Family and Changing Sex-Roles: Some Preliminary Findings About

Sex-Role Attitudes in Germany and the United States[1]

Walter Funk[2]

GSS Cross-National Report No. 12

(Original version: January 29, 1991)

Revised: June 8, 1993

Chicago: NORC

---

[2] Mailing address: Walter Funk, Lehrstuhl fuer Soziologie, Findelgasse 7 - 9, D-8500 Nuernberg 1, Germany.

1. Introduction

In her 1982 paper comparing German[3] and U.S. attitudes toward women's role as expressed in four items used in the 1977 U.S. General Social Survey (GSS) and the 1982 German equivalent Allgemeine Bevoelkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften (ALLBUS), Krauth reports the U.S. respondents to be slightly more traditional than the German respondents, however, both groups favoring a traditional view of a woman's role (see Krauth 1982, p. 14). Eleven years later for the U.S., respectively six years later for Germany, there again is the opportunity to compare both of the countries in their attitudes toward the family and changing sex roles. This is due to data from the 1988 International Social Survey Program (ISSP) which asked U.S. and German citizens, as well as respondents in several other countries, about their attitudes toward marriage, the family and divorce, children and child care, as well as female labor force participation and sex-role attitudes (for ISSP88 see Zentralarchiv 1990; for ISSP generally see Smith 1987; Davis and Jowell 1989). This paper focuses on the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America only, analyzing attitudes toward women's role in social life with respect to their labor force participation. Besides the descriptive analysis of several indices built as composite scores of the interesting items, it is also intended to explore the reasons for differences between U.S. and German respondents.

2. Background

Given the process of individualization, that is often maintained for modern industrialized societies in rapid social change (see , e.g., Beck 1986), it seems plausible that major institutions of society exposed to this ongoing change will undergo significant changes, too. The family is one of those institutions sociologists have always been interested in. Looking at the family there is quite a lot of change obvious. For Germany researchers report more differing family and household structures, deferred marriages, dropping marriage rates, deferred pregnancies, decreasing numbers of children per family, increasing numbers of couples without any children, increasing cohabitation of unmarried partners, increasing divorce rates as well as increasing numbers of one-parent or stepparent families (see Bertram and Borrmann-Mueller, 1988; Luescher 1985, p.111; Schulz 1983). Comparable changes are also reported for the U.S. (for a summary with referring literature see Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 4).

Besides these changes in family structure, researchers' attentions have also been drawn to the fact of increased female labor force participation (see , e.g., Masnick and Bane 1980, ch. 3; Wait 1981; Spain and Bianchi 1983, pp. 23-4) and the question in which way both of these trends - changing family structure and women's employment - affect sex-role attitudes and the relation of family and work generally (see , e.g., Piotrkowski, Rapoport, and Rapoport 1987).

From a traditional point of view a woman's place is with the children in the household while men are working for pay in the labor market to support their family.[4] At least this was the prevailing pattern of the social division of labor that emerged with industrialization and the change from the concentration of production in and around the family toward the production in factories. But this picture does not hold any more. During the last decades female education as well as female labor force participation significantly rose. Both of these facts are also well known to have an impact on sex-role attitudes (see , e.g., Mason, Czajka and Arber 1976, p. 582; Thornton and Freedman 1979, pp. 835-40; Morgan and Walker 1983; Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983, pp. 219-20).

Table 1a displays the levels of school completed in the Federal Republic of Germany for the years 1972 and 1985. Obviously the proportion of women at the basic and low level was decreasing between 1972 and 1985. On the reverse side their proportion at the middle and the two higher educational levels was increasing during this period.

---

[3] Speaking of the "Federal Republic of Germany" and "German respondents" here always refers to former West Germany since the ISSP88 was in the field from April to July 1988 in the then Federal Republic of Germany only.

[4] For a brief summary of the historical context of this social division of labor, see Piotrkowski, Rapoport, and Rapoport (1987, pp. 253-4).

Table 1a: Levels of school completed (FRG; Number and percent of women on each school level)

Levels of school compl. (*)	1972 altogether in 1000 %		1972 women in 1000 %		1985 altogether in 1000 %		1985 women in 1000 %	
basic level	141	17.0	59	41.7	73	6.6	29	39.5
low level	363	43.6	179	49.4	320	28.9	143	44.6
middle level	202	24.3	104	51.5	416	37.6	229	55.0
high level (1)	27	3.2	5	17.4	68	6.1	28	41.2
high level (2)	98	11.8	41	41.2	230	20.8	113	49.3

(*)   basic level = 'ohne Hauptschulabschluss'; low level = 'Hauptschulabschluss'; middle level = 'Realschulabschluss'; high level (1) = 'Fachhochschulreife'; high level (2) = 'Hochschulreife';

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt (1987:119)

Table 1b shows corresponding data for the U.S. (see also Spain and Bianchi 1983, pp. 22-3). Between 1960 and 1988 the percentage of white women completing four years of college education nearly tripled. Generally speaking, white women today are better educated than ever. This is also true for black and Hispanic women. However, their portions in college education increased on a much lower level.

Table 1b: Years of school completed for women by race, and Hispanic origin (U.S.A.; Percent of female population completing)

	Elementary School 0-4	Elementary School 5-7 years	Elementary School 8	High School 1-3	High School 4 years	College 1-3	College 4 years	Median School Years
White								
1960	6.0	11.9	17.8	19.6	29.2	9.5	6.0	11.2
1970	4.1	8.6	12.8	19.4	35.5	11.1	8.4	12.1
1980	2.5	5.6	8.4	15.5	39.1	15.6	13.3	12.6
1986	2.1	4.2	6.1	11.8	42.5	16.9	16.4	12.6
1988	1.9	3.8	5.4	11.2	42.8	17.6	17.3	12.6
Black								
1960	19.8	24.5	13.4	20.5	14.3	4.1	3.3	8.6
1970	12.0	18.3	10.8	26.4	22.2	5.8	4.6	10.1
1980	6.7	11.6	7.3	22.9	30.0	13.2	8.3	12.0
1986	4.3	7.8	5.9	19.0	36.6	15.6	10.7	12.4
1988	4.2	7.2	6.0	19.5	37.3	14.6	11.3	12.4
Hispanic								
1960	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1970	19.9	19.2	11.6	18.3	22.3	5.4	3.2	8.9
1980	15.8	17.1	8.4	16.1	26.0	10.6	6.0	10.6
1986	12.5	16.2	8.9	14.7	29.4	11.0	7.4	11.5
1988	12.7	15.4	7.6	14.3	29.3	12.5	8.1	12.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (1987: No 202; 1990: No 216)

Also, in recent decades, more and more women joined the labor market. Table 2a shows data for the F.R. Germany. However, due to changes in the base of the percentage computations, the data for 1988 are not comparable to the preceding years. In 1988 two thirds of the separated or divorced women without children are working. In comparison with this, less than half the married women without children are in the labor force. When children under 18 are present the portions of working women decreases further for all but the divorced women, who hardly move out of the labor force for that reason. This pattern again changes when children under six are present. Now just one third of the married German women, slightly more of the separated women but still four out of ten divorced women are working for pay.

Table 2a: Women in the labor market in the FRG ("Erwerbstaetigenanteil"; Portion of women aged 15 to 65 of this marital status and this number of children working in the labor market)

	Alto-gether	Sin-gle	Altogether mar-ried	sep.	div.	wid.	No Children mar-ried	sep.	div.	wid.	Children <18 mar-ried	sep.	div.	wid.	Children <6 mar-ried	sep.	div.	wid.
1972	46.9	69.7	40.7	67.9	74.6	30.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1980	48.2	57.6	44.1	64.5	71.8	33.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1986(*)	38.2	53.9	38.4	56.2	55.9	8.8	36.3	56.9	52.6	7.7	41.2	52.7	63.5	42.2	34.4	42.4	44.9	n.a.
1987	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1988	49.6	61.4	44.1	62.1	66.9	30.0	46.8	66.6	66.8	24.5	41.7	53.7	63.4	46.2	34.3	38.2	42.5	n.a.

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt (1988, No. 6.7; 1989, No. 6.9)

(*) Women aged 15 and older.

Table 2b shows corresponding data for the USA. The time trend shows increasing rates of female participation in the labor force for each marital status. Just minor decreases, smaller than one percent, can be seen in some year to year comparisons. The portion of working mothers is much higher than in Germany. In 1988 more than half the married U.S. women are working when their children are still under six and nearly three-fourths of them are working when the children are between six and 17. The corresponding portions are a little bit lower for separated women, but much higher for divorced women: In 1988 seven out of ten divorced U.S. women are working when their children are under six and more than eight out of ten when their children are between six and 17. Compared to Germany differing divorce laws and alimony payment procedures may be expected to have a strong impact on higher U.S. portions of divorced women working even when a child is present. As Alwin, Braun, and Scott ([without year], p. 7) point out, the generally higher level of female employment in the U.S. might also be due to the health benefits obtained out of this.

Table 2b: Women in the labor market in the U.S.A.

	(I) Fem. prop. in labor force	(II) Fem. labor force as % of female population total	single	(III) Participation rates of married, separated, and divorced women in the labor force by presence and age of children (% of women in each specific category in the labor force) total mar.	sep.	div.	No children <18 mar.	sep.	div.	Children 6 - 17 mar.	sep.	div.	Children under 6 mar.	sep.	div.
1960	33.4	34.8	44.1	30.5	n.a.	n.a.	34.7	n.a.	n.a.	39.0	n.a.	n.a.	18.6	n.a.	n.a.
1965	35.2	36.7	40.5	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1970	38.1	42.6	53.0	40.8	52.1	71.5	42.2	52.3	67.7	49.2	60.6	82.4	30.3	45.4	63.3
1975	40.0	46.0	57.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1980	42.5	51.1	61.5	50.1	59.4	74.5	46.0	58.9	71.4	61.7	66.3	82.3	45.1	52.2	68.3
1981	n.a.	52.0	62.3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
1982	n.a.	52.1	62.2	51.2	60.0	74.9	46.2	57.5	71.6	63.2	68.4	83.6	48.7	55.2	67.2
1983	43.5	52.3	62.6	51.8	58.7	74.6	46.6	55.6	71.7	63.8	68.7	82.2	49.9	53.8	68.7
1984	43.8	53.2	63.1	52.8	60.9	74.3	47.2	59.1	70.5	65.4	70.1	84.1	51.8	53.9	67.7
1985	44.2	54.5	65.2	54.2	61.3	75.0	48.2	60.0	72.1	67.8	70.9	83.4	53.4	53.2	67.5
1986	44.5	54.7	65.3	54.6	62.2	76.0	48.2	60.4	72.1	68.4	70.6	84.7	53.8	77.4	73.8
1987	44.8	55.4	65.1	55.8	61.4	75.4	48.4	57.9	71.9	70.6	72.6	84.5	56.8	55.1	70.5
1988	45.0	55.9	65.2	56.5	60.9	75.7	48.9	60.1	73.0	72.5	69.3	83.9	57.1	53.0	70.1

Source: I.:   U.S. Bureau of the Census (Ed.): 1987: No. 609; 1990: No. 631; For civilian noninstitutional population 16 years old and over.
II.:   U.S. Bureau of the Census (Ed.): 1987: No. 623; 1990: No. 635; Persons 14 years old and over through 1965; 16 years old and over thereafter.
III.:   U.S. Bureau of the Census (Ed.): 1990: No. 636; For 1960, civilian noninstitutional persons 14 years old and over, thereafter 16 years old and older.

To a certain extend this 'modern' pattern of female labor force participation can also be seen in the ISSP88 data. The variable FEMALWRK shows the percentage of women in the survey currently working in the labor market full time, part time, or not at all. For married males the data for the spouses are reported. Unmarried males are excluded from the analysis in Table 3.

Table 3:   Variable FEMALWRK (Current employment status of female respondents or spouses of male respondents; Combination of V71 and V97)

	total	Germany				total	United States				white	black	other
		nev. mar.	mar-ried	sep. div.	wid.		nev. mar.	mar-ried	sep. div.	wid.			
Woman working full time	21.7	50.1	17.9	38.7	3.2	38.6	45.4	37.5	59.7	14.9	38.0	44.3	35.3
Woman working part time	10.0	2.6	12.7	13.7	2.3	13.8	14.6	15.0	10.1	10.4	14.4	10.7	9.8
Woman not working	68.3	47.2	69.4	47.6	94.5	47.6	40.0	47.5	30.2	74.6	47.6	45.0	54.9
Sample size N	2471	345	1694	124	308	1168	130	755	149	134	977	140	51

Again we see that the traditional picture of the social division of labor has changed, with 31.7% of the German and 52.4% of the American women or spouses represented in the ISSP88 working for pay full or part time. One might assume that these facts do have some effect on family linked individual behavior like the timing of marriages or the timing and spacing of births. Since this paper is concerned with attitudes toward sex-roles, however, the reported statistics can be considered as the structural or macrosocial background against which individual sex-role attitudes should be interpreted.

Besides behavioral patterns changing, for the purpose of this paper, the changes in the attitudes toward sex-roles are also important.[5] Looking at the U.S. a significant shift from traditional toward more liberal sex-roles is reported by several authors. Using a sample of white women, Mason, Czajka and Arber (1976) found considerable changes between 1964 and 1974 indicating more egalitarian sex-role definitions. Thornton and Freedman (1979) using a sample of white women living in the Detroit metropolitan area report a massive movement toward more egalitarian sex-role attitudes between 1962 and 1977. Using GSS data Cherlin and Walters (1981) found a trend toward more egalitarian attitudes among white women between 1972 and 1975. The same result could be obtained for white men whose sex-role attitudes resembled those of white women in 1978. For black females and males the authors found no significant change in their sex-role attitudes between 1972 and 1978. Using samples of students and their parents, Helmreich, Spence and Gibson (1982) also report a trend toward egalitarianism between 1972 and 1976. While the authors don't find overall changes between 1976 and 1980 for males, they report a small but significant shift toward more traditional attitudes for females in this period of time. Using panel data of Detroit metropolitan area women and their children dated from the mid 1970s to the mid 1980s Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn (1983) identify a trend toward more egalitarian attitudes toward the role of women in social life. McBroom (1986) also reports decreasing traditional attitudes on sex-roles. In his academic samples personal experiences like becoming married, having a child, and becoming employed all favor more liberal sex-role attitudes.

Against this background of the reported behavior of women with respect to paid work as well as the summarized development of sex-role attitudes in the U.S. this paper addresses several questions that should be answered in a first approach to the ISSP88 data set.

1.   Do the different national and cultural settings of Germany and the United States affect different answering patterns concerning sex-role items?
2.   If differences can be found, in which direction are they pointing?
3.   Which factors can be accounted for these differences?

3. Attitudes Toward the Role of Women in Social Life Today

Using the ISSP88 data of Britain, Germany, and the United States Alwin, Braun, and Scott ([without year]) examine the answers to a series of questions concerning the approval of women working outside the house in connection with

---

[5] Due to missing access on adequate German data while staying in Chicago, I concentrate on the U.S. only.

the presence of children. The questionaire distinguishes the situation in a marriage before a child is born, with a preschool child present, with the youngest child starting school, and with the children having left home. For the situation without a child present most respondents answer in favor of a woman working. This answering pattern reverses when preschool children are in the family (see Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 26). Focusing on gender differences, the authors find women to express more liberal attitudes than men. Also the labor force participation of women seems to be important. Working women express more tolerant sex-role attitudes than non-working women. However, the authors note ([without year], p. 27) that this attitude-behavior consistency does not allow one to determine the direction of the influence. Furthermore the higher the educational level of the respondent, the more liberal are his or her sex-role attitudes. Age also turns out to be an important background variable with older respondents expressing less tolerant attitudes. Again, the ISSP88 data does not allow one to determine if this could be interpreted as a 'cohort'-effect or an 'age'-effect (see Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 23). Surprisingly, when pre-school children are present, the respondents are reported to be among the most liberal.

The ISSP88 questionaire also asked the respondents nine questions concerning the role of women in social life (for the question wording of these variables see next page). Answers were requested on a five-point agreement-disagreement Likert-type rating scale. Table 4 shows the marginal distributions of these variables for Germany and the U.S. as well as the Chi square statistics for the crosstabulation of these variables by the two countries.

Table 4:   Marginal distributions of the variables V4 to V12 and Chi square statistics

| | Germany | | | | | United States | | | | | Chi- | d | p |
	stro. agree	ag- ree	neith nor	dis- agree	stro. disag.	stro. agree	ag- ree	neith nor	dis- agree	stro. disag.	square	f	
V4	31.9	38.3	6.0	18.8	5.0	28.5	37.1	8.7	18.3	7.4	22.66	4	.0001
V5	29.5	42.4	11.9	12.6	3.6	10.3	32.8	12.7	29.0	15.1	478.62	4	.0000
V6	23.8	35.4	14.7	18.9	7.2	8.5	26.4	15.3	32.8	17.0	300.83	4	.0000
V7	3.3	17.0	31.5	33.3	14.9	3.5	13.5	38.0	34.9	10.1	33.55	4	.0000
V8	13.4	28.8	21.3	22.9	13.7	8.0	26.4	26.7	26.7	12.2	41.78	4	.0000
V9	20.4	29.5	16.3	23.0	10.9	16.7	37.1	23.4	16.4	6.4	84.38	4	.0000
V10	30.5	38.0	16.4	12.2	2.9	11.6	32.8	23.3	26.2	6.1	293.97	4	.0000
V11	16.8	33.6	22.2	22.3	5.2	15.5	34.2	30.6	16.5	3.2	49.42	4	.0000
V12	19.4	25.1	19.5	18.7	17.2	8.7	19.4	20.5	32.1	19.3	155.36	4	.0000

A first view shows some striking differences in the answering patterns between the two countries. To reduce the amount of data and to condense the information given, a factor analysis (principal components analysis) is being run. According to the information this factor analysis is providing the data seems to be organized around three dimensions. Table 5 shows the rotated factor matrix of the variables included in the analysis for the American and German subsamples altogether.

Table 5:   Varimax rotated factor matrix for the variables V4 to V12

	F1	F2	F3
V4	-.62661		
V5	.83063		
V6	.76894		
V7			.59187
V8		.78868	
V9		.80635	
V10			.80125
V11			.71710
V12		.67375	

These three factors depend on the following statements respectively (variable number and mnemonics included in parentheses):

Factor 1: Index I F L A F A M L

> A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work. (V4; MAWRKWRM)
> A pre-school child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works. (V5; KIDSUFFE)
> All in all, family life suffers when the woman has a full-time job. (V6; FAMSUFFE)

Factor 2: Index I F L A H O U S

> A job is alright, but what most women really want is a home and children. (V8; HOMEKID)
> Being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay. (V9; HOUSEWRK)
> A husband's job is to earn money; a wife's job is to look for the home and family. (V12; HUBBYWRK)

Factor 3: Index I F L A W O R K

> A woman and her family will all be happier if she goes out to work. (V7; HAPIFWRK)
> Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person. (V10; FEJOBIND)
> Both the husband and wife should contribute to the household income. (V11; TWOINCS)

To get an impression of what is being represented by these indices it seems useful to name them according to the content of the items involved, respectively. Since all the items forming factor 1 are dealing with a mother (or wife) working and the consequences out of this for the family, this index is called IFLAFAML (standing for: index female labor force participation with respect to family life). The three items constituting factor 2 are all concerned with the weighting of female labor force participation in contrast to women's role as a keeper of the household and the children. Therefore this index is called IFLAHOUS (index female labor force participation with respect to household, children and family). Finally factor 3 is constituted by items favoring female work and linking it with her happiness, equality and independency. Therefore this index is called IFLAWORK (index female labor force participation with respect to values arising out of her work). Using role-theoretic terms Scott (1990a, p. 55) describes factor 1 as expressing the "role-conflict" of women between the "mother-role" and the role of working outside the family. Factor 2 accordingly expresses "role-segregation", in other words a clear separation of the male and female responsibilities, that is the female responsibility as a housekeeper and the male responsibility as a breadwinner. Finally factor 3 is suppossed to express "role-combination", that is a woman combining the roles of a mother/housekeeper and working outside the family.[6][7]

Before looking at the homogeneity of these three indices it has to be ascertained that all questions/statements involved point at the same direction. Here the view in favor of women working in the labor market is chosen as this direction. This means that a higher ranking (this is a higher number ticked in the questionaire) stands for a stronger approval of women working for pay than a smaller number does, throughout all of the items involved in this analysis.[8] Therefore the following items have to be reversed:

---

[6] Note, however, that the differences between the British sample used by Scott (1990a) and the American and German samples used in this paper result in the moving of variable HAPIFWRK from Scott's "role-conflict" factor to factor "role-combination", here.

[7] Note also, that the factor analysis ends with a different assignment of items to factors if it is run separately for Germany and the United States. The German subsample shows the variables HOMEKID, HOUSEWRK, and HUBBYWRK loading on one factor, while the variables MAWRKWRM, KIDSUFFE, FAMSUFFE, and HAPIFWRK load on a second factor and the variables FEJOBIND and TWOINCS load on a third factor. For the American subsample this assignment again is different: The variables HOMEKID and HOUSEWRK load on a first factor, the variables MAWRKWRM, KIDSUFFE, FAMSUFFE, and HUBBYWRK load on a second factor and finally the variables HAPIFWRK, FEJOBIND, and TWOINCS load on a third factor.

[8] This is (1) strongly disagree (2) disaggree (3) neither agree nor disagree (4) agree (5) strongly agree.

V4 (MAWRKWRM) V7 (HAPIFWRK) V10 (FEJOBIND) V11 (TWOINCS).

With all items of the three indices pointing at the same direction a reliability analysis can be computed, gaining information about the homogeneity of the factors/indices extracted. Cronbach's alpha-coefficients for the three indices (separately for Germany and the U.S.) are displayed in Table 6. Hence the indices are reasonably homogeneous for both of the countries to be furthermore used in the analysis.

Table 6:   Cronbach's alpha-coefficients for each of the indices by country

	Germany	U.S.A.
IFLAFAML:	.6981	.7985
IFLAHOUS:	.8089	.6527
IFLAWORK:	.6161	.6160

Eventually the computation of the three indices using the pooling of the items as expressed in the factor analysis works as follows: An average score across the items of each factor is computed by summing up the individual values per item and dividing this sum through the number of valid answers per respondent. Just one missing value per person is allowed for each index. This procedure has at least two advantages: First the composite score of each index can be expressed in the same range of values as the original items. Second, by deviding the individual sum of values per index through the number of answers out of which this sum consists, the former ordinal level of the data is left. This procedure therefore is a kind of parametrization, lifting the data quality from ordinal level to interval level.

4. National and Socio-demographic Differences in the Attitudes Toward the Role of Women

Table 7 shows the marginal distributions of some ISSP88 socio-demographic variables by country and gender.[9] These variables are supposed to represent important background characteristics of the respondents influencing their attitudes toward sex-roles. They are therefore used as socalled independent variables in the further analysis.

Variable 3 shows that the German respondents are about two-thirds of all of the respondents of the two countries. Variable BIRTH COHORT subdivides the respondents in three groups. Variable MARITAL expresses the marital status of the respondent. Here the higher U.S. rates of separated and divorced persons can be seen. Variable EDUC5 distinguishes five levels of education. It should be noted, however, that the categories are not fully congruent in their meaning. While the German respondents are categorized according to their level of schooling finished, the U.S. respondents are categorized according to their years in school.[10] Variable FEMALWRK distinguishes the current employment status of female respondents or the spouses of male married respondents, respectively. Smith (1985, p. 501, footnote 3) reports eight studies that consider female employment to have a significant impact on sex-role attitudes of women, three studies with mixed results and three studies that report no relationship between these two issues. Smith (1985) himself proves males to have more liberal sex-role attitudes if their spouses are working in the labor market. Variable PRESCHOO dichotomizes the respondents according to the prescence of children in preschool age, that is children younger than six years, at home. Nearly twice as many U.S. males have preschoolers at home compared to their German counterparts. U.S. women too are more likely to have preschoolers. Variable RELCOMMI

---

[9] Since the work of Alwin, Braun, and Scott ([without year]) is the only one using the ISSP88 data set that up till January 1991 came to my attention, I recode the variables of the respondents' age, marital status, and education according to the categories these authors use.

[10] Germany: 'Basic' = school without qualification; 'Low' = Volks- or Hauptschule; 'Middle' = Mittlere Reife, Realschulabschluss, Fachhochschulreife, FOS; 'High' = Fachhochschulabschluss; 'Graduate' = Universitaetsabschluss'.
    United States: 'Basic' = 1 to 6 years in school; 'Low' = 7 to 11 years in school; 'Middle' = 12 years in school; 'High' = 13 to 16 years in school; 'Graduate' = 17 to 20 years in school.

is a combination of V91 and V92 (for question wording see Zentralarchiv 1990), combining religious denomination with the expressed frequency of church attendence and dichotomizing the respondents in those who express a strong or a weak religious commitment.[11] Obviously women in both countries express a stronger commitment to their church and the U.S. respondents generally express a higher level of religious commitment.

Table 7:   Marginal distributions of some socio-demographic variables by country and gender

| | Germany | | U.S.A. | |
	Male	Female	Male	Female
V3 Country	67.9		32.1	
	(n = 2994)		(n = 1414)	
BIRTH COHORT				
1. - 1929	26.0	29.4	23.9	30.9
2. 1930 - 49	29.6	29.6	28.5	26.8
3. 1950 - 70	44.5	41.0	47.6	42.4
MARITAL				
1. Married	60.4	54.0	59.9	48.6
2. Widowed	4.2	18.5	3.4	16.7
3. Sep-Div	4.3	6.8	12.1	18.6
4. Nev Married	31.1	20.7	24.5	16.2
EDUC5				
1. Basic	1.4	2.9	4.1	3.0
2. Low	52.4	55.5	21.3	23.9
3. Middle	24.2	27.2	28.7	33.3
4. High	13.3	9.7	36.4	32.6
5. Graduate	8.7	4.7	9.5	7.3
FEMALWRK				
1. F full time	21.0	22.0	38.6	38.6
2. F part time	11.3	9.4	12.9	14.2
3. F no work	67.7	68.6	48.5	47.2
PRESCHOO				
0. No Child	90.0	85.6	80.5	82.7
1. Child pres.	10.0	14.4	19.5	17.3
RELCOMMI				
1. Strong	12.9	22.5	37.2	51.5
2. Weak	87.1	77.5	62.8	48.5

Given the higher portion of U.S. women with working experience (or the U.S. men with the experience of their spouse working, respectively) as a relevant background variable, it is assumed that U.S. women and their partners are more liberal in their attitudes toward women's roles, compared to their German counterparts. In the framework used here this means that there should be higher index-scores expected for the U.S. respondents generally. It is also expected that women express more liberal sex-role attitudes than men do (see , e.g., Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 13). Furthermore younger respondents are expected to express more liberal attitudes then older respondents (see , e.g., Thornton and Freedman 1979; Morgan and Walker 1983; Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983; Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 27). Looking at the marital status the never married and the separated or divorced respondents should express more liberal attitudes, since the never married are expected to be younger and the separated and divorced should be urged to by their personal situation and experience. The better educated are expected to express more liberal sex-role attitudes (see , e.g., Mason, Czajka, and Arber 1976; Thornton and Freedman 1979; Morgan and Walker 1983; Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983; Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 22). Considering the employment status of women/spouses, more liberal sex-role attitudes are expected for women/husbands of spouses currently working (see , e.g., Mason, Czajka, and Arber 1976; Thornton and Freedman 1979; Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983; Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 24). Respondents who report

---

[11] Respondents are considered to express a strong religious commitment when they are either protestant or jewish and attend religious services at least monthly or when they are catholic or member of another denomination and attend church at least weekly. Otherwise respondents are considered to express a weak religious commitment.

to have preschool children are expected to show more traditional attitudes since their direct experience might stress the importance of personal attention for the child and hinder at least the mothers from working for pay. However, looking at the findings of Alwin, Braun, and Scott ([without year], p. 24) this effect might be small. Strong religious commitments are expected to go along with more traditional sex-role attitudes, too (see , e.g., Thornton and Freedman 1979; Thornton, Alwin, and Camburn 1983).

Table 8 shows the comparison of the means of the three composite scores between the two countries and between the categories of the socio-demographic variables just introduced within each country. The asterisk indicates that the differences between the categories of a variable are significant on the 5% level (p < .05). Note, that a higher score expresses a more egalitarian, liberal or progressive answer, favoring female labor force participation.

Table 8:   Comparison of means of three composite scores, by country

| | IFLAFAML | | IFLAHOUS | | IFLAWORK | |
	FRG	U.S.A.	FRG	U.S.A.	FRG	U.S.A.
	(*)		(*)		(*)	
Sample Mean	2.8000	3.3022	2.8645	3.0070	3.2681	3.0836
SEX	(*)	(*)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	(*)
1. Male	2.7532	3.1564	2.8385	2.9918	3.2552	3.0268
2. Female	2.8371	3.4142	2.8844	3.0185	3.2784	3.1271
MARITAL	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
1. Married	2.7160	3.2278	2.7338	2.9779	3.1827	2.9528
2. Widowed	2.3914	3.0243	2.1395	2.5489	2.8410	3.1192
3. Sep-Div	3.0121	3.4871	3.1356	3.0961	3.5103	3.2412
4: Nev married	3.1512	3.5066	3.4958	3.2714	3.6259	3.2911
BIRTH COHORT	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
1. - 1929	2.4333	2.8729	2.2085	2.5424	2.9827	3.0093
2. 1930 - 49	2.7292	3.3093	2.7687	3.0489	3.2439	2.9956
3. 1950 - 70	3.0960	3.5624	3.3814	3.2703	3.4776	3.1837
FEMALWRK	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
1. F full time	3.2032	3.7349	3.4167	3.3053	3.6815	3.1979
2. F part time	3.1159	3.3595	3.1927	3.1108	3.5574	3.1308
3. F no work	2.5813	2.9880	2.5525	2.6999	3.0403	2.9506
EDUC5	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	n.s.
1. Basic	2.4672	2.4094	2.4253	2.0725	3.1398	2.7879
2. Low	2.6179	3.1125	2.4990	2.6580	3.1328	3.1971
3. Middle	2.9066	3.2552	3.0933	2.9799	3.3626	3.0588
4. High	3.1225	3.4567	3.5981	3.2419	3.5283	3.0488
5. Graduate	3.2996	3.7368	3.6142	3.4764	3.5251	3.1462
PRESCHOO	(*)	(*)	(*)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
0. No Child	2.7767	3.2564	2.8282	2.9848	3.2744	3.0892
1. Child present	2.9457	3.4915	3.0822	3.0942	3.2198	3.0597
RELCOMMI	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
1. Strong	2.5090	3.1757	2.3372	2.8659	3.0127	2.9898
2. Weak	2.8631	3.4122	2.9796	3.1248	3.3270	3.1651

(Sample means and indices by SEX, PRESCHOO, and RELCOMMI tested by t-test. Indices by MARITAL, BIRTH COHORT, FEMALWRK, and EDUC5 tested by analysis of variance.)

Throughout all of the three scores and the two countries women are more progressive then men. This is not a surprising result, because it is them and their chances of participation that are surveyed here. Looking at the marital status, the never married respondents answer most liberal. Here a strong association between age and marital status should be assumed. For more than 88% of the never married German respondents and more than four out of ten of their U.S. counterparts are also younger than 25 years, showing almost always the highest scores among age groups, too (computations not shown in this paper). Intelligibly the separated and divorced persons respond just slightly less liberal than the never married. If they are female they have to face the situation how to make a living for themselves (and eventually their children). If they are male, female employment might be requested and valued because of its impact on the own payment of alimony. Concerning age, broadly speaking, the older the respondent is, the less liberal is her or his view of women in social life. The fact of a woman or a man's spouse being working herself,

again is obvious. If the woman/wife is not working the attitudes expressed are the least liberal. They get more and more liberal if the woman/wife works part time or full time. The impact of education on answering the questions can also be seen. Generally, the higher the educational level of the respondent, the more liberal are her or his attitudes toward the role of women in social life. Surprisingly, the presence of children under six years of age is linked with a slightly more liberal attitude toward the indices IFLAFAML and IFLAHOUS. This pattern reverses on index IFLAWORK. Obviously, the respondents with preschool children present face the difficulties of combining the role of a mother with female paid work (IFLAWORK). However, they generally approve a woman working outside the house expecting less problems for the family (IFLAFAML) and not separating the responsibilities of men and women (IFLAHOUS). Not surprisingly, however, respondents expressing a weak religious commitment score higher on all of the indices than do respondents who express a strong religious commitment.

Comparing Germany and the United States, there are striking differences to report. Concerning index IFLAFAML (female labor force participation with respect to family life) the U.S. sample shows consistently higher ratings throughout all of the background variables with the exception of the basic educated respondents only. This is: the U.S. respondents approve female work more than the Germans do while the German respondents are more concerned about negative consequences of a mother (or wife) working for family life, respectively.

This pattern changes somewhat when index IFLAHOUS (female labor force participation with respect to household, children, and family) is screened. Subdivided by gender, the U.S. women as well as the U.S. men show higher ratings on the items involved than their German counterparts. The same is true for married and widowed U.S. respondents whereas separated, divorced, and never married respondents show slightly higher ratings in Germany. The subdivision by the birth cohorts shows an inconsistent pattern of answers. While the youngest German respondents rate higher than their U.S. counterparts the U.S. respondents show stronger approval for women working in the two older birth cohorts. Here again the strong association between the age and the category 'never married' should be noticed. If the female respondent or the wife of a male respondent is working then the scores are higher for Germany. If the woman (spouse) does not work the U.S. respondents indicate a stronger approval of women working. Looking at the education of the respondents the relatively low educated in the U.S. show stronger approval of a woman working than their German counterparts while respondents on all the other educational levels give higher ratings in Germany than in the U.S. Regardless of children under six present or not and regardless the intensity of the religious commitment, the U.S. respondents show slightly higher scores on IFLAHOUS.

Concerning index IFLAWORK (female labor force participation with respect to values arising out of her work) throughout almost all of the background variables considered the German respondents show higher ratings. This pattern is just reversed for the U.S. respondents who are widowed, those who are in the oldest birth cohort, and the ones with just a low educational training.

Looking at these results the prediction of generally more liberal attitudes of the American respondents does not hold. The higher U.S. ratings on index IFLAFAML is consistent with the expressed expectation and might be due to the overall higher female labor force participation in the U.S. as well as to a higher degree of own work experience or the experience of the wife working, respectively. Another aspect relevant in this case is the availability of child care facilities and their appreciation by the respondents. Here, the much better U.S. situation compared with a poor German standard (see Alwin, Braun, and Scott [without year], p. 18) might interfere.

The items constituting index IFLAHOUS more touch the normative aspects of a woman being responsible for the household, children, and the family. The youngest, never married, separated, divorced, full- or part time working and higher educated Germans obviously do not share this traditional normative point of view anymore. These groups stand in a slight contrast to the rest more traditionally orientated German respondents and even exceed the U.S. respondents in their normative view on the interesting issue.

It seems striking that besides the greater work experience of U.S. women, as reported in Tables 2b and 3, the American respondents do not rate the items concerning the equality, happiness, and independence of a working woman, that is index IFLAWORK, higher than the Germans do. Alwin, Braun, and Scott ([without year], p. 9) refer

to Scott (1990b) who suggests that the term 'independence' in V10 (FEJOBIND) might rather address the U.S. respondents' thoughts toward monetary quantities or 'financial independence' instead of 'personal autonomy' or 'subjective wellbeing'. If this interpretation could be proved this would be a first hint of economic considerations playing a more important role for female labor force participation in the U.S. compared to Germany. Furthermore reasons like 'personal autonomy' or 'subjective wellbeing' could than be considered to be more relevant factors for female labor force participation in Germany, respectively. But of course, this is more a speculation than an interpretation and by far not cogent, for an artefact of question wording can't be excluded.

5. A Multivariate Approach to Differences in the Attitudes Toward the Role of Women

After describing the answering patterns of the German and American respondents and looking at their differences the third question addressed in this paper remains to be answered: Which factors can be accounted for the differences found? In order to examine the differences in the attitudes toward the role of women more accurately, Multiple Classification Analyses (MCA's) (see Andrews et al. 1973) are employed. Now not just the direction of the deviations of group means from the overall mean are the main interesting results. Rather the focus is on the amount of variance in the dependent variables (that is the three extracted indices) explained by each independent variable in a multivariate setting.

In order to make results comparable, I again follow Alwin, Braun, and Scott ([withour year], pp. 20ff) in the multivariate approach I use in this paper. Separately for Germany and the U.S. for each of the indices six models are computed with the index as the dependent variable and a changing set of the socio-demographic variables already introduced serving as independent or predictor variables. It is a good idea to estimate the parameters of a baseline-model first, for improvements in the amount of variance explained by extending the predictor variables can be judged against this background. Here 'gender', 'birth cohort', 'marital status', and the level of 'education' with their categories already introduced in the analysis are used to build the baseline model (model I). In a second model (model II) 'gender', 'birth cohort', and 'education' are used separately for married and unmarried respondents in order to evaluate the effect of the dichotomized marital status. Model III is run separately for female and male respondents for to figure out the impact of gender while regressing the indices on the birth cohort variable, the marital status, and the educational level. In model IV the variable expressing the current employment status of women/spouses, that is FEMALWRK, is added to the analysis. Note, that since males are only represented by FEMALWRK when they are married, the marital status variable will furthermore not be included in the analyses for male respondents and only married males are represented in models IV to VI. Model V adds variable RELCOMMI to the analysis expressing the religious commitment of the respondent. Again this model is build for females and males separately. Finally two variables concerning the presence of preschoolers at home (PRESCHOO) and the expressed adequacy of child care institutions (ICHICARE) are added in model VI to evaluate the importance of the presence of children and their care for the expressed sex-role attitudes. ICHICARE is another index build as a composite score of questions asking for the suitability of different child care arrangements for a child under 3 years old.[12] However, as Alwin, Braun, and Scott ([without year], p. 19) point out, it can't be determined whether these variables measure the perceived 'adequacy' or the personal 'desirability' of a child care institution. Variable ICHICARE remains somewhat ambiguous, though.

As Andrews et al. (1973, p. 47) state, an MCA "... can be considered the equivalent of a multiple regression using dummy variables". The two columns per model (and per gender) express the deviations of a specific category from the mean ("Grand Mean") with the lefthand column expressing unadjusted deviations and the righthand column

---

[12] These questions, designed as Likert-type rating scales, asked for the suitability of a public day care center (V18), a private day care center (V19), a babysitter (V20), a neighbour or friend (V22), and a relative (V24). The respondents could choose the answers 'very suitable', 'somewhat suitable', 'not very suitable', or 'not suitable at all'. For the purpose of this analysis the answers are recoded in a way that a higher score expresses a greater approval for suitable child care outside the family. The composite score ICHICARE is then build analogous to the three sex-role indices, allowing up to two missing values per respondent. For the purpose of the MCA analyses ICHICARE is subdivided into four quartiles with the first quartile expressing the lowest fourth of the rated answers and the fourth quartile expressing their highest fourth.

expressing the deviations assuming that the other independent variables are held constant, that is that they are distributed like in the population at large (see Andrews et al. 1973, p. 34). The eta statistic completing the lefthand column of the unadjusted deviations for the categories of each variable assesses the bivariate relationship between the independent variable, that is the predictor, and the dependent variable. "Eta squared, sometimes called the correlation ratio, is interpretable as the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explainable by the predictor" (Andrews et al. 1973, p.34). The beta statistic completing the righthand column of the adjusted deviations of each variable can be interpreted as a standardized or partial regression coefficient (see Andrews et al. 1973, p. 47) with the rank order of the betas indicating the relative importance of the independent variables as predictors of the dependent variable, given that all other predictors are held constant (see Andrews et al. 1973, p. 47). Adding predictors model by model hence allows to assess the marginal importance of this predictor, respectively (see Andrews et al. 1973, p. 47). Finally R squared indicates the portion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the set of the predictors employed (see SPSS Inc. 1988, p. 376).

Table 9 displays the six models for the prediction of index IFLAFAML for the German respondents. The explanatory power of the whole set of socio-demographic variables of the baseline model (model I) is quite weak with the membership in a certain birth cohort being the most important predictor followed by the educational level of the respondent. Distinguishing the married respondents from the not married (model II) shows the very weak explanatory power of the model for the married respondents. R squared increases somewhat for the not married Germans with the 'birth cohort' variable again showing to be most important. Looking at gender differences (model III) neither expresses differences in the relative importance of the predictor variables nor increases the portion of variance explained. Adding the current employment status of women/spouses, that is FEMALWRK, improves the performance of the model somewhat with FEMALWRK having the strongest predictive power both for males and females. R squared is higher for women than for men. Model V adds variable RELCOMMI expressing the religious commitment of the respondents. The impact of this variable is quite poor, increasing the explained portion of variance just slightly only for women. Model VI adds the two variables concerned with preschool children (PRESCHOO) and the adequacy of child care (ICHICARE). ICHICARE turns out to be the second most important variable both for women and men with just FEMALWRK being more important. On the other hand variable PRESCHOO is the least important of the whole set of predictors. R squared increases considerably to .159 for males and .186 for females.

Table 10 expresses some remarkable differences between the models for the German respondents just discussed and the ones for the American respondents. Again the baseline model shows a quite weak performance with 'birth cohort' being the most important predictor variable. For the U.S. respondents too, model II for the married respondents is very weak, working considerably better for the unmarried respondents. The differences between the sexes as expressed in model III are greater than in the German data with 'birth cohort' still being the strongest predictor variable. Introducing variable FEMALWRK in model IV again increases R squared and shows FEMALWRK to have the strongest predictive power for males as well as for females. While 'education' is the second most important predictor for males, 'birth cohort' is second most important for females in this model. Model V that adds variable RELCOMMI to the set of predictors just increases R squared slightly. However, the religious commitment is more important as a predictor in the U.S.-model than in the German model. Again model VI adds the variables PRESCHOO and ICHICARE and increases the portion of explained variance considerably. With ICHICARE being the most important predictor R squared is now .286 for men and .268 for women.

Table 11 displays the models for index IFLAHOUS and the German respondents. Model I again shows 'birth cohort' to be the most important variable followed by 'education' with a R squared of .268 which is reasonably high. For IFLAHOUS too the baseline model performs much better for the not married respondents than for the married ones (model II) as well as for the females than for the males (model III). Adding variable FEMALWRK to the predictor variables (model IV) shows it to be most important for married men, while decreasing the R squared for males compared to model III. For women 'education' now is the most important predictor, followed by 'birth cohort' and FEMALWRK. The female R squared however, increases. Again model V and the introduction of variable RELCOMMI does not improve the predictive power considerably. Also adding variables PRESCHOO and ICHICARE increases the portion of variance explained just slightly. Throughout models IV to VI the educational level is the most important predictor variable for women and variable FEMALWRK is most important for men. The

lesser importance of ICHICARE compared to index IFLAFAML is quite understandable given the fact, that children just play a minor role in the content of the items building IFLAHOUS, whereas they are central in index IFLAFAML. Also it turns out that the current employment status of a woman is just of lesser importance for women in predicting IFLAHOUS. Obviously the age of the females, as expressed in 'birth cohort', and their educational level are more important to predict sex-role attitudes with respect to a woman's housekeeping role as expressed by the items forming index IFLAHOUS. Model VI performs far better for women with 33.8% of the variance in IFLAHOUS explained whereas the comparative quantity for men is just 22.1%.

Looking at Table 12 shows that the predictive power of the baseline model for the American sample is worse than that for the German sample. Again the models works better for the not married (model II), slightly better for the females (model III), and 'education' turns out to be the most important predictor variable for both women and men (models IV to VI). Also ICHICARE is less important here. However, it is more important for the male respondents than it is for the females. While the second most important predictor for males is 'birth cohort', for women their current employment status turns out to succeed the importance of their educational level. Model VI ends up with 22.6% of the variance explained for men and 25.8% for women.

Table 13 displays the models for the prediction of sex-role attitudes as expressed in index IFLAWORK for the German subsample. The baseline model performs quite weak with the marital status being most important. Model II is inadequate for the married respondents but increases the R squared somewhat for the not married with 'birth cohort' being the strongest predictor. Both models III for males and females perform quite poor with 'marital status' again being most important. Introducing variable FEMALWRK in model IV does not increase the portion of variance explained for married males. However it turns out to be the most important predictor variable for both of the sexes and it increases the R squared for women considerably. FEMALWRK remains most important in model V too with variable RELCOMMI just slightly increasing the portions of variance explained for women and men. Model VI again introduces variables PRESCHOO and ICHICARE. However, variable FEMALWRK remains the most important predictor with ICHICARE having the second best predictive power. Model VI ends up with explaining 14.3% of variance for males and 19.5% for females.

Finally Table 14 displays the models predicting IFLAWORK for the U.S. subsample. Already the baseline model shows a somewhat inadequate performance that is even worse for the married respondents (model II). However, 'marital status' turns out to be the strongest predictor in model III. This is also true for the females in model IV whereas the variable FEMALWRK is most important for males. This pattern remains the same in model V with the variable RELCOMMI just slightly increasing the portion of variance explained for women. Introducing the variables PRESCHOO and ICHICARE in model VI increases the R squared for married men with ICHICARE being the strongest predictor variable followed by variable FEMALWRK. However, for the females still 'marital status' is most important with the educational level being second most important and ICHICARE just being the third strongest predictor. Model VI ends up with a somewhat weak 12.4% of explained variance for U.S. men and 11.5% for U.S. women.

6. Conclusion

Given the background of increased female education as well as increasing female labor force participation, this paper compares German and American respondents in their sex-role attitudes as expressed in the ISSP88 survey. After extracting three factors out of the set of nine questions considered here, considerable differences between the German and the American respondents can be observed. While the U.S. respondents express more tolerant views toward the index that evaluates female labor force participation with respect to family life (IFLAFAML), the answering pattern is more mixed concerning the index IFLAHOUS (female labor force participation with respect to household, children, and the family). Here younger, never married, separated, divorced, full- or part time working, and higher educated Germans rate higher than their American counterparts. The picture is fully reversed for index IFLAWORK, considering female labor force participation with respect to equality of the sexes, female happiness and independency. Here the German respondents rate higher on almost all of the categories of the socio-demographic variables introduced.

In a multivariate approach using MCA's the relative importance of an independent variable in predicting each of the indices is assessed separately for Germany and the United States. In predicting index IFLAFAML variable ICHICARE is the strongest predictor in the American subsample, succeeded by variable FEMALWRK, and the educational level of the respondents. For the German respondents the variable FEMALWRK is the most important predictor followed by the variable ICHICARE, and again the educational level. This is not a surprising result for index IFLAFAML summarizes items concerned with the side-effects on children and the family of a mother working. So the expressed adequacy of child care institutions and the current employment status of a woman/spouse are likely to have the strongest predictive power.

Looking at index IFLAHOUS the variable expressing the educational level of the respondents turns out to be most important for all of the Americans as well as for the German females. For married German males the current employment status of their spouses is a stronger predictor than 'education'. Obviously the presence of children and the expressed adequacy of child care institutions do not play a very important role in predicting the rather normative issues addressed by IFLAHOUS.

While the variable FEMALWRK turns out to be the strongest predictor of index IFLAWORK for all of the German respondents, variable ICHICARE is a stronger predictor for the U.S. males, and the 'marital status'-variable is the strongest predictor for the U.S. females. However, the six models build to predict IFLAWORK are not very appropriate for the U.S. subsample. The models work slightly better for German males and quite reasonably for German females.

Looking at country specific differences the models build in this paper work better for the German subsample as far as the indices IFLAHOUS and IFLAWORK are concerned. The models work better for the American subsample in predicting index IFLAFAML. These findings refer to the reliability analyses as displayed in Table 6. Cronbach's alpha-coefficient of index IFLAFAML is higher for the American subsample, the alpha-coefficient of index IFLAHOUS is higher for the German subsample, and both of the countries show rather weak alpha-coefficients for index IFLAWORK. Further work on both the index formation as well as the set of predictor variables seems to be necessary to improve this introductory international comparison of sex-role attitudes. -

Table 9: Multivariate Models for the Prediction of Sex-Role Attitudes: IFLAFAML / Germany

	Model I Unadj (Eta)	I Adj (Beta)	Model II (Married) Unadj (Eta)	II (Married) Adj (Beta)	Model II (Not Married) Unadj (Eta)	II (Not Married) Adj (Beta)	Model III (Males) Unadj (Eta)	III (Males) Adj (Beta)	Model III (Females) Unadj (Eta)	III (Females) Adj (Beta)	Model IV (Males) Unadj (Eta)	IV (Males) Adj (Beta)	Model IV (Females) Unadj (Eta)	IV (Females) Adj (Beta)	Model V (Males) Unadj (Eta)	V (Males) Adj (Beta)	Model V (Females) Unadj (Eta)	V (Females) Adj (Beta)	Model VI (Males) Unadj (Eta)	VI (Males) Adj (Beta)	Model VI (Females) Unadj (Eta)	VI (Females) Adj (Beta)
Grand Mean	2.79		2.72		2.90		2.75		2.82		2.62		2.82		2.62		2.83		2.62		2.82	
Gender																						
1. Male	-.04	-.08	-.09	-.07	.07	-.11																
2. Female	.03	.07	.08	.07	-.04	.07																
(Eta)(Beta)	.04	.08	.10	.07	.06	.09																
Birth Cohort																						
1. -1929	-.36	-.25	-.25	-.20	-.50	-.46	-.33	-.20	-.38	-.31	-.15	-.02	-.38	-.21	-.15	-.02	-.38	-.19	-.15	.00	-.38	-.16
2. 1930 - 49	-.06	-.03	-.02	-.02	.00	-.01	-.10	-.08	-.03	.02	-.03	-.08	-.03	-.01	-.03	-.08	-.04	-.02	-.03	-.08	-.06	-.01
3. 1950 - 70	.30	.20	.23	.18	.32	.30	.29	.18	.31	.22	.25	.16	.31	.17	.25	.15	.32	.16	.26	.13	.32	.12
(Eta)(Beta)	.29	.19	.19	.16	.38	.35	.28	.17	.29	.23	.17	.11	.29	.16	.17	.10	.30	.15	.18	.09	.30	.09
Marital Status																						
1. Married	-.07	-.05					-.13	-.06	-.02	-.06			-.02	-.04			-.02	-.03			-.03	-.04
2. Widowed	-.40	-.15					-.67	-.42	-.38	-.05			-.38	-.03			-.39	-.03			-.40	-.03
3. Sep - div	-.22	-.16					-.22	.21	.20	.14			.20	.08			.21	.06			.20	.07
4. Never marr.	.35	.16					.35	.16	.37	.16			.37	.11			.39	.10			.38	.11
(Eta)(Beta)	.25	.11					.28	.15	.24	.10			.24	.06			.25	.06			.25	.06
Education																						
1. Basic	-.32	-.22	-.29	-.27	-.40	-.18	-.26	-.28	-.37	-.18	-.43	-.31	-.37	-.15	-.43	-.33	-.38	-.15	-.43	-.36	-.40	-.15
2. Low	-.17	-.10	-.11	-.09	-.26	-.12	-.17	-.10	-.17	-.10	-.09	-.07	-.17	-.09	-.09	-.07	-.18	-.08	-.09	-.05	-.19	-.09
3. Middle	.12	.03	.11	.06	.02	.00	.07	.02	.14	.05	-.06	.01	.14	.02	-.06	.01	.15	.02	-.06	-.02	.16	-.03
4. High	.33	.16	.11	.11	.37	.17	.31	.14	.36	.17	.14	.15	.36	.22	.16	.16	.38	.23	.13	.10	.37	.22
5. Graduate	.51	.47	.50	.49	.52	.49	.41	.38	.68	.60	.43	.37	.68	.52	.42	.38	.67	.49	.44	.42	.67	.49
(Eta)(Beta)	.24	.16	.18	.16	.29	.17	.23	.16	.25	.17	.18	.15	.25	.16	.17	.15	.26	.15	.17	.15	.26	.15
FEMALWRK (Female Work)																						
1. Full time											.43	.38	.44	.23	.42	.38	.45	.24	.41	.36	.44	.21
2. Part time											.25	.26	.43	.37	.24	.24	.42	.35	.25	.25	.42	.33
3. No Work											-.17	-.16	-.20	-.13	-.17	-.15	-.21	-.13	-.16	-.15	-.21	-.12
(Eta)(Beta)											.28	.26	.31	.20	.28	.26	.31	.19	.27	.24	.31	.18
RELCOMMI (Religious Commitment)																						
1. Strong															-.15	-.10	-.30	-.09	-.17	-.12	-.32	-.10
2. Weak															.03	.02	.09	.03	.03	.02	.09	.03
(Eta)(Beta)															.07	.05	.17	.05	.08	.06	.18	.05
PRESCHOO (Preschoolers at Home)																						
1. No kids																			-.04	-.01	-.04	-.01
2. Kids present																			.21	.08	.21	.06
(Eta)(Beta)																			.10	.04	.09	.03
ICHICARE																						
1. 1st quartile																			-.24	-.21	-.26	-.18
2. 2nd quartile																			-.11	.07	.06	.03
3. 3rd quartile																			.14	.17	.23	.17
4. 4th quartile																			.42	.42	.27	.21
(Eta)(Beta)																			.23	.21	.22	.15
R squared	.122		.068		.174		.122		.126		.115		.156		.114		.162		.159		.186	
Sample N	2994		1702		1292		1329		1665		803		1665		803		1665		803		1665	

Table 10: Multivariate Models for the Prediction of Sex-Role Attitudes: IFLAFAML / U.S.A.

	Model I Unadj. (Eta)	Model I Adj. (Beta)	Model II (Married) Unadj. (Eta)	Model II (Married) Adj. (Beta)	Model II (Not Married) Unadj. (Eta)	Model II (Not Married) Adj. (Beta)	Model III (Males) Unadj. (Eta)	Model III (Males) Adj. (Beta)	Model III (Females) Unadj. (Eta)	Model III (Females) Adj. (Beta)	Model IV (Males) Unadj. (Eta)	Model IV (Males) Adj. (Beta)	Model IV (Females) Unadj. (Eta)	Model IV (Females) Adj. (Beta)	Model V (Males) Unadj. (Eta)	Model V (Males) Adj. (Beta)	Model V (Females) Unadj. (Eta)	Model V (Females) Adj. (Beta)	Model VI (Males) Unadj. (Eta)	Model VI (Males) Adj. (Beta)	Model VI (Females) Unadj. (Eta)	Model VI (Females) Adj. (Beta)
Grand Mean	3.30		3.23		3.39		3.15		3.42		3.14		3.42		3.14		3.42		3.15		3.41	
Gender																						
1. Male	-.15	-.16	-.09	-.08	-.21	-.31																
2. Female	.12	.14	.09	.08	.13	.18																
	.12	.13	.08	.07	.15	.22																
Birth Cohort																						
1. -1929	-.42	-.36	-.36	-.32	-.49	-.44	-.40	-.35	-.46	-.38	-.33	-.12	-.46	-.24	-.33	-.11	-.46	-.21	-.32	-.07	-.49	-.17
2. 1930 – 49	.01	-.01	.02	.01	.02	-.03	-.06	-.08	.07	.05	.00	-.07	.07	-.03	.00	-.07	.07	-.04	.01	-.06	.05	.01
3. 1950 – 70	.26	.23	.22	.20	.27	.27	.24	.22	.29	.24	.23	.15	.29	.19	.24	.14	.28	.17	.23	.10	.28	.10
	.26	.23	.23	.20	.30	.28	.24	.22	.30	.25	.22	.11	.30	.18	.22	.11	.30	.15	.21	.08	.30	.11
Marital Status																						
1. Married	-.07	-.05					-.01	.03	-.10	-.14			-.10	-.12			-.11	-.11			-.11	-.08
2. Widowed	-.27	.05					-.30	.16	-.36	.05			-.36	.04			-.34	.04			-.36	.00
3. Sep - div	.18	.11					-.21	-.16	.34	.25			.34	.20			.34	.18			.34	.14
4. Never marr.	.20	.03					.18	-.02	.28	.09			.28	.09			.27	.08			.25	.07
	.15	.06					.12	.06	.23	.14			.23	.12			.23	.11			.23	.08
Education																						
1. Basic	-.89	-.61	-.58	-.39	-1.20	-.81	-.61	-.37	-1.15	-.91	-.32	-.12	-1.15	-.79	-.32	-.17	-1.16	-.78	-.25	-.16	-1.16	-.66
2. Low	-.19	-.12	-.26	-.19	-.16	-.06	-.20	-.16	-.19	-.09	-.28	-.17	-.19	-.04	-.28	-.19	-.19	-.07	-.29	-.27	-.19	-.09
3. Middle	-.05	-.05	-.02	-.03	-.05	-.08	-.17	-.17	.02	.04	-.15	-.17	.02	.03	-.15	-.17	.01	.03	-.15	-.15	.01	.02
4. High	.15	.08	.11	.06	.19	.11	.22	.16	.10	.01	.23	.13	.10	-.01	.22	.15	.11	.01	.20	.16	.09	.01
5. Graduate	.43	.42	.45	.46	.42	.37	.39	.42	.51	.41	.43	.50	.51	.34	.43	.50	.51	.33	.46	.54	.53	.44
	.23	.17	.20	.17	.27	.19	.24	.20	.25	.18	.24	.20	.25	.15	.24	.21	.25	.15	.23	.23	.25	.16
FEMALWRK (Female Work)																						
1. Full time											.44	.38	.39	.25	.44	.37	.39	.26	.43	.30	.37	.19
2. Part time											-.16	-.17	.10	.05	-.16	-.14	.09	.05	-.20	-.14	.10	.03
3. No Work											-.31	-.26	-.35	-.23	-.30	-.25	-.35	-.23	-.29	-.20	-.34	-.17
											.34	.29	.32	.21	.34	.28	.32	.21	.33	.23	.31	.16
RELCOMMI (Religious Commitment)																						
1. Strong															-.10	-.11	-.16	-.11	-.12	-.09	-.17	-.11
2. Weak															.09	.10	.18	.12	.11	.08	.19	.12
															.10	.10	.16	.11	.11	.08	.17	.11
PRESCHOO (Preschoolers at Home)																						
1. No kids																			-.03	.00	-.06	-.04
2. Kids present																			.07	.01	.25	.18
																			.04	.00	.11	.08
ICHICARE																						
1. 1st quartile																			-.82	-.69	-.81	-.66
2. 2nd quartile																			-.32	-.27	-.34	-.26
3. 3rd quartile																			.19	.09	.01	-.03
4. 4th quartile																			.40	.40	.42	.36
																			.39	.34	.36	.29
R squared	.120		.084		.166		.101		.141		.165		.173		.173		.184		.286		.268	
Sample N	1414		756		658		611		803		366		803		366		803		366		803	

Table 11: Multivariate Models for the Prediction of Sex-Role Attitudes: IFLAHOUS / Germany

	Model I		Model II (Married)		Model II (Not Married)		Model III (Males)		Model III (Females)		Model IV (Males)		Model IV (Females)		Model V (Males)		Model V (Females)		Model VI (Males)		Model VI (Females)	
	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)
Grand Mean	2.84		2.73		3.01		2.82		2.86		2.63		2.86		2.62		2.86		2.63		2.87	
Gender																						
1. Male	-.02	-.08	-.10	-.06	.17	-.12																
2. Female	.02	.06	.09	.05	-.10	.07																
	.02	.06	.09	.05	.11	.08																
Birth Cohort																						
1. -1929	-.64	-.45	-.50	-.43	-.82	-.68	-.60	-.44	-.66	-.49	-.40	-.24	-.66	-.39	-.39	-.23	-.66	-.35	-.40	-.18	-.66	-.36
2. 1930 - 49	-.08	-.01	.00	.01	-.07	-.03	-.08	-.04	-.07	.03	.05	.00	-.07	.01	.06	.01	-.07	.01	.06	.01	-.10	-.02
3. 1950 - 70	.52	.33	.39	.32	.57	.47	.47	.33	.55	.34	.44	.32	.55	.29	.43	.30	.56	.26	.44	.23	.55	.27
	.42	.29	.32	.27	.54	.44	.40	.28	.45	.30	.31	.20	.45	.25	.30	.19	.45	.23	.31	.15	.44	.23
Marital Status																						
1. Married	-.11	-.06					-.19	-.07	-.03	-.07			-.03	-.05			-.03	-.05			-.05	-.05
2. Widowed	-.71	-.21					-.72	-.19	-.72	-.16			-.72	-.14			-.72	-.13			-.72	-.10
3. Sep - div	.29	.21					.25	.24	.30	.19			.30	.12			.28	.08			.25	.09
4. Never marr.	.62	.23					.54	.15	.72	.31			.72	.24			.74	.25			.74	.22
	.36	.13					.32	.10	.39	.15			.39	.11			.40	.11			.39	.10
Education																						
1. Basic	-.42	-.19	-.32	-.26	-.57	-.20	-.17	-.22	-.50	-.16	-.26	-.17	-.50	-.13	-.26	-.20	-.52	-.14	-.26	-.19	-.49	-.12
2. Low	-.35	-.23	-.22	-.18	-.54	-.33	-.32	-.21	-.37	-.24	-.18	-.13	-.37	-.23	-.17	-.12	-.37	-.22	-.18	-.13	-.39	-.24
3. Middle	.25	.12	.23	.14	.27	.09	.11	.03	.34	.18	.09	.00	.34	.15	.10	.01	.34	.15	.10	.00	.34	.15
4. High	.75	.48	.40	.39	.82	.50	.69	.44	.83	.50	.34	.32	.83	.55	.34	.32	.84	.54	.33	.30	.85	.55
5. Graduate	.77	.69	.81	.76	.71	.66	.61	.56	1.00	.87	.74	.64	1.00	.79	.74	.66	1.02	.79	.83	.75	1.01	.80
	.38	.26	.29	.25	.47	.30	.35	.25	.42	.28	.27	.22	.42	.27	.26	.22	.42	.27	.28	.23	.43	.28
FEMALWRK (Female Work)																						
1. Full time											.53	.38	.67	.25	.52	.38	.68	.24	.52	.40	.67	.22
2. Part time											.38	.32	.43	.31	.38	.30	.43	.30	.46	.37	.40	.29
3. No Work											-.23	-.17	-.28	-.12	-.22	-.17	-.28	-.12	-.24	-.19	-.28	-.11
											.32	.24	.36	.16	.31	.23	.36	.16	.33	.26	.36	.14
RELCOMMI (Religious Commitment)																						
1. Strong															-.30	-.21	-.56	-.19	-.35	-.25	-.56	-.20
2. Weak															.05	.04	.17	.06	.06	.04	.17	.06
															.12	.08	.27	.09	.14	.10	.27	.09
PRESCHOO (Preschoolers at Home)																						
1. No kids																			-.07	-.02	-.04	.02
2. Kids present																			.41	.14	.24	-.09
																			.16	.06	.09	.03
ICHICARE																						
1. 1st quartile																			-.11	-.06	-.25	-.12
2. 2nd quartile																			.09	.04	.17	.11
3. 3rd quartile																			.06	.08	.14	.05
4. 4th quartile																			-.01	-.01	.02	-.07
																			.09	.05	.16	.09
R squared	.268		.163		.366		.231		.301		.197		.321		.197		.332		.221		.338	
Sample N	2994		1702		1292		1329		1665		803		1665		803		1665		803		1665	

Table 12: Multivariate Models for the Prediction of Sex-Role Attitudes: IFLAHOUS / U.S.A.

	Model I		Model II (Married)		(Not Married)		Model III (Males)		(Females)		Model IV (Males)		(Females)		Model V (Males)		(Females)		Model VI (Males)		(Females)	
	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)
Grand Mean	3.01		2.98		3.04		2.99		3.02		2.93		3.02		2.93		3.03		2.94		3.04	
Gender																						
1. Male	-.02	-.05	-.05	-.05	.05	-.05																
2. Female	.01	.04	.05	.04	-.03	.03																
	.02	.05	.06	.05	.04	.04																
Birth Cohort																						
1. -1929	-.46	-.33	-.38	-.31	-.55	-.40	-.44	-.35	-.47	-.31	-.38	-.27	-.47	-.19	-.38	-.24	-.47	-.16	-.38	-.26	-.50	-.19
2. 1930 - 49	.04	.02	.09	.07	-.02	-.07	-.03	-.02	.10	.06	.05	.00	.10	.00	.05	.00	.09	-.01	.07	.01	.07	-.01
3. 1950 - 70	.26	.19	.18	.15	.33	.26	.24	.19	.28	.18	.23	.19	.28	.14	.23	.18	.28	.12	.21	.18	.28	.13
	.33	.24	.27	.22	.39	.30	.32	.25	.35	.22	.29	.22	.35	.15	.29	.20	.34	.12	.29	.21	.35	.14
Marital Status																						
1. Married	-.03	-.03					-.06	-.03	.01	-.03			.01	-.02			.01	.00			-.01	.01
2. Widowed	-.46	-.06					-.31	.21	-.49	-.09			-.49	-.10			-.46	-.10			-.49	-.12
3. Sep - div	.09	.02					-.12	-.11	.18	.09			.18	.05			.18	.03			.20	.04
4. Never marr.	.26	.09					.27	.10	.26	.09			.26	.09			.25	.08			.24	.04
	.21	.06					.18	.09	.25	.07			.25	.06			.25	.06			.25	.06
Education																						
1. Basic	-.94	-.69	-.74	-.57	-1.12	-.77	-.86	-.61	-1.02	-.78	-.71	-.51	-1.02	-.67	-.70	-.56	-1.03	-.66	-.74	-.60	-1.04	-.62
2. Low	-.35	-.27	-.33	-.27	-.38	-.27	-.28	-.25	-.40	-.29	-.25	-.17	-.40	-.25	-.25	-.18	-.40	-.28	-.23	-.19	-.42	-.30
3. Middle	-.02	-.03	-.04	-.04	.02	.00	-.04	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.08	-.09	-.02	-.02	-.10	-.11	-.02	-.02	-.09	-.10	-.04	-.04
4. High	.23	.16	.17	.12	.30	.21	.18	.12	.28	.20	.17	.09	.28	.18	.17	.12	.28	.20	.14	.11	.28	.20
5. Graduate	.47	.43	.53	.53	.40	.32	.43	.44	.52	.42	.51	.57	.52	.35	.51	.58	.51	.35	.54	.58	.57	.41
	.34	.26	.31	.27	.38	.27	.32	.27	.35	.26	.31	.27	.35	.23	.32	.29	.36	.25	.31	.29	.37	.25
FEMALWRK (Female Work)																						
1. Full time											.25	.15	.34	.20	.26	.15	.34	.20	.25	.11	.34	.17
2. Part time											-.02	-.08	.17	.09	-.02	-.05	.17	.09	-.03	-.04	.14	.07
3. No Work											-.19	-.09	-.33	-.19	-.20	-.10	-.33	-.19	-.19	-.08	-.33	-.17
											.25	.14	.34	.19	.25	.14	.34	.20	.24	.10	.33	.17
RELCOMMI (Religious Commitment)																						
1. Strong															-.09	-.10	-.14	-.12	-.11	-.10	-.15	-.12
2. Weak															.09	.10	.15	.13	.10	.10	.16	.14
															.11	.12	.16	.14	.13	.12	.17	.14
PRESCHOO (Preschoolers at Home)																						
1. No kids																			-.02	.03	-.02	.01
2. Kids present																			.06	-.07	.09	-.04
																			.04	.05	.05	.02
ICHICARE																						
1. 1st quartile																			-.35	-.28	-.50	-.36
2. 2nd quartile																			-.16	-.09	-.11	-.03
3. 3rd quartile																			.08	.01	.16	.11
4. 4th quartile																			.19	.19	.07	.01
																			.22	.18	.19	.13
R squared	.177		.145		.217		.174		.187		.179		.215		.196		.231		.226		.258	
Sample N	1414		756		658		611		803		366		803		366		803		366		803	

Table 13: Multivariate Models for the Prediction of Sex-Role Attitudes: IFLAWORK / Germany

	Model I		Model II (Married)		Model II (Not Married)		Model III (Males)		Model III (Females)		Model IV (Males)		Model IV (Females)		Model V (Males)		Model V (Females)		Model VI (Males)		Model VI (Females)	
	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)
Grand Mean	3.26		3.18		3.38		3.25		3.27		3.13		3.27		3.13		3.28		3.14		3.28	
Gender																						
1. Male	-.01	-.05	-.06	-.04	.09	-.05																
2. Female	.01	.04	.05	.04	-.06	.03																
	.01	.06	.06	.05	.08	.05																
Birth Cohort																						
1. -1929	-.28	-.14	-.15	-.12	-.44	-.43	-.25	-.11	-.30	-.18	-.09	.03	-.30	-.06	-.10	.03	-.31	-.05	-.09	.05	-.29	-.04
2. 1930 - 49	-.02	-.03	.01	.02	.09	.10	-.06	-.02	.02	.08	.01	-.04	.02	.05	.02	-.02	.02	.05	.01	-.04	.00	.04
3. 1950 - 70	.21	.07	.10	.07	.26	.25	.21	.09	.21	.07	.11	.01	.21	.01	.09	.00	.21	.00	.09	.00	.21	.00
	.24	.10	.12	.09	.38	.37	.24	.10	.24	.13	.10	.04	.24	.05	.09	.03	.25	.05	.09	.05	.24	.03
Marital Status																						
1. Married	-.08	-.07					-.12	-.09	-.04	-.07			-.04	-.03			-.04	-.03			-.04	-.03
2. Widowed	-.42	-.30					-.65	-.53	-.39	-.20			-.39	-.18			-.40	-.18			-.38	-.15
3. Sep - div	.25	.21					.41	.43	.17	.12			.17	.04			.18	.04			.13	.02
4. Never marr.	.37	.29					.32	.23	.43	.34			.43	.26			.44	.26			.43	.23
	.29	.22					.31	.25	.29	.21			.29	.16			.30	.16			.29	.14
Education																						
1. Basic	-.12	-.02	-.20	-.19	-.14	.09	-.06	-.08	-.15	.01	-.53	-.37	-.15	.03	-.54	-.40	-.15	.04	-.54	-.44	-.15	.06
2. Low	-.13	-.06	-.08	-.07	-.19	-.07	-.09	-.03	-.16	-.09	-.04	-.03	-.16	-.08	-.04	-.02	-.16	-.08	-.05	-.03	-.16	-.08
3. Middle	.10	.04	.09	.06	.11	.01	.06	.02	.13	.06	.05	.01	.13	.03	.05	.00	.13	.03	.06	.00	.12	.02
4. High	.27	.09	.15	.15	.25	.07	.23	.07	.30	.10	.12	.14	.30	.16	.12	.14	.31	.16	.14	.14	.32	.16
5. Graduate	.26	.21	.27	.26	.26	.20	.08	.03	.54	.47	.13	.08	.54	.37	.10	.06	.54	.38	.16	.15	.55	.40
	.18	.09	.13	.12	.22	.09	.14	.04	.23	.15	.10	.07	.23	.13	.10	.07	.23	.13	.12	.09	.24	.14
FEMALWRK (Female Work)																						
1. Full time											.38	.38	.48	.32	.37	.37	.48	.31	.37	.35	.47	.28
2. Part time											.32	.33	.36	.34	.32	.32	.35	.34	.32	.32	.32	.29
3. No Work											-.17	-.17	-.21	-.15	-.16	-.16	-.21	-.15	-.17	-.16	-.21	-.14
											.31	.31	.35	.25	.30	.30	.35	.25	.30	.29	.34	.23
RELCOMMI (Religious Commitment)																						
1. Strong															-.19	-.16	-.23	-.05	-.22	-.20	-.24	-.06
2. Weak															.03	.03	.07	.01	.04	.04	.07	.02
															.10	.09	.14	.03	.12	.10	.15	.04
PRESCHOO (Preschoolers at Home)																						
1. No kids																			.00	.01	.00	.00
2. Kids present																			-.01	-.03	-.02	-.03
																			.00	.02	.01	.01
ICHICARE																						
1. 1st quartile																			-.19	-.17	-.25	-.19
2. 2nd quartile																			.08	.07	.08	.06
3. 3rd quartile																			.15	.15	.19	.14
4. 4th quartile																			.26	.24	.27	.19
																			.19	.18	.23	.17
R squared		.106		.030		.151		.108		.119		.101		.168		.103		.170		.143		.195
Sample N	2994		1702		1292		1329		1665		803		1665		803		1665		803		1665	

Table 14: Multivariate Models for the Prediction of Sex-Role Attitudes: IFLAWORK / U.S.A.

	Model I		Model II (Married)		(Not Married)		Model III (Males)		(Females)		Model IV (Males)		(Females)		Model V (Males)		(Females)		Model VI (Males)		(Females)	
	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)	Unadj. (Eta)	Adj. (Beta)
Grand Mean	3.08		2.95		3.24		3.02		3.13		2.95		3.13		2.95		3.13		2.95		3.15	
Gender																						
1. Male	-.06	-.05	-.01	.00	-.09	-.12																
2. Female	.05	.04	.01	.00	.06	.07																
	.07	.06	.01	.01	.09	.12																
Birth Cohort																						
1. -1929	-.07	-.07	.01	-.01	-.16	-.20	-.12	-.11	-.05	-.04	.00	.10	-.05	.02	.00	.10	-.05	.04	-.01	.06	-.06	.03
2. 1930 - 49	-.09	-.07	-.05	-.05	-.08	-.07	-.10	-.06	-.08	-.06	-.07	-.12	-.08	-.10	-.07	-.12	-.08	-.10	-.08	-.12	-.09	-.09
3. 1950 - 70	.10	.08	.04	.05	.12	.14	.12	.10	.08	.07	.06	.03	.08	.04	.07	.04	.08	.03	.08	.07	.09	.04
	.11	.09	.05	.06	.16	.19	.15	.12	.09	.07	.07	.12	.09	.07	.08	.12	.09	.07	.10	.12	.10	.07
Marital Status																						
1. Married	-.13	-.12					-.08	-.06	-.17	-.16			-.17	-.15			-.17	-.14			-.17	-.14
2. Widowed	.05	.06					.06	.16	.01	.02			.01	.02			.00	.01			.02	.02
3. Sep - div	.16	.16					-.01	.01	.22	.23			.22	.21			.23	.21			.19	.16
4. Never marr.	.20	.15					.19	.12	.24	.19			.24	.20			.24	.19			.26	.19
	.18	.16					.15	.11	.22	.21			.22	.20			.23	.19			.23	.18
Education																						
1. Basic	-.30	-.23	-.15	-.14	-.46	-.28	-.14	-.05	-.46	-.43	.13	.17	-.46	-.37	.13	.15	-.46	-.36	.24	.26	-.47	-.35
2. Low	.11	.12	.06	.07	.11	.16	.03	.04	.16	.17	-.03	.01	.16	.19	-.04	.01	.16	.17	-.06	-.06	.18	.19
3. Middle	-.03	-.01	.02	.02	-.05	-.06	.00	.01	-.05	-.02	.00	-.01	-.05	-.02	.01	-.01	-.05	-.02	.02	.01	-.07	-.05
4. High	-.04	-.06	-.09	-.10	.02	-.02	-.01	-.03	-.06	-.09	-.04	-.07	-.06	-.09	-.05	-.06	-.05	-.08	-.04	-.05	-.05	-.08
5. Graduate	.06	.06	.17	.18	-.07	-.08	.02	.03	.12	.10	.18	.20	.12	.07	.18	.20	.12	.06	.14	.18	.19	.15
	.10	.10	.11	.11	.13	.14	.04	.04	.15	.15	.09	.11	.15	.15	.09	.10	.15	.14	.10	.11	.17	.16
FEMALWRK (Female Work)																						
1. Full time											.15	.18	.11	.11	.15	.18	.12	.11	.16	.14	.10	.07
2. Part time											.10	.15	.03	.06	.10	.16	.03	.06	.10	.18	.03	.04
3. No Work											-.15	-.18	-.10	-.11	-.15	-.18	-.11	-.11	-.15	-.16	-.09	-.08
											.19	.24	.12	.13	.19	.24	.13	.13	.20	.21	.11	.09
RELCOMMI (Religious Commitment)																						
1. Strong															-.04	-.04	-.11	-.08	-.04	-.03	-.10	-.06
2. Weak															.04	.03	.12	.08	.04	.03	.11	.07
															.05	.05	.14	.10	.06	.04	.13	.08
PRESCHOO (Preschoolers at Home)																						
1. No kids																			.03	.02	.00	.00
2. Kids present																			-.06	-.06	.01	.00
																			.05	.05	.01	.00
ICHICARE																						
1. 1st quartile																			-.45	-.38	-.28	-.18
2. 2nd quartile																			.00	.01	-.12	-.09
3. 3rd quartile																			-.01	-.04	-.02	-.04
4. 4th quartile																			.18	.18	.17	.13
																			.25	.23	.18	.13
R squared	.053		.015		.058		.034		.076		.062		.089		.065		.098		.124		.115	
Sample N	1414		756		658		611		803		366		803		366		803		366		803	

References:

Alwin, Duane F., Michael Braun, and Jacqueline Scott. [Without date of the year]. *"The Separation of Work and Family: Gender Differences in Sex-Role Attitudes in Britain, Germany and the United States."* Unpublished manuscript. (Meanwhile published as: Alwin, Duane F., Michael Braun, and Jacqueline Scott. 1992. "The Separation of Work and the Family: Attitudes Towards Women's Labour-Force Participation in Germany, Great Britain, and the United States." *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 8 No. 1 (May):13-37.)

Andrews, Frank M., James N. Morgan, Jon A. Sonquist, and Laura Klem. 1973. *"Multiple Classification Analysis."* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Beck, Ulrich. 1986. *"Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne."* Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Bertram, Hans and Renate Borrmann-Mueller. 1988. "Individualisierung und Pluralisierung familialer Lebensformen." *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte - Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament*, B13, pp. 14-23.

Cherlin, Andrew and Pamela Barnhouse Walters. 1981. "Trends in United States Men's and Women's Sex-Role Attitudes: 1972 to 1978." *American Sociological Review*, 46:453-460.

Davis, James A. and Roger Jowell. 1989. "Measuring national differences. An Introduction to the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)." Pp. 1-13 in Roger Jowell, Sharon Witherspoon and Lindsay Brook (Eds.): *Britisch Social Attitudes. Special International Report.* Hants: Gover.

Helmreich, Robert L., Janet T. Spence, and Robert H. Gibson. 1982. "Sex-Role Attitudes." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* Vol. 8, No. 4:656-663.

Krauth, Cornelia. 1982. "Attitudes towards Women's Role -- A Comparative Analysis Based on the 1977 NORC General Social Survey (GSS) and the 1982 German General Social Survey (ALLBUS)." *GSS Crossnational Report No. 2.*

Luescher, Kurt. 1985. "Moderne familiale Lebensformen als Herausforderung der Soziologie." Pp 110-127 in Burkhard Lutz (Ed.): *Soziologie und gesellschaftliche Entwicklung. Verhandlungen des 22. Deutschen Soziologentages in Dortmund 1984.* Frankfurt/M., New York: Campus.

Masnick, George and Mary Jo Bane. 1980. *"The Nation's Families."* Boston, Mass.: Auburn House.

Mason, Karen Oppenheim, John L. Czajka, and Sera Arber. 1976. "Change in U.S. Women's Sex-Role Attitudes, 1964-1974." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 41, No. 4:573-596.

McBroom, William H. 1986. "Changes in Role Orientations of Women. A Study of Sex Role Traditionalism over a Five-Year Period." *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 7, No. 2:149-159.

Morgan, Carolyn Stout and Alexis J. Walker. 1983. "Predicting Sex Role Attitudes." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 2:148-151.

Piotrkowski, Chaya S., Robert N. Rapoport, and Rhona Rapoport. 1987. "Families and Work." Pp. 251-283 in Marvin B. Sussman and Suzanne K. Steinmetz (Eds.): *Handbook of Marriage and the Family.* New York and London: Plenum Press.

Schulz, Wolfgang. 1983. "Von der Institution 'Familie' zu den Teilbeziehungen zwischen Mann, Frau und Kind. Zum Strukturwandel von Ehe und Familie." *Soziale Welt* 34:401-419.

Scott, Jacqueline. 1990a. "Women and the Family." Pp. 57 - 71 in Roger Jowell, Sharon Witherspoon, and Lindsay Brook (Eds.): *British Social Attitudes. The 7th report.* Hants: Gower.

Scott, Jacqueline. 1990b. *"Women and the Family: Changing Attitudes and Cross-national Comparisons."* Unpublished paper. University of Essex.

Smith, Tom W. 1985. "Working Wives and Women's Rights: The Connection Between the Employment Status of Wives and the Feminist Attitudes of Husbands." *Sex Roles*, Vol. 12, Nos. 5/6:501-508.

Smith, Tom W. 1987. "The International Social Survey Program." *Comparative Public Opinion*, Vol. 4, No. 1:2-3.

Spain, Daphne and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 1983. "How Women Have Changed." *American Demographics*, Vol. 20:19-25.

SPSS, Inc. 1988. *"SPSS-X User's Guide. 3rd Edition."* Chicago, IL.: SPSS.

Statistisches Bundesamt (Hrsg.). 1987. *"Frauen in Familie, Beruf, Gesellschaft."* Mainz: Kohlhammer.

Statistisches Bundesamt (Hrsg.). 1988, 1989. *"Statistisches Jahrbuch 1988, 1989 fuer die Bundesrepublik Deutschland."* Stuttgart, Mainz: Kohlhammer.

Thornton, Arland and Deborah Freedman. 1979. "Changes in the Sex Role Attitudes of Women, 1962-1977: Evidence From A Panel Study." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 44, No. 5:831-842.

Thornton, Arland, Duane F. Alwin, and Donald Camburn. 1983. "Causes and Consequences of Sex-Role Attitudes and Attitude Change." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48, No. 2:211-227.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (Ed.). 1987, 1990. *"Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1988, 1990."* Washington, DC.

Waite, Linda J. 1981. "U.S. Women at Work." *Population Bulletin*, Vol. 36, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau.

Zentralarchiv fuer empirische Sozialforschung (ZA). 1990. *"Codebook ISSP 1988 'Family and Changing Sex Roles'."* Za-No. 1700, Koeln: ZA.