The Political Paradox of Gender: The Attitudes of Women and Men Toward Socially Compassionate and Morally Traditional Policies, 1973-1998

Alice H. Eagly

Northwestern University

Amanda Diekman

Purdue University

Abstract

The attitudes of women in the United States are more socially compassionate and morally traditional than those of men. This study determined that these attitudinal sex differences were generally stable between 1973 and 1998 in the General Social Survey but varied in magnitude across sociodemographic variables such as education, labor force participation, and minority or majority group status. The alignment of women with the socially compassionate positions of the political left and the morally traditional positions of the right has the potential to produce instability in women's political commitments and party identifications as the issues that are critical to elections shift with current events.

The Political Paradox of Gender: The Attitudes of Women and Men Toward Socially Compassionate and Morally Traditionally Policies, 1973-1998

Many researchers have identified social and political issues on which women and men tend to hold differing attitudes (see reviews by Center for American Women and Politics, 1997; Manza & Brooks, 1999; Pratto, Stallworth, & Sidanius, 1997; Seltzer, Newman, & Leighton, 1997). The most commonly noted difference is that women are more likely than men to endorse policies that can be considered "compassionate" because they support the provision of social services for disadvantaged groups (Goertzel, 1983; Shapiro & Mahajan, 1986) and protect people from violence (Goertzel, 1983; Smith, 1984). In addition, women are more disapproving of many behaviors that are traditionally considered immoral (e.g., casual sex; Oliver & Hyde, 1993). Although these trends pertain to citizens of the United States, researchers have obtained similar findings in Western Europe (e.g., Ekehammer & Sidanius, 1982; Jelen, Thomas, & Wilcox, 1994) as well as in Canada (Kopinak, 1987) and South Africa (Furnham, 1985).

Our research focuses on the stability of sex differences in social and political attitudes in the United States since the early 1970s. Starting at this time, high-quality, nationally representative attitudinal survey data became available through the General Social Survey (GSS; Davis & Smith, 1998), and many attitudinal items were repeated in subsequent surveys. These data allow the examination of sex differences on some social and political attitudes in a relatively long time frame. Specifically, the GSS yielded the opportunity to examine sex-differentiated attitudes in two areas: (a) socially compassionate attitudes supportive of the provision of social services and opposed to violence and (b) traditionally moral attitudes supportive of restricting activities that violate conventional norms about personal behavior. As we show in this article, the more socially compassionate yet traditionally moral attitudes of

women, compared with men, present a political paradox of aligning women with the left when guided by their social compassion and with the right when guided by their traditional morality.

To better understand these attitudes of men and women, we examine the extent to which the compassion and morality attitudes of women and men have converged, diverged, or maintained the same degree of difference from the early 1970s onward. In addition to analyzing the attitudes of women and men across time, we examine whether sex differences in attitudes are stable across other variables (e.g., racial groups, education). The patterning of the attitudes of men and women across time and other variables should shed some light on the causes of gender gaps in attitudes.

In this article, we focus in particular on women's attitudes. This emphasis flows not only from the tendency for women to show higher endorsement of social compassion and traditional morality but also from the greater potential complexity of understanding women's attitudes. As we explain in the next subsection, this complexity follows from the need to understand the influence of the women's movement and contemporary changes in women's typical social roles. Men, in contrast, have not participated in an analogous gender-based social movement, nor have their typical social roles shown much change over time. Men's attitudes thus provide a useful standard of comparison for evaluating women's attitudes.

Implications of the Social Roles of Men and Women for Gender Gaps in Attitudes

We formulated this research in terms of the social role theory of sex differences and similarities (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000), by which the attitudes of men and women are assumed to reflect their family and occupational roles. When the men and women in a society tend to be differently positioned in the social structure, a variety of processes conspire to make men and women psychologically different, and these differences may sometimes extend to their attitudes on social and political issues. Sex-differentiated characteristics and behaviors

emerge through a variety of proximal, mediating processes that include the formation of gender roles, by which people of each sex are expected to have characteristics that equip them for the tasks that they typically perform. Gender roles, along with the specific occupational and family roles occupied by men and women, then guide social behavior. This guidance is facilitated by sex-typed socialization processes by which girls and boys are encouraged to develop characteristics suited for their expected adult roles (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Ruble & Martin, 1998). Also important are the processes detailed in social psychological theory such as expectancy confirmation and self-regulatory processes (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998) as well as hormonal activation that orients women and men to effectively accomplish activities associated with their roles (see Wood & Eagly, 2001).

The idea that women and men adjust their attitudes on social and political issues to facilitate their performance of their social roles assumes that people link their life situations and their positions on such issues. For example, women's greater responsibility for parenting might lead them to favor policies that promote the welfare of children and families. However, when most women were confined to the domestic role, they tended not to become politically involved or vocal on public issues (Ruddick,1989; Sapiro, 1983). Studies of political socialization conducted in the 1960s and early 1970s thus showed that boys, more than girls, developed strong political involvement and partisan attitudes (Feltner & Goldie, 1974; Hess & Torney, 1967). As a consequence, men, more than women, reported a sense of personal efficacy in relation to political issues (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes, 1960), were politically knowledgeable and involved (Almond & Verba, 1963; Campbell et al., 1960; Lipset, 1960), and voted in elections (Campbell et al., 1960; Lipset, 1960). In surveys conducted prior to 1970, women in most Western countries had attitudes that differed little from those of men or that were slightly more conservative (Almond & Verba, 1963).

As women increased their gender consciousness and political activism as the feminist movement became a substantial force in the 1970s (Gurin, 1985; Gurin & Townsend, 1986), they not only became less approving of traditional gender relations (Harris & Firestone, 1998; Spence & Hahn, 1997; Twenge, 1997a) but also enlarged their political knowledge (Rapoport, 1982; Slevin & Aday, 1993). As attitude researchers have shown, when people gain expertise on politics and think about political issues, they develop attitudinal structures in which their attitudes about social policies that are more coherent and internally consistent (Lavine, Thomson, & Gonzales, 1997; Lusk & Judd, 1988). Women's increasing political expertise and interest should therefore have enabled them to develop policy positions that reflected their distinctive social position and group interest. This idea coheres with research we have conducted showing that female respondents' agreement with policy items in the GSS is correlated with the extent to which these items are rated as having positive implications for women (Diekman, Eagly, & Kulesa, in press). Contemporary women thus show attitudinal divergence from men that presumably reflects their analysis of how social policies affect women as a social group. In contrast, suggesting a relative absence of political activation of men as a social group, male respondents' agreement with policy items in the GSS did not relate to their group interest (Eagly et al., in press).

Although women's growing political sophistication is one likely influence on their sociopolitical attitudes, women's increasing labor force participation, which has placed women and men into more similar social roles, also needs to be taken into account. This shift toward paid employment for women is marked since 1970: from 43.3% of women in 1970 to 60.3% in 2000 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 2000, Table 645; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2001b, Table A-1). However, the increased role similarity of the sexes resulting from this change has particular contours–specifically, it primarily consists of women's increased wage labor, which

has occurred without a commensurate change in men's domestic labor (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000; Haas, 1995; Shelton & John, 1996). Women thus continue to have disproportionate responsibility for domestic work in the United States, including child care (e.g., Bianchi, 2000; Bianchi et al., 2000; Blair & Lichter, 1991) and are more likely to accept other caring responsibilities such as tending ill or disabled family members (e.g., Cancian & Oliker, 2000; Schulz, Williamson, Morycz, & Biegel, 1992). Although the amount of time that fathers devote to child care has increased somewhat in the United States, mothers' child care time has remained quite constant since 1965 (Bianchi, 2000). Also, women have entered many male-dominated occupations without a corresponding shift of men into female-dominated occupations (Reskin, McBrier, & Kmec, 1999; Reskin & Roos, 1990). Women thus continue to be the great majority of workers in traditionally female-dominated occupations (e.g., 98% of secretaries, 93% of registered nurses; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2001a, Table 11). Also, women in the United States and other nations continue to have lower status than men in terms of indicators such as wages relative to those of men, the holding of elective political offices, and participation in elite leadership roles (Eagly & Karau, in press; United Nations Development Programme, 2000). The changes in the social roles of the sexes are thus one-sided, with women shifting into male-dominated roles to a far greater extent that men shift into female-dominated roles.

The attitudinal implications of these one-sided changes are clear. To the extent that the attitudinal gender gaps that have emerged in survey data in recent decades reflect women's substantial domestic responsibilities, responsibility for care taking, and status disadvantage relative to men, these sex-typed attitudes likely show relatively little convergence over time. This prediction holds despite women's shift into paid employment. Nonetheless, the magnitude of attitudinal sex differences may vary across other demographic indicators because women who

are situated similarly to men–for example, with little domestic responsibility–may have attitudes similar to their male counterparts.

The expectation that women and men differ in their attitudes reflects the *group-centrism* of public opinion (Kinder, 1998). In general, group memberships in terms of broad social groupings with which people identify (e.g.,race, gender, religion) are often associated with distinctive political views. Although racial groupings have particularly large impact on attitudes in the United States (Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Kleugel & Smith, 1986), gender influences attitudes as well to the extent that group consciousness is associated with being male or female. However, as women developed gender consciousness with the modern feminist movement, their political realities remained complex. Some of this complexity arises from the fact that most women exist within families in an alliance with men, albeit sometimes an uneasy alliance. To the extent that men share their resources with their wives and children, policies that favor women at the expense of men may receive a mixed reception even among women. Such considerations suggest that the emergence of gender gaps in public opinion may depend, not only on the group interest of women and men, but also on the ways that policies are perceived to influence families and communities. Our data allow an exploration of these themes.

Two Domains of Sex-Typed Attitudes: Social Compassion and Traditional Morality

The gender gaps in the two types of attitudes that we examine, socially compassionate attitudes and traditionally moral attitudes, can plausibly be linked to the distinctive social position of women in terms of their greater domestic responsibility, concentration in low-wage occupations, and generally lower status, compared with men. If these attitudes reflect these general differences in the social position of the sexes, findings analogous to these attitudinal gender gaps should appear in other types of social psychological data. In fact, such findings are evident in several domains. One such demonstration derives from studies of gender stereotypes

showing that the stereotype of women as communal–that is, friendly, unselfish, concerned with others, and expressive–is intact in the culture of the United States (e.g., Lueptow, Garovich-Szabo, & Lueptow, 2001) and arises from the association of women with the domestic role (Eagly & Steffen, 1984), female-dominated occupations (Cejka & Eagly, 1999), and lower-status roles (e.g., Conway, Pizzamiglio, & Mount, 1996). These communal qualities of women also emerge in personality test data (Feingold, 1994). Similar themes appear in women's relatively interdependent self-concepts, whereby they, more than men, incorporate representations of others into their self-construals (Cross & Madson, 1997). Women's views of themselves are especially oriented to close relationships within dyads and intimate groups rather than within larger collectives (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999). Under contemporary conditions, these communal and interdependent qualities of women may be manifested in policy preferences that are approving of government support of people in need and disapproving of interpersonal violence.

Psychologists have given only limited attention to the kinds of moral orientations that may be associated with women's more favorable attitudes toward traditional morality. Most research on sex differences in morality has tested Gilligan's (1982) claim that women's moral reasoning is more oriented to caring and men's to abstract concerns of justice. Although this generalization has received modest empirical support (Jaffee & Hyde, 2000), this aspect of morality is different from the conservative versus liberal moral theme that is reflected in attitudinal data and that appears in many other types of data. For example, women's conventional morality emerges in their greater disapproval of many sexual behaviors traditionally considered immoral (e.g., premarital and extramarital relations; Oliver & Hyde, 1993) and of questionable business practices such as the use of insider information (Franke, Crown, & Spake, 1997). Women are also less approving than men of academic dishonesty and are less likely to cheat (Whitley, Nelson, & Jones, 1999), violate traffic laws (Marelich, Berger,

& McKenna, 2000; Simon & Corbett, 1996), and engage in most types of criminal behavior (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000). In addition, women manifest greater religiosity than men (e.g., Kelly & DeGraaf, 1997; Walter & Davie, 1998). The more restrictive morality of women that is reflected in such findings might have several causes, especially their sense that violations of traditional moral norms pose a danger to children, family relationships, and close interpersonal relationships more generally. This conclusion is consistent with Himmelfarb's (1999) analysis of the United States as currently possessing two cultures: One culture, rooted in the 1950s, is religious, puritanical, and family-oriented, and the other culture, rooted in the 1960s, is secular, hedonistic, and individualistic. Although these two cultures differ by region and social class, it is our contention that they also differ by gender, with women more likely to be oriented to the first of these cultures and men to the second.

To the extent that gender gaps in policy attitudes in the area of social compassion and traditional morality reflect women's greater commitment to child-rearing and close relationships, these attitudes may show little shift over time since the early 1970s, because responsibilities in these areas have remained disproportionately female-dominated. This expectation about the stability of these attitudes is congruent with meta-analytic findings on self-report measures of masculine and feminine personal qualities, which showed relative constancy from 1973 to 1993 in the tendency of women to describe themselves as more communal (i.e., feminine) than men (Twenge, 1997b). This constancy in communal self-descriptions contrasts with the tendency for women to describe themselves as increasingly agentic (i.e., masculine) in later compared with earlier years–that is, as more independent, assertive, and confident (Twenge, 1997b). This shift in agentic, masculine qualities is consistent with the type of role shift that has occurred on a large scale–that is, increasing labor force participation of women and their entry into many male-dominated roles.

Within-Sex Diversity of Attitudes

Another important consideration in analyzing differences in the attitudes of men and women is that neither of these social groups is politically homogeneous. Although sex is one social division or *cleavage* identified by political sociologists and marked by attitudinal differences and a voting "gap," there are other important cleavages such as social class and race (Manza & Brooks, 1999). Therefore, our analysis examines whether attitudinal sex differences are consistent across sociodemographic groups defined by race, education, labor force participation, and other factors as well as across the years. To the extent that the differing attitudes of women and men reflect their different positioning in social roles, controlling for sociodemographic variables may reduce the magnitude of these attitudinal differences. For example, controlling for men's higher income might reduce the magnitude of some attitudinal sex differences.

Predicting from sociodemographic variables as well as sex, in addition to reducing the magnitude of the sex effect, may moderate the impact of respondent sex on attitudes to the extent that attitudinal gender gaps are inconsistent across various social groupings. Moderation by labor force participation in the form of employed women's attitudes becoming similar to men's attitudes should be modest in magnitude for three reasons: (a) as we already indicated, women have retained disproportionate domestic responsibility even when employed; (b) the problems that women face as employees may be different from those that men face (e.g., discrimination, difficulties in simultaneously managing domestic responsibilities), and (c) women are concentrated in different occupations than men, especially in communally demanding, people-oriented occupations (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Lippa, 1998). Also, sex may interact with some sociodemographic variables because groups that are generally disadvantaged, especially racial and ethnic minorities, tend to support compassionate social policies (e.g., Cook & Barrett, 1992;

Kinder & Sanders, 1996), and the attitudes of minority men and women may thus be more similar that those of majority men and women. In general, the ability of various sociodemographic variables to account for attitudinal sex differences or to moderate the impact of sex on attitudes should yield some insight into the causes of these differences.

Consistent with Sears and Huddy's (1990) view that women lack political solidarity, despite the potentially unifying influence of the women's movement, women, like men, distribute themselves all along the liberal versus conservative continuum, which is generally a much stronger predictor of sociopolitical attitudes than sex (e.g., Cook & Barrett, 1992; Poole & Zeigler, 1985; Sapiro, 1983). Although women are both more socially compassionate and traditionally moral in their attitudes, compassionate attitudes are associated with the political left and, especially in recent years, moral attitudes are associated with the political right (e.g., Kerlinger, 1984; Manza & Brooks, 1999; McGirr, 2001). Because women on the average identify themselves as somewhat more liberal and less conservative than men (Seltzer et al., 1997), it is possible that women's generally more liberal political philosophy accounts for their more compassionate attitudes. Social scientists have thus often emphasized that attitudes can have a hierarchical structure whereby attitudes and beliefs are organized around a dominant overall theme such as liberalism and conservatism (see Eagly & Chaiken, 1998). Because moral traditionalism is more common on the political right, overall ideological sex differences cannot account for women's greater moral traditionalism. It is also possible that, on some issues, the magnitude of the sex difference may be moderated by political ideology (e.g., Poole & Zeigler, 1985), to the extent that a political philosophy of the left or the right is especially influential for both sexes, thus bringing together the men and women of that political orientation. The inclusion in the GSS of an item assessing self-reported liberal versus conservative ideology allows a limited exploration of the influence of political ideology on sex-related attitudes.

Method

Survey Procedure

This research uses data from the National Opinion Research Center's General Social Survey (GSS) for 1973-1998. The survey was conducted annually from 1972 to 1994, except for the years 1979, 1981, and 1992 and continued biennially since 1994. Approximately 1700 respondents were interviewed individually for each survey, in an interview that lasted approximately 1½ hours: "Each survey is an independently drawn sample of English-speaking persons 18 years of age or over, living in non-institutional arrangements within the United States" (Davis & Smith, 1998, p. v). The oversampling of Black respondents in 1982 and 1987 was corrected by omitting the extra respondents from our analyses.

The sample used for these analyses consisted of 35,796 respondents (56.4% women,[1] 43.6% men). The racial/ethnic composition of the sample was predominantly European American; with 11.8% African American, 4.3% Hispanic American, and 1.2% Asian American. Of the sample, 51.7% had obtained a high school diploma as their highest degree, and 12.8% had completed a bachelor's degree. The median age of the sample was 42, ranging from 18 to 89 years. The median family income was $21,659 (in constant 1986 dollars).

In order to maintain the integrity of our attitudinal scales, we included data from a given year in each analysis only if at least half of the scale items appeared in that year. As a result, the year 1986 was dropped from the analyses examining attitudes related to traditional morality. Also, we omitted the 1972 survey from all analyses because the item selection was generally insufficient.

Attitude Measurement

To identify attitudinal domains in which women and men show differing levels of agreement, we initially searched the GSS for attitudinal items that appeared in identical form in

at least 15 years and that showed at least a 4% gender gap in overall endorsement in all of these years. The items that met these criteria were entered into a factor analysis (promax rotation). Based on inspection of the scree plot, a four-factor solution was chosen, with the factors identified as civil liberties, traditional morality, support for establishment institutions, and social compassion. We then standardized the scores for the items that loaded .30 or higher on each of these factors. Within each scale, the standardized item scores were averaged to form a composite scale for each attitude. In order to avoid restricting the sample of items to those that showed a consistent gender gap over time, we then searched the GSS all items that pertained to the four sex-typed attitudinal domains that we had identified. We thus added to each scale all items that correlated .30 or more with it and that appeared in at least 15 years, regardless of whether they yielded a sex difference. This expanded group of items was then factor-analyzed and again yielded the four-factor structure. All items that loaded .30 or higher on a factor in this new factor analysis were retained, and items that loaded on more than one factor were assigned to the higher-loading factor. Once again, we standardized the scores for the items entering into each of the resulting four scales and averaged them. Because the overall sex difference for two of these attitudes was very small, r (28,475) = - .045 for support for establishment institutions and r (24,502) = -.044 for support for civil liberties (with greater male support in both areas), these results are not presented in this article.

The first scale, *social compassion*, included 10 items on police brutality, gun control, government spending for African Americans, reducing income differences between the rich and poor, and similar issues (alpha = .59). The second scale, *traditional morality*, included 12 items on extramarital relationships, divorce, suicide, pornography, and similar issues (alpha = .84). All items included in these scales appear in Appendix A.

Predictor Variables

The predictors of the attitudes are listed in Table 1. In order to retain all respondents in the analysis, labor force participation was dummy-coded as participant (i.e., employed full-time) versus nonparticipant (i.e., all other respondents), and occupational prestige as above average versus below average for the respondent's current job or past job if he or she was not employed at the time of the survey. The Hispanic variable indicated respondents' designation of their heritage as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or another Spanish-speaking group.

Data Analysis

Using a hierarchical regression procedure, we entered the independent variables into each regression in five steps with all continuous variables centered to facilitate the interpretation of interactions (Aiken & West, 1991). Exploratory analyses entered all continuous variables in their linear and quadratic forms, and the quadratic terms were retained if they were significant on either compassion or morality attitudes. Model 1 included only sex of respondent. Model 2 added year, year^2, and the Year × Sex interaction. Model 3 added sociodemographic variables such as education, age, employment, and race. Model 4 added the interactions between sex and the sociodemographic variables that proved to be significant predictors of either attitude. Model 5 added political ideology and its interaction with sex. A correlation matrix of all of the independent and dependent variables appears in Appendix B.

Results

Social Compassion Attitudes

As shown in Table 2's display of the regression results, in Model 1 the sex effect indicated that women held more socially compassionate attitudes than men, with other variables not controlled. Model 2's addition of year, year^2, and the Year ×Sex interaction, all of which were significant, had little impact on the prediction from sex. As depicted in Figure 1, attitudes

became generally more compassionate over time, consistent with the significant year effect. Also, consistent with the year^2 effect, attitudes showed mainly a downward trend in the early years before rising. Although the Year × Sex interaction in Model 2 showed that the sex difference in compassion attitudes became slightly larger over the years, this interaction was not significant in subsequent models, which controlled for other variables. The sex difference in compassion attitudes thus appears to be generally stable over time.

With the addition of Model 3's controls on various sociodemographic variables, the sex effect decreased somewhat in magnitude. These additional effects showed that attitudes were more compassionate for respondents who (a) were younger, with the quadratic trend reflecting some increase in compassion among the older respondents; (b) were unmarried; and (c) had fewer children, with the larger quadratic trend showing that the negative relation between number of children and compassion reversed as respondents with 3 or more children became increasingly compassionate. Attitudes were also more compassionate for respondents who (a) were more educated, with the quadratic trend reflecting increased compassion among respondents with the lowest and highest levels of education; (b) were not in the labor force; (c) had a low-prestige occupation; (d) had less household income, with the quadratic trend reflecting a relatively sharp drop in compassion as incomes increased at the lower levels; (e) were African American; and (f) were Hispanic. The largest of the standardized regression coefficients pertained to being African American.

Model 4's addition of interactions between sex and sociodemographic variables decreased the magnitude of the sex effect only slightly. The Age × Sex interaction showed that tendency for women to have more compassionate attitudes than men became smaller among older respondents (see Figure 2). The Total Children × Sex interaction reflected the larger magnitude of the sex difference among respondents with more children (see Figure 3). The

Occupational Prestige ×Sex interaction reflected the larger magnitude of the sex difference among respondents who had high-prestige occupations (see Figure 4). Both the African American × Sex and the Hispanic × Sex interactions reflected the smaller size of the sex difference among respondents from these minority groups (see Figures 5 and 6).

Finally, the addition of liberal-conservative political ideology in Model 5 did not change the magnitude of the sex effect, even though the relatively strong effect of political ideology showed that more liberal respondents had more compassionate attitudes. (Yet, the majority of the effects of the other sociodemographic variables became slightly smaller with Model 5's control on liberalism-conservatism). In addition, the Political Ideology × Sex interaction reflected greater divergence of male and female attitudes among more conservative respondents (see Figure 7).

Traditional Morality Attitudes

As shown in Table 3's display of the regression results, in Model 1 the sex effect indicated that women held more favorable attitudes toward traditional morality than men, with other variables not controlled. With Model 2's addition of year, year^2, and the Year × Sex interaction, only the year^2 effect was significant (in addition to sex), consistent with the tendency for traditional morality to rise and then fall over time (see Figure 8). Given that the Year × Sex interaction did not reach significance, the sex difference in morality attitudes appeared to remain stable over time.

With the addition of Model 3's controls on various sociodemographic variables, the sex effect decreased somewhat in magnitude. These additional effects showed that attitudes were more traditionally moral for respondents who (a) were older, with the quadratic trend reflecting less support with increasing age among the younger respondents followed by a rise in support among older respondents; (b) were married; (c) had more children, with the smaller quadratic

trend reflecting a slight flattening of the linear trend between 1 and 2 children and a steeper trend between 6 and 7 children; and (d) had a child in the home. Attitudes were also more traditionally moral for respondents who (a) were less educated, with the smaller quadratic trend reflecting a small rise in traditional morality at the lowest educational level and a steeper fall at the highest levels; (b) had less household income; and (c) were Hispanic. The largest standardized regression coefficient pertained to years of education and the next largest to marital status.

Model 4's addition of interactions between sex and the sociodemographic variables increased the magnitude of the sex effect. The Age × Sex and Labor Force Participation × Sex interactions reflected that the tendency for women to have more traditional attitudes than men was larger for respondents who were older or were not full-time participants in the labor force (see Figures 9 and 10).

Finally, the addition of liberal-conservative political ideology in Model 5 had little impact on the magnitude of the sex effect. The effect of ideology consisted of a relatively strong tendency for more conservative respondents to have more traditionally moral attitudes. (As with socially compassionate attitudes, controlling for liberalism-conservatism reduced the variability accounted for by several of the other sociodemographic variables.) In addition, the Political Ideology × Sex interaction reflected the greater divergence of male and female attitudes among more conservative respondents (see Figure 11).

Discussion

Our analysis of gender gaps in attitudes on social issues yielded informative patterning across two general areas of social and political debate. The largest sex difference found in the General Social Survey occurred on social compassion issues, whereby women were more supportive of social provision and opposed to harsh policies across a wide spectrum of specific issues. A smaller gender gap appeared on traditional morality issues, which took the form of

women being more disapproving of behavior that violates conventional moral norms in domains such as sexuality, drug use, suicide, and family life. Because the reliability of our attitudinal measures was not high, the true relationships between sex and these attitudes is no doubt somewhat stronger than our statistics indicated. Correcting these relationships for unreliability (Cronbach, 1990) thus reveals a correlation between sex and socially compassionate attitudes of .21 and a correlation between sex and morally traditional attitudes of .09. The greater unreliability of the compassion scale compared with the morality scale thus attenuated the difference in the strength of these relations in our data.

These attitudinal sex differences appeared to be generally stable over time, but showed important variability across other demographic variables and political ideology. As we argued in the Introduction, this stability over time is consistent with the lack of overall change the domestic and care taking responsibilities of women in the past 30 years (e.g., Bianchi, 2000) and with other psychological findings showing little change in dispositions that reflect women's more communal and family-oriented concerns (Twenge, 1997b). Thus, the continuation of women's greater domestic responsibilities and generally lower status relative to men likely undergirds women's distinctive policy preferences in the general domains of compassion and morality in the period that has followed the political awakening of women in the context of the modern feminist movement. With women's contemporary level of awareness of the policies that would support them in their life tasks, they have attitudes that diverge somewhat from those of men on important policy questions. To the extent that gender inequality remains present, especially in care taking and nurturing responsibilities, the attitudinal gender gaps appearing in our data will likely endure in public opinion data.

Social Compassion Attitudes

Women's tendency to have more socially compassionate attitudes than men was accompanied by a comparable tendency for Hispanics to have more compassionate attitudes than other respondents and a larger tendency for African Americans to have more compassionate attitudes than other respondents. As expected, the sex differences in these attitudes were also somewhat smaller among African American or Hispanic respondents than majority respondents. Moreover, the more compassionate attitudes of people who were younger, not employed, or had a low-prestige occupation demonstrated a general pattern of greater support for compassionate policies among respondents from more disadvantaged groups. Contrasting with these effects associating disadvantage with socially compassionate attitudes was an overall trend toward greater compassion among more educated respondents, but those who were at the lowest educational levels also showed relatively strong endorsement of compassionate policies. Sensible from a social role theory perspective is the additional finding that controlling for these additional demographic variables reduced the magnitude of the sex effect to some extent. Some relatively small portion of the sex difference in compassion attitudes thus reflected the different positioning of women and men in the social structure, especially their lesser labor force participation, occupational prestige, and household income (see Appendix B).

Also congruent with a role perspective is the tendency for the sex differences in compassion to increase somewhat for respondents who had more children. Because child care responsibilities fall disproportionately on women, the presence of children may increase their support for socially compassionate policies that support families and communities.

Traditional Morality Attitudes

Although women manifested both traditionally moral and socially compassionate attitudes to a greater extent than men, the other predictors of moral attitudes were for the most

part different from those of compassionate attitudes. The strongest predictor of traditional morality was education, with less educated people showing stronger endorsement; those with less household income also endorsed traditional morality more strongly. Although these predictors suggest social class differences in moral orientation, the tendencies of respondents who were married and had more children or a child in the home to favor traditional morality more strongly than other respondents is consistent with the idea that people view these moral norms and policies as protecting children and families. These findings are generally consistent with Himmelfarb's (1999) two cultures argument, which locates the more traditional culture in less educated, more family-oriented groupings in society. Moreover, the association of moral nontraditionalism with respondents who were unmarried, had no or few children, and were more educated and wealthier is reminiscent of the independent self-construals and valuing of independence and freedom that cross-cultural psychologists have identified as characterizing the culture of university students and other relatively privileged individuals in the United States (e.g., Kim & Markus, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The sex differences we have demonstrated in traditionally moral attitudes may thus reflect, not only the gains for families and close relationships that women believe follow from traditionalism, but also the gains of independence and freedom that men believe follow from throwing off traditional moral strictures.

Controlling for the interactions of sex with age and labor force participation increased the prediction from sex, suggesting that these interactions acted as suppressor variables by removing variability from the sex variable that was unrelated to moral attitudes. Particularly interesting from a social role theory perspective is the erosion of the sex difference in traditional morality among labor force participants, suggesting that the role similarity engendered by employment reduced this attitudinal difference. This result recalls Franke et al.'s (1997) meta-analytic finding

that the greater concern of women than men with ethical decision-making in business settings eroded with greater work experience of the respondent sample.

Liberalism-Conservatism

Prediction from liberalism-conservatism produced several provocative results. One important finding is that entering liberalism-conservatism into the regression equations had little effect on the ability of sex to predict socially compassionate or morally traditional attitudes. Women's slightly more liberal orientation would not be expected to account for their relatively more traditionally moral attitudes, which tend to be consistent with positions taken by conservative and Republican politicians. Although women's slightly more liberal orientation might have the potential to account for a portion of their more socially compassionate attitudes, the relation between sex and response to the liberal versus conservative political ideology item included in the GSS was extremely small, r (30,465) = -.02, $p < .0001$. Although the direction of this relation was, as expected, toward greater liberalism of women, its very small size may reflect women's mix of liberal and conservative attitudes. The minimal effect of political ideology on prediction from respondent sex as well as the generally small effects of political ideology on prediction from other sociodemographic variables also coheres with research suggesting that often people do not derive their attitudes to be consistent with their labeling of themselves with traditional ideological labels (e.g., Converse, 1964). Other research has suggested that the perceived relations of social policies to the attainment of specific values can be a more important source of attitudinal organization than broader political ideologies, especially among people who are not particularly knowledgeable about politics (Lavine et al., 1997).

Despite the failure of overall liberalism-conservatism to account for women's relatively compassionate attitudes, this ideological variable did predict both socially compassionate and

morally conservative attitudes: Liberal identity was associated with approval of socially compassionate policies and conservative identity with approval of morally traditional policies. Moreover, liberalism-conservatism moderated the magnitude of attitudinal sex differences in both socially compassionate and morally traditional attitudes. These differences between the attitudes of women and men were smaller among more liberal respondents, suggesting that liberalism is a more constraining ideology than conservatism with respect to the two attitudinal domains that we investigated.

Consequences of Attitudinal Sex Differences for Voting and Political Alignments

In view of debates about whether sex differences are large enough to be consequential (see Eagly, 1995; Hyde & Plant, 1995), it is important to note that by metrics such as percentage of agreement with survey items or percentage of variability in attitudes, the sex differences we have examined can be described as relatively small. Nonetheless, many social scientists have argued that many effects that would strike most researchers as quite small can have considerable practical importance (e.g., Bushman & Anderson, 2001; Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1996). When small differences in social groups are repeatedly observed and acted upon over long time periods, their effects are magnified. For example, small attitudinal differences may produce gender gaps in voting that are very consequential, especially in close elections.

In terms of voting behavior, considerable research supports the claim that citizens to some extent engage in *policy voting*, whereby one determinant of their voting preferences is their perception of candidates' similarity to them on important policy issues (see Kinder, 1998). Policy voting likely underlies the greater preference of women for Democratic candidates in most presidential elections since the early 1970s and in congressional elections since the early 1980s (Roper Center, 1996; Seltzer, Newman, & Leighton, 1997). Attitudinal sex differences would account for the gender gap in voting only to the extent that women, more than men, favor

the more liberal policies typically espoused by Democratic politicians. As our research has shown, women are indeed more supportive of the socially compassionate policies associated with the Democratic party.

Analyses of the relations between sex-related attitudes and voting gender gaps in the United States have produced evidence consistent with the claim that attitudinal differences underlie these gaps. Controlling for several demographic variables, Seltzer et al. (1997) examined whether respondents' sex accounted for additional variability in voting in numerous elections once sex-related attitudinal predictors were entered as predictors in multivariate analyses. Because prediction was typically not improved by adding sex as a predictor, Seltzer et al. concluded that attitudinal sex differences accounted for the divergent voting patterns of the sexes. Several other correlational studies have produced similar findings (e.g., Chaney, Alvarez, & Nagler, 1998; Gilens, 1988; Kaufmann & Petrocik, 1999; Manza & Brooks, 1998, 1999; Miller, 1988; Studlar, McAllister, & Hayes, 1998). In addition, in experiments portraying hypothetical candidates, Eagly, Diekman, and Kulesa (in press) showed that participants of each sex reported greater likelihood, compared with participants of the other sex, of voting for the candidate who endorsed positions typically favored more by their own sex than the other sex. The particular policy attitudes generally implicated as responsible for the voting gender gaps are typically variants of socially compassionate attitudes (e.g., attitudes on compassion issues and the use of force in Chaney et al., 1998; attitudes toward social services spending in Manza & Brooks, 1998, 1999). This interpretation of voting gender gaps coheres with our finding in that women do indeed support more liberal policies in this area as well as with the effort of George W. Bush's 2000 presidential campaign to portray conservative policies as "compassionate" (e.g., Olasky, 2000).

The role of women's more traditionally moral attitudes in relation to elections warrants further study. The fact that women tend to vote to the left of men suggests that these attitudes may not be a major influence on the voting gender gap, perhaps because they are not as generally important as socially compassionate attitudes (Krosnick, 1988) or are less relevant to voting. In general, distinctively moral issues, except for abortion, seldom appear on the lists of issues that voters consider in elections (e.g., Washington Post, 2000, November 2). However, moral considerations can influence perceptions of candidates' character, which in turn influences voting (Kinder, 1998). Therefore, in some elections women's traditionally moral attitudes may diminish or enhance the magnitude of the gender gap in voting, depending on voters' perceptions of candidates' morality. The impact may be modest, given that the attitudinal sex difference on traditional morality is smaller than the difference on social compassion. Nonetheless, suggesting the possible importance of moral issues is the considerable prominence they achieved in the 2000 presidential election campaign, in which George W. Bush portrayed himself as restoring "honor and integrity" to the presidency, thereby contrasting himself to Bill Clinton, whose extramarital affairs and other indiscretions had tarnished his personal reputation as a moral man. In fact, on the dimension of "moral authority," a survey of historians ranked Bill Clinton at the very bottom of the list of 41 presidents of the United States (Lacey, 2000, February 21).

Conclusion

This research has demonstrated that the attitudes of women and men differ consistently in recent decades in the important areas of social compassion and moral traditionalism. Thorough understanding of why these sociopolitical attitudes show persisting sex differences requires additional exploration of the social psychological roots of these attitudes, especially the functions that these attitudes serve for men and women (see Eagly & Chaiken, 1998). Assumptions about functions were implicit in our contention in this article that the two major

domains in which the attitudes of men and women differ–social compassion and moral traditionalism–reflect women's commitments to the family and close interpersonal relationships and their concentration in communally demanding, lower-status paid employment. Women may thus perceive socially compassionate and morally traditional policies as protecting their personal interests and the interests of women and families more generally. In general support of this view, women's endorsements of items on the GSS can be predicted from policies' perceived group interest for women (Diekman et al., in press). The influence of group interest on attitudes also coheres with the general tendency we observed in this study for respondents from disadvantaged groups to favor compassionate policies. Yet, attitude theorists have argued that attitudes serve a variety of functions (Katz, 1960; Maio & Olson, 2000), not only facilitating progress toward personal or collective goals, but also allowing people to express their values and self-concepts. A valuing of independence and individualism by men (e.g., Cross & Madson, 1997) may thus be manifested in their moral nontraditionalism, and a general value of social liberalism by more highly educated people (Kluegel & Smith, 1986) may be expressed in their support of compassionate policies. These considerations invite research exploring the various functions that attitudes serve for women and men.

Finally, the analysis that we have offered in this article should deter scholars from offering overly simple analyses of the impact of changing social roles on psychological attributes. In particular, some scholars have reasoned inaccurately from the perspective of the social role theory of sex similarities and differences (Eagly et al., 2000) by suggesting that this theory predicts that increasing similarity in the social roles of the sexes in industrialized countries causes men and women to become psychologically similar (e.g., Lueptow et al., 2001). Although increasing similarity would be expected in characteristics that reflect women's paid labor, women's persistently disproportionate responsibility for domestic labor would maintain

psychological sex differences that reflect this responsibility. Thus, findings that more egalitarian societies show larger sex differences in emotions (Fischer & Manstead, 2000) and personality (Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001) remain ambiguous because these studies did not focus on the agentic (or masculine) characteristics associated with labor force participation. Most observed shifts over time in psychological attributes in the United States thus reflect convergence of men and women on masculine but not feminine characteristics (e.g., Twenge, 1997b, 2001; see Diekman & Eagly, 2000; Eagly & Diekman, in press-a, in press-b). The stability over time that we have demonstrated in male-female differences in socially compassionate and morally traditional attitudes provides yet more evidence of the maintenance of the sex differences that reflect the communal, feminine domain of social life.

References

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Almond, G., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Maternal employment and time with children: Dramatic change or surprising continuity? *Demography, 37*, 401-414.

Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces, 79,* 191-228.

Blair, S. L., & Lichter, D. T. (1991). Measuring the division of household labor: Gender segregation of housework among American couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 12*, 91-113

Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2001). Media violence and the American public: Scientific facts versus media misinformation. *American Psychologist, 56,* 477-489.

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review, 106,* 676-713.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W., & Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The American voter.* New York: Wiley.

Cancian, F. M., & Oliker, S. J. (2000). *Caring and gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Cejka, M. A., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25,* 413-423.

Center for American Women and Politics. (1997). *The gender gap: Attitudes on public policy issues (Fact sheet from National Information Bank on Women in Public Office, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University)*. Retrieved on September 1, 2001 from http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~cawp/pdf/ggapissues.pdf.

Chaney, C. K., Alvarez, R. M., & Nagler, J. (1998). Explaining the gender gap in U.S. presidential elections, 1980-1992. *Political Research Quarterly, 51*, 311-339.

Converse, P. E. (1974). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D. E. Apter (Ed.), *Ideology and discontent* (pp. 206-261). New York: Free Press.

Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, M. T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 25-38.

Cook, F. L., & Barrett, E. J. (1992). *Support for the American welfare state: The views of Congress and the public.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Costa, P., Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 322-331

Cronbach, L. J. (1990). *Essentials of psychological testing* (5th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin, 122*, 5-37.

Davis, J. A., & Smith, T. W. (1998). *General social surveys, 1972-1998.* [CD-ROM machine-readable data file]. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, producer. Storrs, CT: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, distributor.

Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 788-827). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Diekman, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 1171-1188.

Diekman, A. B., Eagly, A. H., & Kulesa, P. (in press). Accuracy and bias in stereotypes about the social and political attitudes of women and men. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H. (1995). The science and politics of comparing women and men. *American Psychologist, 50,* 145-158.

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude structure and function. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 269-322). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eagly, A. H., & Diekman, A. B. (in press-a). The malleability of sex differences in response to changing social roles. In L. G. Aspinwall & U. M. Staudinger (Eds.), *A psychology of human strengths*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Eagly, A. H., & Diekman, A. B. (in press-b). The common-sense psychology of changing social groups. In J. Jost, M. Banaji, & D. Prentice (Eds.), *The ying and yang of social psychology: Perspectivism at work* (Festschrift in honor of William J. McGuire).

Eagly, A. H., Diekman, A. B., M. Schneider, & Kulesa, P. (2001). *Experimental tests of an attitudinal theory of the gender gap in voting.* Unpublished manuscript, Northwestern University.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (in press). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 735-754.

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekman, A. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Taunter (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ekehammar, B., & Sidanius, J. (1982). Sex differences in socio-political attitudes: A replication and extension. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 21,* 249-257.

Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 116,* 429-456.

Feltner, P., & Goldie, L. (1974). The impact of socialization and personality on the female voter: Speculations tested with 1964 presidential data. *Western Political Quarterly, 27*, 280-292.

Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2000). The relation between gender and emotions in different cultures. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotions: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 71-94). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Franke, G. R., Crown, D. F., & Spake, D. F. (1997). Gender differences in ethical perceptions of business practices: A social role theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 920-934.

Furnham, A. (1985). Adolescents' sociopolitical attitudes: A study of sex and national differences. *Political Psychology, 6*, 621-636.

Gabriel, S., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Are there "his" and "hers" types of interdependence? The implications of gender differences in collective versus relational interdependence for affect, behavior, and cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 642-655.

Gilens, M. (1988). Gender and support for Reagan: A comprehensive model of presidential approval. *American Journal of Political Science, 32,* 19-49.

Goertzel, T. G. (1983). The gender gap: Sex, family income, and political opinions in the early 1980's. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 11,* 209-222.

Gurin, P. (1985). Women's gender consciousness. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 49,* 143-163.

Gurin, P., & Townsend, A. (1986). Properties of gender identity and their implications for gender consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 139-148.

Haas, L. L. (1995). Household division of labor in industrial societies. In B. B. Ingoldsby & S. Smith (Eds.), *Families in multicultural perspective: Perspectives on marriage and the family* (pp. 268-296). New York: Guilford Press.

Harris, R. J., & Firestone, J. M. (1998). Changes in predictors of gender role ideologies among women: A multivariate analysis. *Sex Roles, 38*, 239-252.

Hess, R. D., & Torney, J. V. (1967). *The development of political attitudes in children*. Chicago: Aldine.

Himmelfarb, G. (1999). *One nation, two cultures*. New York: Knopf.

Hyde, J. S., & Plant, E. A.(1995).The magnitude of psychological gender differences: Another side to the story. *American Psychologist, 50*, 159-161.

Jaffee, S., & Hyde, J. S. (2000). Gender differences in moral orientation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 703-726.

Jelen, T. G., Thomas, S., & Wilcox, C. (1994). The gender gap in comparative perspective: Gender differences in abstract ideology and concrete issues in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research, 25*¸ 171-186.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163-204.

Kaufmann, K. M., & Petrocik, J. R. (1999). The changing politics of American men: Understanding the sources of the gender gap. *American Journal of Political Science, 43*, 864-887.

Kelly, J., & DeGraaf, N. D. (1997). National context, parental socialization, and religious belief: Results from 15 nations. *American Sociological Review, 62*, 639-659.

Kerlinger, F. N.(1984).*Liberalism and conservatism: The nature and structure of social attitudes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 785-800.

Kinder, D. R. (1998). Opinion and action in the realm of politics. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 778-867). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kinder, D. R., & Sanders, L. M. (1996). *Divided by color: Racial politics and democratic ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R.(1986).*Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be.* New York: Aldine de Grader.

Kopinak, K. (1987). Gender differences in political ideology in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 24,* 23-38.

Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 196-210.

Lacey, M. (2000, February 21). Clinton ranks in the middle, but falls last on morality. *New York Times,* Section A, p. 11.

Lavine, H., Thomsen, C. J., & Gonzales, M. H. (1997). A shared consequences model of the development of inter-attitudinal consistency: The influence of values, attitude-relevant thought, and expertise. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 735-749.

Lueptow, L. B., Garovich-Szabo, L., & Lueptow, M. B. (2001). Social change and the persistence of sex typing, 1974-1997. *Social Forces, 80*, 1-36.

Lippa, R.(1998).Gender-related individual differences and the structure of vocational interests: The importance of the "people-things" dimension. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 996-1009.

Lipset, S. M. (1960). *Political man: The social bases of politics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Lusk, C. M., & Judd, C. M.(1988).Political expertise and the structural mediators of candidate evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24*, 105-126.

Maio, G. R., & Olson, J. M. (Eds.). *Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self; Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Manza, J., & Brooks, C. (1998). The gender gap in U.S. presidential elections: When? Why? Implications? *American Journal of Sociology, 103*, 1235-1266.

Manza, J., & Brooks, C. (1999). *Social cleavages and political change: Voter alignments and U.S. party coalitions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Marelich, W. D., Berger, D. E., & McKenna, R. B. (2000). Gender differences in the control of alcohol-impaired driving in California. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 61*, 396-401.

Martell, R. F., Lane, D. M., & Emrich, C. E. (1996). Male-female differences: A computer simulation. *American Psychologist, 51*, 157-158.

McGirr, L. (2001. Piety and property: Conservatism and right-wing movements in the Twentieth Century. In H. Sitkoff (Ed.), *Perspectives on modern America: Making sense of the Twentieth Century* (pp. 33-54). New York: Oxford University Press.

Miller, A. (1988). Gender and the vote: 1984. In C. M. Mueller (Ed.), *The politics of the gender gap: The social constructions of political influence* (pp. 258-282). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Olasky, M. (2000). *Compassionate conservatism: What it is, what it does, and how it can transform America.* New York: Free Press.

Oliver, M. B., & Hyde. J. S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 114,* 29-51.

Poole, K. T., & Zeigler, L. H. (1985). *Women, public opinion, and politics: The changing political attitudes of American women.* New York: Longman.

Pratto, F., Stallworth, L. M., & Sidanius, J. (1997). The gender gap: Differences in political attitudes and social dominance orientation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36,* 49-68.

Rapoport, R. B. (1982). Sex differences in attitude expression: A generational expression. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 46,* 86-96.

Reskin, B. F., McBrier, D. B., & Kmec, J. A. (1999). The determinants and consequences of workplace sex and race composition. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25,* 335-361.

Reskin, B. F., & Roos, P. A. (1990). *Job queues, gender queues: Explaining women's inroads into male occupations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ruble, D. N., & Martin, C. L. (1998). Gender development. In W. Damon & N. Heisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 933-1016). New York: Wiley.

Ruddick, S. (1989). *Maternal thinking*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sapiro, V. (1983). *The political integration of women: Roles, socialization, and politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Schulz, R., Williamson, G. M., Morycz, R. K., & Biegel, D. E.(1992).Costs and benefits of providing care to Alzheimer's patients. In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Helping and being helped: Naturalistic studies* (Claremont Symposium on Applied Psychology), pp. 153-181.Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sears, D. O., & Huddy, L. (1990). On the origins of political disunity among women. In L. A. Tilly & P. Gurin (Eds.), *Women, politics, and change* (pp. 249-277). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Seltzer, R. A., Newman, J., & Leighton, M. V. (1997). *Sex as a political variable: Women as candidates and voters in U.S. elections.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner.

Shapiro, R. Y., & Mahajan, H. (1986). Gender differences in policy preferences: A summary of trends from the 1960s to the 1980s. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 50,* 42-61.

Simon, F., & Corbett, C. (1996). Road traffic offending, stress, age, and accident history among male and female drivers. *Ergonomics, 39*, 757-780.

Slevin, K. F., & Aday, D. P. (1993). Gender differences in self-evaluations of information about current affairs. *Sex Roles, 29*, 817-828.

Smith, T. W. (1984). The polls: Gender and attitudes toward violence. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 48*, 384-396.

Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 17-34.

Studlar, D. T., McAllister, I., & Hayes, B. C. (1998). Explaining the gender gap in voting: A cross-national analysis. *Social Science Quarterly, 79*, 779-798.

Twenge, J. M. (1997a). Attitudes toward women, 1970-1995: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 35-51.

Twenge, J. M. (1997b). Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles, 36,* 305-325.

Twenge, J. M. (2001). Changes in women's assertiveness in response to status and roles: A cross-temporal meta-analysis, 1931-1993. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 133-145.

United Nations Development Programme. (2000). *Human development report 2000.* New York: Oxford University Press.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. (2000). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2000.* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Retrieved August 31, 2001 from http://www.census.gov/prod/www/statistical-abstract-us.html

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2001a). *Annual average tables from the January 2001 issue of "Employment and earnings."* Retrieved on October 2, 2001 from http://stats.bls.gov/cpsaatab.htm#empstat.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2001b). *The employment situation: July 2001.* Retrieved on September 2, 2001 from http://stats.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/empsit.pdf.

U. S. Department of Justice (2000). *Crime in the United States 1999.* Retrieved on October 1, 2001 from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/Cius_99/99crime/99cius.pdf.

Walter, T., & Davie, G. (1998). The religiosity of women in the modern West. *British Journal of Sociology, 49*, 640-660.

Washington Post Poll (2000, November 3). *Which one of these issues is most important in your vote for president?* Retrieved on October 6, 2001 from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/polls.htm.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., Nelson, A. B., & Jones, C. J. (1999). Gender differences in cheating attitudes and classroom cheating behavior: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles, 41*, 657-680.

Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2001). *A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences*. Manuscript under review.

Footnotes

[1] The higher percentage of women than men reflects not only their greater longevity but also the selection of respondents from noninstitutional environments, which excludes the male-dominated groups consisting of incarcerated criminals and military personnel.

Author Note

The authors thank Gena Chieco, Sheila Jauma, and Paulette Barry for help with preliminary data analyses and Mary Johannesen-Schmidt, Carmen Tanner, and Anne Koenig for comments on a draft of the manuscript. The research was supported by National Science Foundation Grant SBR-9729449 to Alice H. Eagly.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alice H. Eagly, Department of Psychology, 2029 Sheridan Road, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to eagly@nwu.edu.

Table 1

Independent Variables

Variable	Coding
Sex	0 = male; 1 = female
Year*	1973, 1974, . . ., 1998
Age*	18 = 18 years, 19 = 19 years, . . ., 89 years
Marital status	0 = not married; 1 = married
Total children*	0 = none, 1 = one child, . . ., 8 = eight or more children
Child in home	0 = no; 1 = yes
Years of education*	1 = 1 year, 2 = 2 years, . . .
Labor force participation	0 = nonparticipant; 1 = participant
Occupational prestige	0 = below average; 1 = above average
Household income*	Scaled to constant 1986 dollars
African American	0 = not African American; 1 = African American
Hispanic	0 = not Hispanic; 1 = Hispanic
Political ideology*	1 = extremely liberal, . . .,7 = extremely conservative

* Continuous variable.

Table 2

Regression Results for Social Compassion Attitudes

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	b	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β
Sex	.164***	.160	.163****	.159	.135****	.132	.128****	.125	.129****	.126
Year variables										
Year			.004****	.059	.003****	.040	.002****	.037	.004****	.054
Year^2			.000*	.013	.000*	.012	.000*	.011	.000	.009
Year × Sex			.000*	.017	.001	.012	.001	.015	.001	.007
Other sociodemographic variables										
Age					-.002****	-.068	-.001****	-.041	-.001	-.020
Age^2					.000**	.020	.000***	.023	.000****	.026
Marital status					-.039****	-.038	-.040****	-.039	-.026****	-.025
Total children					-.010****	-.035	-.017****	-.061	-.014****	-.051
Total children^2					.004****	.045	.004****	.043	.003****	.038
Child in home					.011	.010	.013	.013	.017*	.016
Years of education					.012****	.076	.013****	.078	.011****	.068
Years of education^2					.002****	.082	.002****	.082	.002****	.071
Labor force participation					-.051****	-.050	-.056****	-.055	-.046****	-.045
Occupational prestige					-.040****	-.039	-.058****	-.056	-.050****	-.049
Household income					.000****	-.098	.000****	-.100	.000****	-.092
Household income^2					.000****	.054	.000****	.057	.000****	.056
African American					.479****	.304	.527****	.334	.496****	.315

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	b	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β
Hispanic					.251****	.100	.310****	.124	.287****	.114
Interactions of other sociodemographic variables and sex										
Age × Sex							-.001***	-.032	-.001***	-.032
Total children × Sex							.014****	.037	.013****	.035
Labor force participation × Sex							.016	.012	.003	.003
Occupational prestige × Sex							.031**	.025	.026*	.021
African American × Sex							-.080****	-.041	-.062****	-.032
Hispanic × Sex							-.102****	-.031	-.082**	-.025
Political ideology										
Political ideology									-.086****	-.223
Political ideology × Sex									.022****	.039
Constant	-.948****		-.105****		-.154****		-.152****		-.159****	
R^2	.026****		.031****		.171****		.173****		.210****	
R^2 change			.005****		.140****		.002****		.037****	

Note. Total *df* = 29,178 for all models. Survey years included are 1973-1978, 1980, 1982-1991, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1998. *b* = unstandardized regression coefficient. β = standardized regression coefficient.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$. ****$p < .0001$.

Table 3

Regression Results for Traditional Morality Attitudes

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	b	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β
Sex	.107****	.081	.105****	.079	.080****	.060	.133****	.101	.132****	.099
Year variables										
Year			.000	.005	.005****	.062	.005****	.062	.004****	.046
Year^2			.000****	-.035	.000****	-.036	.000****	-.036	.000****	-.035
Year× Sex			.001	.010	.000	.007	.001	.009	.002	.016
Other sociodemographic variables										
Age					.004****	.097	.002****	.048	.001**	.030
Age^2					.000****	.043	.000****	.041	.000****	.038
Marital status					.174****	.131	.180****	.136	.159****	.120
Total children					.026****	.072	.029****	.080	.026****	.072
Total children^2					.003**	.023	.003**	.024	.003****	.029
Child in home					.068****	.051	.067****	.049	.062****	.046
Years of education					-.032****	-.156	-.033****	-.158	-.031****	-.147
Years of education^2					.000*	-.012	.000	-.010	.000	.002
Labor force participation					.015	.012	.062****	.047	.051****	.039
Occupational prestige					-.012	-.009	.000	.001	-.008	-.006
Household income					.000****	-.093	.000****	-.096	.000****	-.104
Household income^2					.000	.013	.000	.014	.000	.015
African American					-.011	-.006	-.006	-.003	.029	.014

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	b	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β	*b*	β
Hispanic					.052**	.016	.062*	.019	.089***	.027
Interactions of other sociodemographic variables and sex										
Age × Sex							.003****	.063	.003****	.055
Total children × Sex							-.006	-.013	-.007	-.014
Labor force participation × Sex							-.090****	-.056	-.074****	-.046
Occupational prestige × Sex							-.013	-.008	-.008	-.005
African American × Sex							-.000	-.000	-.011	-.004
Hispanic × Sex							-.015	-.003	-.039	-.009
Political ideology										
Political ideology									.100****	.201
Political Ideology × Sex									.015**	.021
Constant	-.066****		-.038****		-.186****		-.227****		-.218****	
R^2	.006****		.008****		.106****		.109****		.155****	
R^2 change			.001****		.098****		.003****		.047****	

Note. Total *df* = 27,887 for all models. Survey years included were 1973-1978, 1980, 1982-1985, 1987-1991, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1998.

b = unstandardized regression coefficient. β = standardized regression coefficient.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$. ****$p < .0001$.

Appendix A

Items in Attitude Scales

Variable name	Description	Coding
	Social compassion	
CAPPUN (82)	Do you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder?	1 = favor 2 = oppose*
EQWLTH (72)	Some people think that the government in Washington ought to reduce the income differences between the rich and the poor, perhaps by raising the taxes of wealthy families or by giving income tax assistance to the poor. Others think that the government should not concern itself with reducing this income difference between the rich and poor. What score between 1 and 7 comes closest to the way you feel?	(1-7 scale) 1 = government should do something to reduce income differences between rich and poor* 7 = government should not concern itself with income differences
GUNLAW (86)	Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy a gun?	1 = favor* 2 = oppose
HITROBBR	(If approve of a man punching an adult male stranger:) Would you approve if the stranger had broken into the man's house?	1 = yes 2 = no*
HITCHILD (231C)	Would you approve of a man punching a stranger who had hit the man's child after the child accidentally damaged the stranger's car?	1 = yes 2 = no*

Variable name	Description	Coding
NATCITY (65D)	Are we spending too much money, too little money, or about the right amount on solving the problems of the big cities?	1 = too little* 2 = about right 3 = too much
NATRACE (65H)	Are we spending too much money, too little money, or about the right amount on improving the conditions of Blacks?	1 = too little* 2 = about right 3 = too much
POLESCAP (232C)	Would you approve of a policeman striking a citizen who was attempting to escape from custody?	1 = yes 2 = no*
POLHITOK (232)	Are there any situations you can imagine in which you would approve of a policeman striking an adult male citizen?	1 = yes 2 = no*
RACOPEN (128)	Suppose there is a community-wide vote on the general housing issue. There are two possible laws to vote on. Which would you vote for?	1 = one law says that a homeowner can decide for himself whom to sell his house to, even if he prefers not to sell it to (Negroes/Blacks/African Americans) 2 = the second law says that a homeowner cannot refuse to sell to someone because of their race or color*
	Traditional morality	
ABNOMORE (206)	Tell me whether or not you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a <u>legal</u> abortion if she is married and does not want any more children.	1 = yes 2 = no*
DIVLAW (215A)	Should divorce in this country be easier or more difficult to obtain than it is now?	1 = easier 2 = more difficult* 3 = stay as is

Variable name	Description	Coding
GRASS (95)	Do you think the use of marijuana should be made legal or not?	1 = should 2 = should not*
LETDIE1 (226)	When a person has a disease that cannot be cured, do you think doctors should be allowed by law to end the patient's life by some painless means if the patient and his family request it?	1 = yes 2 = no*
PORNLAW (222)	Which of these statements comes closest to your feelings about pornography laws?	1 = there should be laws against the distribution of pornography whatever the age* 2 = there should be laws against the distribution of pornography to persons under 18 3 = there should be no laws forbidding the distribution of pornography
PORNMORL (221B)	Sexual materials lead to the breakdown of morals	1 = yes* 2 =no
PORNRAPE (221C)	Sexual materials lead people to commit rape	1 = yes* 2 = no
PRAYER (119A)	The United States Supreme Court has ruled that no state or local government may require the reading of the Lord's Prayer or Bible verses in public schools. What are your views on this– do you approve or disapprove of the court ruling?	1 = approve* 2 = disapprove
PREMARSX (217)	If a man and woman have sex relations before marriage, do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?	1 = always wrong* 2 = almost always wrong 3 = wrong only sometimes 4 = not wrong at all
SUICIDE1 (227A)	Do you think a person has the right to end his or her own life if this person has an incurable disease?	1 = yes 2 = no*

Variable name	Description	Coding
SUICIDE4 (227D)	Do you think a person has the right to end his or her own life if this person is tired of living and ready to die?	1 = yes 2 = no*
XMARSEX (218)	What is your opinion about a married person having sexual relations with someone other than the marriage partner–is it always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?	1 = always wrong* 2 = almost always wrong 3 = wrong only sometimes 4= not wrong at all

Note. Asterisks indicate the more socially compassionate or more traditionally moral end of the scale for each item. Items were scored so that higher numbers indicated higher levels of the construct.

Appendix B

Correlations Among Dependent and Independent Variables

Variable	Tradi-tional morality	Sex	Year	Age	Current marital status	Total children	Child in home	Years of education	Labor force participa-tion	Occupa-tional prestige	Household income	African American	Hispanic	Political ideology
Social compassion	-.02***	.16****	.08****	-.07****	-.14****	-.01	.02****	-.01*	-.08****	-.09****	-.12****	.33****	.10****	-.24****
Traditional morality		.08****	.01*	.17****	.10****	.19****	.03****	-.23****	-.11****	-.10****	-.12****	.02**	.03****	.25****
Sex			.01*	.04****	-.09****	.08****	.06****	-.05****	-.26****	-.06****	-.10****	.04****	.01	-.02****
Year				.02****	-.14****	-.07****	-.10****	.19****	.08****	.03****	.00	.03****	.04****	.03****
Age					.02**	.35****	-.40****	-.27****	-.32****	.02**	-.08****	-.04****	-.10****	.13****
Current marital status						.22****	.25****	.02****	.05****	.10****	.31****	-.14****	-.01	.10****
Total children							.20****	-.25****	-.14****	-.08****	-.01	.08****	.02**	.09****
Child in home								.04****	.10****	-.02****	.11****	.06****	.09****	-.01
Years of education									.27****	.40****	.37****	-.11****	-.07****	-.04****
Labor force participation										.18****	.23****	-.01**	.02**	-.02**
Occupational prestige											.29****	-.13****	-.06****	.03****
Household income												-.14****	-.05****	.05****
African American													-.05****	-.08****
Hispanic														-.03****

Note. *N*s ranged from 27,888 to 34,326, depending on missing data. The metrics for demographic variables are located in Table 1.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$. ****$p < .0001$.