ideology differs by the gender of the respondent.

To further test the idea of work status being an important predictor of gender ideology, I perform analysis that includes the respondent's spouse's work status. The last three models contain only married individuals. In Model 5, I include respondent's work status, the same control variables as before, and the spouse's work status variable. Model 6 includes an interaction between respondent's gender and work status. Model 7 has an interaction between respondent's gender and respondent's spouse's work status. The interactions tell us if the effect of respondent's work status and gender on gender ideology is the same as or different from the effect of spouse's work status and respondent's gender on gender ideology. Finally, it should be noted that the model results I present are for unweighted data. Models run with weighted data produce results very similar to the ones shown here.

#### Panel Data

The remaining research question asks if a change in an individual's work status can lead to a change in the individual's gender ideology. In order to answer this question, I use panel data from the General Social Survey. While the GSS was originally a repeated cross-sectional design, in 2006 a panel component was implemented. There are three totally completed, separate panels and each started in 2006, 2008, and 2010, respectively. In 2006, of the 4,510 individuals surveyed for the cross-sectional survey, 2,000 were randomly chosen to be re-interviewed in 2008 and

again in 2010. From the 2,000 respondents chosen for a panel in 2006, 1,536 were re-interviewed in 2008, which is a 77% retention rate, and 1,276 were interviewed again in 2010, which is a retention rate of 64%. Out of the 2,023 respondents for the panel beginning in 2008, there were 1,581 (78%) re-interviewed in 2010 and 1,295 re-interviewed (64%) in 2012. For the panel beginning in 2010, there were 2,044 respondents and in 2012, 1,551 (78%) responded again and in 2014, 1,304 (65.2%) responded again. I stacked all three completed panels into one sample for the analysis and did a listwise deletion of cases with any missing data. After deleting missing cases, I have a sample size of N=5,738.

### *Variables*

*Outcome variable.* The outcome variable for the panel data analysis is measured using the same type of aggregate scale I use for the cross-sectional data analysis. The range remains from 0 to 9. The Cronbach's Alphas are 0.69 for the scale for the first wave of the panel, 0.70 for the second wave, and 0.71 for the third wave. The mean is 5.57 for the first wave, 5.64 for the second wave, and 5.79 for the third wave.

*Predictor variable.* The key predictor variable is again the individual's work status. Instead of showing differences between the groups of work statuses, the panel data show how an individual change in work status can impact an individual's gender ideology. Full-time (N=3,792) is used as a reference category for part-time (N=808), unemployed (N=353), and keeping house (N=785).

*Controls.* Control variables for the panel data need to be separated into two categories: time-variant and time-invariant. These are variables that change over time



and those that do not change over time, respectively. Fixed effects models do not include time-invariant variables. The time-invariant variables in this analysis include the respondent's race and gender. When I am able to include these in a model, gender and race are coded the same as they were for the cross-sectional analysis.

The time-variant variables include the respondent's age, highest education level, mother's highest education level, respondent's political beliefs, religious affiliation, family income, whether the respondent has any children, and marital status. All control variables are coded the same for the panel analysis as they were for the cross-sectional analysis because the GSS follows the same pattern of coding for respondent's answers in both types of data.

### *Methods*

Panel data are useful because they allow researchers to not only look at between group differences but also within-individual differences due to following the same individuals over three time periods. To look at both of these forms of variation, I use a fixed effects model and a hybrid effects model. The hybrid model includes both within and between variations and is used as a robustness check for the fixed effects model. The Hausman test indicates if there are systematic differences between the coefficients from a random effects model and a fixed effects model. The test confirmed that the coefficients from the random effects model were significantly different from the coefficients from the fixed effects model, indicating the necessity of the hybrid model.

The fixed effects model uses the variation that we do not have in cross-sections, which is the variation within individuals. This allows us to see if a change in work status leads to a change in gender ideology. Here is the equation for the fixed effects model:

$$(y_{it} - \bar{y}_i) = (x_{it} - \bar{x}_i)\beta + (\epsilon_{it} - \bar{\epsilon}_i)$$

where  $y$  is the gender ideology score of each individual  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $x$  is the individual's work status, and  $\epsilon$  represents that error term. The equation shows that for each individual, his/her outcome, the predictor variable, and the covariates will deviate from his/her mean score to show change over time. There are four models using fixed effects. The first is a bivariate between gender ideology and work status and the second includes all time-variant control variables. The final two model analyze the relationship between work status and gender ideology for men and women separately to see if within-individual change occurs differently for men and women. There are somewhat more women (N=3,198) in the sample than men (N=2,540).

The hybrid effects model allows me to look at differences between and within individuals by modeling individual means (for between effects) and deviations from those means (for within effects) (Allison 2009). If a variable does not vary between and within, it is included in the analysis as time-invariant. These variables include: having children and mother's education.

Using this method allows me to maintain any statistical power that might be lost by running a solely fixed effects model. Losing the between group variation with the fixed effect model has the possibility of decreasing statistical power and could lead researchers to question any causal suggestions (Allison 2009). A hybrid model leaves

both types of variation in the equation and allows that power to remain with the between and within effects (Allison 2009; Schleifer and Chaves 2014). The equation for the hybrid model is as follows:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + (x_{it} - \bar{x}_i)\beta_1 + \bar{x}_i\beta_2 + v_i + \bar{\epsilon}_i$$

where  $y$  is the outcome variable for each individual  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $\alpha$  is the intercept, and  $x$  is the predictor variable. The equation shows two separate beta coefficients that are allowed to vary. With the hybrid model, I include both time-invariant and variant variables but only the time-invariant has results for the within-person effects. Each model using panel data contains weights for the wave of the panel and year in which the panel was given.

## **Chapter 5: Results**

### Cross-Sectional Data

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Table 2 displays the regression results of Models 1-4. Model 1 includes only the bivariate relationship between work status and gender ideology. It shows those who are unemployed or keeping house are significantly more traditional than those who are working full-time. After including the demographic and other control variables in Models 2 and 3, all three work status categories have a significant negative relationship with gender ideology relative to those working full-time. Using predicted values shows that, on the scale from 0 to 9, those who work full-time have a predicted gender ideology of 5.51 while those who keep house have a predicted gender ideology of 4.69,

or stated differently, keeping house contributes to a 0.82 unit decrease in ideology relative to the reference category.

It might be somewhat surprising that the part-time work status coefficient is negative because these individuals are still in the work force. Looking at the gender of those who are part-time reveals that of the 1,937 part-time workers, 69% of them are women. Past research has shown that when women work part-time they might use the time not in paid labor for household and child-rearing duties which could help explain the negative coefficient (Higgins, Duxbury, and Johnson 2000). A more flexible, part-time schedule could be preferred by women in order to make time for household responsibilities.

The results in Models 2-4 of Table 2 show men are significantly more traditional than women. In other words, men are predicted to have a gender ideology that is approximately 1.00 lower in the models, or more traditional, than women. Studies in the past have found similar results. Model 4 includes an interaction between men and their work status. The three work statuses included in this analysis are all non-traditional for men because full-time is used as the comparison. Results show that men who are working part-time or keeping house are significantly more egalitarian than the comparison group of women who are working full-time. Men who work full-time are predicted to have a gender ideology of 4.92, men who work part-time have a predicted ideology of 5.67, and men who are keeping house have a predicted ideology of 5.17. These results are opposite to what past studies have found about women in the work force and their gender ideology (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Fan and Marini 2000; Zuo and Tang 2000). Without including the interaction, we would not be able to see

how differences in men's employment status relates to differences in gender ideology, with men who are in non-traditional work situations (i.e. not working full-time) tending to have a more egalitarian gender ideology. Consistent with the gender ideology discrepancy hypothesis (Kroska and Elman 2009), it seems that men who are not fulfilling the traditional breadwinner role by being a full-time worker might hold a more egalitarian ideology to match their current employment situation.

Each of the gender ideology scale items is analyzed separately in a supplementary analysis using logistic regression with categories representing egalitarian responses (e.g., strongly disagree and disagree, depending on the wording of the item) coded as 1 and traditional responses (e.g., strongly agree and agree depending on the wording of the item) coded as 0. The analysis include all control variables. Results are shown in Table S1 in Appendix D and are displayed as odds ratios. For example, looking at the results in the first column, part-time workers have -0.192 lower odds of having an egalitarian attitude on the gender ideology item for women staying at home and men being in the work force relative to full-time workers. Overall, the findings for the analysis of individual gender ideology items are similar to those for the entire gender ideology scale but with more significant results for the first item than the other two.

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Table 3 displays the results of the regression analyses for Models 5-7 of married individuals. Results for overall work status are similar to those shown in Table 2, with those who are employed part-time or keeping house being significantly more traditional than full-time workers. Model 6 includes the interaction between men and their work

status while Model 7 includes the interaction between men and their spouse's work status. The results in Table 3 (Model 6) also show the same pattern of results for the interaction between men and their work status and their gender ideology as in Table 2 (Model 4). Predicted values indicate that part-time employed men will have a gender ideology of 5.12 and men who keep house will have an ideology of 5.29 which are both higher than the predicted gender ideology of 5 for full-time employed men.

Results for the interaction of gender and spouse's work status further complicates the story. Men whose spouse works part-time or keeps house are significantly more traditional than men whose spouse works full-time. Men who are married to a part-time working woman have a predicted ideology of 4.46 and those married to a woman who keeps house have a predicted score of 3.96. In comparison, men who are married to full-time working wives have a predicted gender ideology of 5.10. Men who personally are in non-traditional employment situations might hold ideologies that are more accepting of non-traditional situations while men whose wives are in more traditional situations (as homemakers or by not being fully in the labor force) are able to maintain traditional beliefs. These findings expand considerably on those of Cassidy and Warren (1996) who included only full-time employed men in their analysis. Figure 1 displays the predicted values of gender ideology for women and men separately depending on their work status.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

A subsequent analysis (results not displayed) using men as the comparison group for women shows that women who work part-time or keep house hold significantly more traditional gender beliefs than women who work full-time. This is

consistent with the findings of past research. Yet, looking at women and their spouse's work status results in women's ideologies being significantly more egalitarian when their spouse's work part-time or keep house compared to women whose spouse works full-time. Although the results for women are opposite to what men showed, the explanation is largely the same. Women in a traditional employment situation (part-time or keeping house) maintain their traditional beliefs whereas women whose husbands are in non-traditional employment situations (part-time or keeping house) are more egalitarian. Overall, the findings show different family situations in terms of different work statuses are associated with an individual's gender ideology.

#### Panel Data

##### *Fixed Effects Models*

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

Table 4 displays the fixed effects model regression results for Models 1 and 2. These results show any changes in gender ideology predicted by a change in the work status of the individual. The first model looks at the bivariate relationship between the outcome and the predictor variable. The coefficients can be interpreted as a change in gender ideology by a change in each work status. Results show that becoming a part-time worker and becoming unemployed are significant for gender ideology. An individual's gender ideology is predicted to increase 0.173 points as they become a part-time worker. It may be that, as someone enters part-time work, their gender ideology becomes more egalitarian compared to someone who did not enter part-time work. Looking at predicted values shows specific differences between work statuses and the resulting gender ideology score. For example, someone who enters full-time employment is predicted to have a gender ideology of 5.32 while someone who enters

part-time employment is predicted to have a score of 5.81. This is a difference of 0.49 in egalitarianism between those who become part-time and full-time workers. A positive relationship between part-time work and gender ideology is somewhat surprising given the negative relationship between work status and gender ideology found for those in part-time work in the cross-sectional data. Perhaps the *entrance* into part-time work leads to a significant and positive change in gender ideology.

The second work status that is significant is being unemployed. An individual who becomes unemployed is predicted to lower their gender ideology score by 0.251 points. Or, stated differently, those who become unemployed become more traditional in their gender ideology. Again, perhaps they are matching their gender ideology to their current work status as the gender ideology discrepancy hypothesis would predict. Looking at predicted values, those who become unemployed will have a gender ideology score of 5.38. This is 0.43 points lower than someone who becomes a part-time worker.

The final work status is keeping house, and although the models did not produce significant results at the 0.05 level, the direction of the relationship is interesting. Past research has shown a negative relationship between keeping house and gender ideology, meaning that those who keep house and are not in the paid labor force are usually more traditional (e.g., because they are not exposed to egalitarian ideals in the work force). However, the fixed effect models show a positive relationship. This suggests that as individuals enter the status of keeping house, their ideology becomes more egalitarian. The shift into keeping house, as opposed to already keeping house, might be important in reversing the relationship here. And perhaps at least some of these individuals are



men or women choosing to stay home because they are able to do so. A larger sample of individuals who keep house or move into keeping house might provide significant results. Finally, Model 2 includes the time-variant control variables as well as the same key predictor variable as Model 1. Results for the different work statuses are consistent with those in Model 1.

[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

Table 5 displays the fixed effects results for men and women separately to see whether the relationship between change in work status and change in gender ideology differs by gender. All control variables were included in these analyses but are not shown. Results indicate that for women, becoming a part-time worker leads to more egalitarianism while becoming unemployed leads to more traditional attitudes. No work force status measure is significant for men. Reflecting the national trend, the number of male panel respondents in the GSS who keep house or work part-time is still relatively small, which could help explain the lack of significant findings for men. It should be noted that the directions of the effects support what the between-group effects for men who are in nontraditional statuses indicated (e.g., negative for men who become unemployed). Alternatively, perhaps the entrance into part-time work only influences women and is responsible for the significant effects of part-time work status in the full sample model shown in Table 4.

#### *Hybrid Effects Models*

[INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE]

The results of the hybrid models are displayed in Table 6. Both the between and within results are displayed for the time-variant variables and only the between effects are available for the time-invariant variables. Looking at the between effects for the key predictor variables, we see significance for all three work statuses. Between groups of individuals, those who are part-time workers have a gender ideology score that is 0.355 points lower than those who are working full-time. This is consistent with the results from previous research and the results from the cross-sectional data analysis in this study. Part-time workers are usually more traditional, much like those who are unemployed and keeping house. We also see a between group effect for those who are unemployed and keeping house holding a more traditional gender ideology than those who are working full-time.

The results of the between and within effects models for two of the work statuses are in opposite directions. The within effects results show individuals who became part-time workers became more egalitarian (similar to the results shown in Table 4) while the between effects results show those who became part-time workers became more traditional. The keeping house variable also has results in opposite directions for the between effects model (negative) and the within effects model (positive), although it is not significant in the within effects model.

## **Chapter 6: Discussion**

Using two forms of data to analyze the relationship between work status and gender ideology allowed me to answer my two research questions. My predictions about men's and women's work statuses and their ideologies were supported. In the

cross-sectional analysis, men in nontraditional employment situations have more egalitarian beliefs and men who are married to women who work full-time hold more egalitarian beliefs. Women married to men working full-time hold more traditional beliefs. It appears that individuals who are in, or their spouses are in, traditional work statuses (for their gender) maintain a traditional ideology while individuals who are in, or their spouses are in, nontraditional statuses (for their gender) are more egalitarian. The panel analysis results support my prediction that a change in an individual's work status will have an influence on the individual's gender ideology. Specifically, the results show for the full sample that the gender ideology of those who become part-time workers become more egalitarian (except for the between effects results in Table 6) and those who become unemployed become more traditional. Within-individual differences for women show that entering part-time work leads to more egalitarian attitudes. Overall, the results are consistent with the gender ideology discrepancy hypothesis by Kroska and Elman (2009) because both men's and women's gender ideologies appear to be aligned with their work status as well as the work status of their spouse (for married individuals).

### *Strengths and Limitations*

This study makes multiple contributions to the gender ideology literature. My first contribution is including multiple work statuses for men and seeing how type of work status is associated with their gender ideology. There are few past studies of gender ideology that focus on men's different work statuses, and some studies of gender ideology do not include men in the analysis at all. Including men who work part-time, are unemployed, or keep house expands the literature on gender ideology. Second, I

also included spouse's work status as a possible influence on gender ideology. Past research has found a relationship between wives' work statuses and gender ideology (Cassidy and Warren 1996), yet multiple categories of men's work statuses (full-time, part-time, unemployed, and keeping house) and gender ideology have not been researched. Considering the changes in job availability for men and the increase in wives' labor force participation in recent decades, understanding men's beliefs about gender and how they can be influenced by work status (theirs and their wives') is an important contribution.

Finally, my research used two types of data, both from the GSS, which further allows me to expand our understanding of the relationship between work status and gender ideology. The use of panel data is rarely done in gender ideology research. The ability to compare within-person changes in gender ideology based on individual changes in work status is not possible with cross-sectional data. Therefore, using panel data brings us a step closer to establishing any causal links between work status and gender ideology. The results include a surprising outcome for the part-time working group being more traditional in one analysis while individuals who enter part-time work become more egalitarian in other analyses. These results, to my knowledge, have not appeared in previous literature.

One limitation is the somewhat limited number of individuals who changed their work status over the three waves. There are only three completed waves per panel covering the years 2006-2014; individuals' work statuses might not change enough over the three waves in order to find a relationship between change in work statuses and a change in gender ideology. There are also a small number of men in nontraditional

work statuses (e.g., employed part-time, keeping house), which could limit any significant findings. In the future, this number should continue growing and allow for further analyses.

Even though this analysis followed other research in this area by using variables to make an aggregated gender ideology scale, the items might not fully represent one's beliefs about gendered roles. The scale I used includes three commonly used items that primarily ask about women's roles and could possibly sway the responses toward traditional beliefs (Cassidy and Warren 1996). Men's gendered expectations are largely excluded from measures of gender ideology save for their role as breadwinners. Perhaps in the future, a confirmatory factor analysis scale using a structural equation modeling approach would be more accurate in measuring what is essentially a latent variable of gender ideology. This way, some variables could have more influence on someone's score than others. Because the scale I used does tap into some of the most commonly used items that other scholars have identified to measure certain aspects of gender ideology, my results are still useful (Mason and Lu 1988).

## **Chapter 7: Conclusion**

The research questions for this study asked if an individual's current work status and his or her spouse's current work status are associated with gender ideology and if a change in individual work status can influence gender ideology. I also asked if relationships between work status and gender ideology differ for men and women. Because men are entering nontraditional work statuses more often and women continue to be in the work force in greater numbers than several decades ago, the possible

influence of work status on gender ideology needs to be researched. I believed that men's and women's ideologies would shift to match their current life situations and the work statuses of their spouses. Using both cross-sectional and panel data, I was able to answer my research questions by looking at both between-group effects and within-person changes. The extent to which an individual, or an individual's spouse, is employed (full-time or part-time), or is unemployed, or keeping house have differing associations with gender ideology. Men who are part-time or keeping house are more egalitarian while women in those work statuses are more traditional. Yet women who work full-time are more egalitarian than men who are in the same status.

There were intriguing mixed results with the panel data for the part-time group. Future research should look further into the differing results for the between and within group effects. It is possible that as women or men who were not working, and not experiencing the positive effects of the work force for an egalitarian gender ideology, enter the work force part-time their ideologies shift with that change in work status. Those who are already part-time workers might be individuals earning supplemental income for their household and maintaining an ideology more similar to those who are keeping house. The analysis for this study is a step in the right direction to understanding the relationship between work status and gender ideology and should be expanded upon in the future in order to understand these patterns more fully.

## References

- Allison, Paul D. 2009. *Fixed Effects Regression Models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Bernard, Jessie. 1986. "The Good-Provider Role: Its Rise and Fall." *American Psychologist* 36(1):1-12.
- Bolzendahl, Catherine I. and Daniel J. Myers. 2004. "Feminist Attitudes and Support for Gender Equality: Opinion Change in Women and Men, 1974–1998." *Social Forces* 83(2):759-89.
- Brewster, Karin L. and Irene Padavic. 2000. "Change in Gender-Ideology, 1977–1996: The Contributions of Intracohort Change and Population Turnover." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(2):477-87.
- Brooks, Clem and Catherine Bolzendahl. 2004. "The Transformation of US Gender Role Attitudes: Cohort Replacement, Social-Structural Change, and Ideological Learning." *Social Science Research* 33(1):106-33.
- Carlson, Daniel L. and Jamie L. Lynch. 2013. "Housework: Cause and Consequence of Gender Ideology?" *Social Science Research* 42(6):1505-18.
- Cassidy, Margaret L. and Bruce O. Warren. 1996. "Family Employment Status and Gender Role Attitudes a Comparison of Women and Men College Graduates." *Gender & Society* 10(3):312-29.
- Cha, Youngjoo and Sarah Thébaud. 2009. "Labor Markets, Breadwinning, and Beliefs How Economic Context Shapes Men's Gender Ideology." *Gender & Society* 23(2):215-43.
- Ciabattari, Teresa. 2001. "Changes in Men's Conservative Gender Ideologies Cohort and Period Influences." *Gender & Society* 15(4):574-91.

- Cohen, Philip N. 2004. "The Gender Division of Labor "Keeping House" and Occupational Segregation in the United States." *Gender & Society* 18(2):239-52.
- Cotter, David, Joan M. Hermsen and Reeve Vanneman. 2011. "The End of the Gender Revolution? Gender Role Attitudes from 1977 to 2008." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(1):259-89.
- Cotter, David, Joan M. Hermsen, Reeve Vanneman, Sharon Sassler, Christine R Schwartz and Youngjoo Cha. 2014. "Back on Track? The Stall and Rebound in Support for Women's New Roles in Work and Politics, 1977-2012." Council on Contemporary Families Gender Rebound Symposium.
- Cunningham, Mick, Ann M. Beutel, Jennifer S. Barber and Arland Thornton. 2005. "Reciprocal Relationships between Attitudes about Gender and Social Contexts during Young Adulthood." *Social Science Research* 34(4):862-92.
- Davis, James Allan and Tom William Smith. 1991. *General Social Surveys, 1972-1991: Cumulative Codebook: National Opinion Research Center (NORC)*. Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago.
- Davis, Shannon N. and Theodore N. Greenstein. 2009. "Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:87-105.
- Fan, Pi-Ling and Margaret Mooney Marini. 2000. "Influences on Gender-Role Attitudes during the Transition to Adulthood." *Social Science Research* 29(2):258-83.
- Higgins, Chris, Linda Duxbury, and Karen Lea Johnson. 2000. "Part-time Work for Women: Does it Really Help Balance Work and Family?" *Human Resource Management* 39(1):17-32.
- Kalleberg, Arne L, Barbara F Reskin, and Ken Hudson. 2000. "Bad jobs in America: Standard and Nonstandard Employment Relations and Job Quality in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 65(2):256-78.



- Kroska, Amy and Cheryl Elman. 2009. "Change in Attitudes about Employed Mothers: Exposure, Interests, and Gender Ideology Discrepancies." *Social Science Research* 38(2):366-82.
- Larsen, Knud S. and Ed Long. 1988. "Attitudes toward Sex-Roles: Traditional or Egalitarian?" *Sex Roles* 19(1-2):1-12.
- Mason, Karen Oppenheim, John L Czajka and Sara Arber. 1976. "Change in US Women's Sex-Role Attitudes, 1964-1974." *American Sociological Review* 41(4): 573-96.
- Mason, Karen Oppenheim and Yu-Hsia Lu. 1988. "Attitudes toward Women's Familial Roles: Changes in the United States, 1977-1985." *Gender & Society* 2(1):39-57.
- Morgan, S. Philip, and Linda J. Waite. 1987. "Parenthood and the Attitudes of Young Adults." *American Sociological Review* 52:541-547.
- Parker, Kim, and Gretchen Livingston. 2016. "6 Facts about American Fathers." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/06/16/fathers-day-facts/>
- Pampel, Fred. 2011. "Cohort Changes in the Socio-Demographic Determinants of Gender Egalitarianism." *Social Forces* 89(3):961-82.
- Seguino, Stephanie. 2011. "Help or Hindrance? Religion's Impact on Gender Inequality in Attitudes and Outcomes." *World Development* 39(8):1308-21.
- Schleifer, Cyrus and Mark Chaves. 2014. "Family Formation and Religious Service Attendance Untangling Marital and Parental Effects." *Sociological Methods & Research* 46(1):125-152
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2016. *Women in the Labor Force: A Databook*. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/womens-databook/archive/women-in-the-labor-force-a-databook-2015.pdf>

Vespa, Jonathan. 2009. "Gender Ideology Construction a Life Course and Intersectional Approach." *Gender & Society* 23(3):363-87.

Wilkie, Jane Riblett. 1993. "Changes in Us Men's Attitudes toward the Family Provider Role, 1972-1989." *Gender & Society* 7(2):261-79.

Zuo, Jiping. 1997. "The Effect of Men's Breadwinner Status on Their Changing Gender Beliefs." *Sex Roles* 37(9):799-816.

Zuo, Jiping and Shengming Tang. 2000. "Breadwinner Status and Gender Ideologies of Men and Women Regarding Family Roles." *Sociological Perspectives* 43(1):29-43.

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Cross-Sectional Data

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max
<i>Dependent Variable:</i>	5.37	2.03	0	9
<i>Gender Ideology Scale</i>				
	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	
<i>Independent Variable: Work Status</i>				
Full-time	9,898	69.04	69.04	
Part-time	1,937	13.51	82.55	
Unemployed	551	3.84	86.40	
Keeping House	1,950	13.60	100.00	
<i>Controls: Indicator Variables</i>				
<i>Gender</i>				
Female	8,040	56.08	56.08	
Male	6,296	43.92	100.00	
<i>Race</i>				
White	11,609	80.98	80.98	
Black	1,830	12.77	93.74	
Other	897	6.26	100.00	
<i>Marital Status</i>				
Not Married	6,915	48.24	48.24	
Married	7,421	51.76	100.00	
<i>Have Children</i>				
No Kids	4,240	29.58	29.58	
Kids	10,096	70.42	100.00	
<i>Spouse Work Status</i>				
Full-time	12,222	85.25	85.25	
Part-time	828	5.78	91.03	
Unemployed	174	1.21	92.24	

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Cross-Sectional Data, Continued

	Freq.	Percent	Cum.	
Keeping House	1,112	7.76	100.00	
<b>Political Views</b>				
Moderate	5,322	37.12	37.12	
Liberal	4,161	29.02	66.15	
Conservative	4,853	33.85	100.00	
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>				
Evangelical	5,048	35.21	35.21	
Mainline	2,701	18.84	54.05	
Other	1,054	7.35	61.40	
Catholic	3,600	25.11	86.52	
None	1,933	13.48	100.00	
<hr/>				
<i>Controls: Continuous</i>	Mean	Std.	Min.	Max.
<i>Variables</i>		Dev.		
<hr/>				
Age	40.468	12.980	18	89
Education	13.691	2.790	0	20
Mother's Education	11.490	3.463	0	20
Family Income/1000	71.839	53.847	.517	252.36
<hr/>				
Total	14,336			

APPENDIX B: CROSS-SECTIONAL DATA RESULTS

Table 2. Linear Regression of Gender Ideology and Work Status

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<i>Work Status<sup>1</sup></i>				
Part-time	0.027 (0.050)	-0.220*** (0.049)	-0.185*** (0.047)	-0.330*** (0.057)
Unemployed	-0.194* (0.088)	-0.180* (0.085)	-0.159* (0.081)	-0.286* (0.123)
House	-0.714*** (0.050)	-1.149*** (0.051)	-0.812*** (0.050)	-0.922*** (0.052)
<i>Socio-demographics</i>				
Male <sup>2</sup>		-1.046*** (0.035)	-0.970*** (0.034)	-1.070*** (0.038)
Race <sup>3</sup>				
Black		0.191*** (0.049)	0.247*** (0.049)	0.235*** (0.049)
Other		-0.426*** (0.067)	-0.511*** (0.067)	-0.518*** (0.067)
Age		-0.021*** (0.001)	-0.022*** (0.001)	-0.022*** (0.001)
Has had a Child <sup>4</sup>			0.158*** (0.039)	0.175*** (0.039)
Currently Married <sup>5</sup>			-0.214*** (0.037)	-0.199*** (0.037)
Year of Education			0.079*** (0.007)	0.078*** (0.007)
Political Views <sup>6</sup>				
Liberal			0.253*** (0.039)	0.254*** (0.039)
Conservative			-0.520*** (0.037)	-0.516*** (0.037)
Mother's Educ.			0.033*** (0.005)	0.033*** (0.005)
Family Income <sup>7</sup>			0.002*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)
Religious Affiliation <sup>8</sup>				
Mainline			0.356*** (0.045)	0.356*** (0.045)
Other			0.010 (0.064)	0.012 (0.064)
Catholic			0.274*** (0.042)	0.278*** (0.052)
None			0.461*** (0.052)	0.463*** (0.052)
Year			3.154*** (0.560)	3.170*** (0.559)

Table 2. Linear Regression of Gender Ideology and Work Status, Continued

Year-Squared			-0.001***	-0.001***
			(0.000)	(0.000)
<i>Interactions<sup>9</sup></i>				
Male x Part-time				0.407***
				(0.099)
Male x Unemployed				0.242
				(0.162)
Male x House				1.165***
				(0.197)
<i>N</i>	14,336	14,336	14,336	14,336
<i>R-Squared</i>	0.015	0.096	0.187	0.190
<i>Adjusted R-Squared</i>	0.015	0.095	0.185	0.188

Source: GSS 1975-2014. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ; standard errors in parentheses.

Unweighted data; using weights in these models produced similar results to those here.

Reference categories for each variable are: <sup>1</sup>Full-time. <sup>2</sup>Female. <sup>3</sup>White. <sup>4</sup>Has no child. <sup>5</sup>Not married.

<sup>6</sup>Moderate. <sup>7</sup>Family income brought to 2014 dollars and divided by 1000. <sup>8</sup>Evangelical. <sup>9</sup>Full-time female.

Table 3. Linear Regression of Gender Ideology and Respondent's Work Status and Spouse's Work Status for Married Individuals<sup>1</sup>

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
<i>Work Status</i>			
Part-time	-0.320*** (0.071)	-0.482*** (0.081)	-0.312*** (0.070)
Unemployed	-0.177 (0.155)	-0.243 (0.271)	-0.168 (0.155)
House	-1.074*** (0.068)	-1.177*** (0.071)	-1.068*** (0.068)
<i>Spouse's Work Status<sup>2</sup></i>			
Part-time	-0.489*** (0.074)	-0.477*** (0.074)	-0.198 (0.135)
Unemployed	0.030 (0.145)	0.027 (0.145)	0.117 (0.162)
House	-1.002*** (0.070)	-1.004*** (0.070)	-0.167 (0.220)
Male	-0.691*** (0.055)	-0.790*** (0.058)	-0.587*** (0.060)
<i>Interactions</i>			
<i>Male x Work Status<sup>3</sup></i>			
Male x Part-time		0.604*** (0.164)	
Male x Unemp.		0.119 (0.329)	
Male x House		1.494*** (0.331)	
<i>Male x Spouse Work Status<sup>4</sup></i>			
Male x Sp. Part-time			-0.442** (0.160)
Male x Sp. Unemployed			-0.356 (0.367)
Male x Sp. House			-0.959*** (0.232)
<i>N</i>	7,421	7,421	7,421
<i>R-Squared</i>	0.210	0.213	0.213
<i>Adjusted R-Squared</i>	0.208	0.211	0.210

Source: GSS 1975-2014.  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ ; standard errors in parentheses. Unweighted data; using weights in these models produced similar results to those here.

<sup>1</sup>These models include the same controls included in Model 4 but are not displayed here.

<sup>2</sup>Spouse working full-time.

<sup>3</sup>Female full-time.

<sup>4</sup>Female with spouse working full-time.

APPENDIX C: PANEL DATA RESULTS

Table 4. Fixed Effects of Gender Ideology and Work Status

	Model 1	Model 2 <sup>1</sup>
<i>Work Status</i>		
Part-time	0.173* (0.087)	0.173* (0.088)
Unemployed	-0.251* (0.104)	-0.244* (0.105)
House	0.087 (0.118)	0.085 (0.118)
<i>N</i>	5,738	5,738
<i>AIC</i>	13979.594	13995.445
<i>BIC</i>	14012.868	14108.577

Source: Panel GSS 2006-2010. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Standard errors in parentheses.

Results are weighted by panel wave.

<sup>1</sup>Control variables included in Model 2.



Table 5. Fixed Effects of Gender Ideology and Work Status by Gender

	Male	Female
<i>Work Status</i>		
Part-time	0.049 (0.133)	0.236* (0.119)
Unemployed	-0.084 (0.139)	-0.431** (0.160)
House	0.020 (0.247)	0.070 (0.144)
<i>N</i>	2,540	3,198
<i>AIC</i>	5938.170	8004.608
<i>BIC</i>	6031.608	8101.732

Source: Panel GSS 2006-2010. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$   
Standard errors in parentheses.  
Results are weighted by panel wave.

Table 6. Hybrid Effects of Gender Ideology and Work Status

	Model 1	
	Between Effects	Within Effects
<i>Work Status</i> <sup>1</sup>		
Part-time	-0.355*** (0.099)	0.172* (0.087)
Unemployed	-0.272 <sup>†</sup> (0.153)	-0.251* (0.104)
House	-0.618*** (0.096)	0.086 (0.117)
<i>Socio-demographics</i>		
Age	-0.009*** (0.002)	0.028** (0.009)
Year of Education	0.087*** (0.012)	-0.023 (0.024)
<i>Political Views</i> <sup>2</sup>		
Liberal	0.113* (0.055)	0.033 (0.073)
Conservative	-0.788*** (0.076)	0.014 (0.068)
Currently Married <sup>3</sup>	-0.281*** (0.071)	0.072 (0.102)
<i>Religious Affiliation</i> <sup>4</sup>		
Mainline	0.162* (0.078)	-0.026 (0.121)
Other	0.009 (0.106)	0.117 (0.121)
Catholic	0.128 (0.073)	0.119 (0.159)
None	0.314*** (0.092)	0.003 (0.101)
Family Income <sup>5</sup>	-0.000 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)
Male <sup>6</sup>	-0.777*** (0.062)	
<i>Race</i> <sup>7</sup>		
Black	0.106 (0.086)	
Other	-0.367*** (0.090)	
Has had a Child <sup>8</sup>	0.045 (0.068)	
Mother's Education	0.031*** (0.008)	
<i>N</i>	5,738	

Source: Panel GSS 2006-2010 \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Standard errors in parentheses. Models weighted by panel wave. Reference categories for each variable are: <sup>1</sup>Full-time. <sup>2</sup>Moderate. <sup>3</sup>Not married. <sup>4</sup>Evangelical. <sup>5</sup>Family income brought to 2014 dollars and divided by 1000. <sup>6</sup>Female. <sup>7</sup>White. <sup>8</sup>Has no child.

APPENDIX D: SCALE ITEM ANALYSES

Table S1. Logistic Regression of Each Gender Ideology Scale Item<sup>1</sup> (N=14,336)

	Mom Home	Child Suffers	Working Mom
<i>Work Status</i>			
Part-time	-0.192 <sup>***</sup> (0.059)	-0.176 <sup>***</sup> (0.055)	-0.066 (0.060)
Unemployed	-0.232 <sup>*</sup> (0.100)	-0.087 (0.097)	-0.063 (0.101)
House	-0.702 <sup>***</sup> (0.060)	-0.586 <sup>***</sup> (0.058)	-0.619 <sup>***</sup> (0.060)
<i>Socio-demographics</i>			
Male	-0.488 <sup>***</sup> (0.043)	-0.773 <sup>***</sup> (0.040)	-0.914 <sup>***</sup> (0.043)
Race			
Black	0.088 (0.062)	0.406 <sup>***</sup> (0.061)	0.336 <sup>***</sup> (0.064)
Other	-0.521 <sup>***</sup> (0.081)	-0.555 <sup>***</sup> (0.076)	-0.238 <sup>**</sup> (0.081)
Age	-0.026 <sup>***</sup> (0.002)	-0.021 <sup>***</sup> (0.002)	-0.011 <sup>***</sup> (0.002)
Has had a Child	-0.081 <sup>*</sup> (0.051)	0.212 <sup>***</sup> (0.047)	0.054 (0.050)
Currently Married	-0.171 <sup>***</sup> (0.046)	-0.182 <sup>***</sup> (0.043)	-0.144 <sup>***</sup> (0.045)
Year of Education	0.104 <sup>***</sup> (0.009)	0.034 <sup>***</sup> (0.008)	0.063 <sup>***</sup> (0.008)
<i>Political Views</i>			
Liberal	0.291 <sup>***</sup> (0.051)	0.100 <sup>*</sup> (0.046)	0.135 <sup>**</sup> (0.050)
Conservative	-0.514 <sup>***</sup> (0.045)	-0.459 <sup>***</sup> (0.043)	-0.415 <sup>***</sup> (0.045)
Mother's Education	0.032 <sup>***</sup> (0.007)	0.027 <sup>***</sup> (0.006)	0.025 <sup>***</sup> (0.006)
Family Income	0.003 <sup>***</sup> (0.000)	0.001 <sup>**</sup> (0.000)	0.001 <sup>***</sup> (0.000)
<i>Religious Affiliation</i>			
Mainline	0.473 <sup>***</sup> (0.057)	0.212 <sup>***</sup> (0.053)	0.298 <sup>***</sup> (0.056)
Other	-0.044 (0.072)	-0.159 <sup>*</sup> (0.074)	0.026 (0.078)
Catholic	0.304 <sup>***</sup> (0.051)	0.140 <sup>**</sup> (0.049)	0.296 <sup>***</sup> (0.051)
None	0.747 <sup>***</sup> (0.072)	0.268 <sup>***</sup> (0.062)	0.329 <sup>***</sup> (0.066)
Year	0.023 <sup>***</sup> (0.002)	0.031 <sup>***</sup> (0.002)	0.016 <sup>***</sup> (0.002)
Year-Squared	0.000 <sup>***</sup> (0.000)	0.000 <sup>***</sup> (0.000)	0.000 <sup>***</sup> (0.000)

Source: GSS 1975-2014. \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Results displayed in odds ratios.  
<sup>1</sup>Same reference categories for variables as in Table 2.

APPENDIX E: FIGURES

Figure 1. Gender Ideology by Gender and Work Status



Source: GSS 1975-2014.

GI is Gender Ideology, F is Full-time, P is Part-time, U is Unemployed, and KH is Keeping House