Perceptions of Feminism and Equal Rights

Introduction

The year 2020 marked the 100-year anniversary of the 19th Amendment being passed, which is the law that gave women the right to vote. The proposition of the Equal Rights Amendment as an addition to the Constitution has sparked controversy in the last 40 years and has been delayed since the 1970s. The Equal Rights Amendment would make it illegal to discriminate based on gender. The controversy has sparked interest in what the U.S. thinks of gender equality today and what improvements need to be made.

In Spring of 2020, Ipsos on behalf of Pew Research conducted the 19th Amendment survey to gather data about US adults and their opinions on feminism and other related topics. The topics covered in the survey include gender discrimination, equal rights, the Equal Rights Ammendment, women's advancements in society, feminist ideology, and women's activism. These topics were included in the survey to evaluate the U.S population's perceptions of gender equality. Ipsos invited one adult from a representative sample of households to take this survey. Ipsos sampled eligible to obtain the correct number of interviews in each sample group given the allotted field period.

The focus of our research was the question, which demographics surveyed affect an individual's views on feminism? We hypothesized that age and gender have a significant effect on views of feminism. We also hypothesized that employment status will not have a significant effect on views of feminism.

Additionally, we focused on whether political stereotypes are true in regards to feminist views. We hypothesized an individual's views on feminism are not independent of political party and their views of gender discrimination .

Data

The data for this research comes from the 19th Amendment Survey. The target population consisted of non-institutionalized adults age 18 and older residing in the United States. This survey consists of a population of at least 3,113 adult KP members, a main sample of 2,500 completes and augments of at least 437 African Americans and 176 Hispanics. A stratified random sample was drawn for this survey.

We had ten variables of interest from this survey that we used in our research. Tables 1 and 2 show the frequency data for these variables. Refused responses were removed from the variables of interest to increase precision of our results.

For our analysis on political stereotypes and feminism, we have conducted multiple chi-square tests to test our hypotheses about the relationship between political stereotypes and views of feminism. The variables used in the chi squared tests are party, gender discrimination ("When it comes to gender discrimination against women, which do you think is the bigger problem for our country today?"), ERA question 2 ("How do you feel about the ERA being added to the Constitution?"), and equal rights question 1 ("How important, if at all, is it for women to have equal rights with men in our country?") .The ERA refers to the Equal Rights Amendment.

For our analysis on the effect of different demographics on feminist views, the variables ideology, age, gender, race/ethnicity, employment status, and describe question 2 ("How well, if at all, do each of the following describe you?" [feminist]) are used. Ideology is measured on a scale of very conservative to very liberal with 6.6% of respondents identifying as "very conservative", 24% identifying as "conservative", 44.9% identifying as "moderate", 18.2% identifying as "liberal", and 6.1% identifying as "very liberal". The categories in the race/ethnicity

variable are “white, non-hispanic” (64.08% of respondents), “black, non-hispanic” (11.1%), “other, non-hispanic” (7.3%), “hispanic” (16%), and “2+ races, non-hispanic” (1.4%). Employment status contains about 67% “Working” responses and about 33% “Not Working” responses. For the describe question 2, the response options were “very well” (14.6% of respondents) , “somewhat well” (37%), “not too well” (27.8%) , and “not well at all” (20.5%). Additionally, 48.7% of participants were male and 51.2% of participants were female.

Analysis

Our logistic regression model that tested the probability of different demographics having describing themselves as a feminist. Table 9 shows the model effects of the logistic regression. As shown in Table 9, gender ($p<0.0001$), age ($p= 0.006$), and ideology ($p<0.0001$) were significant predictors of a participant describing themself as a feminist. Furthermore, race/ethnicity ($p= 0.2539$) and employment status ($p=0.7978$) were not significant predictors of a participant describing themself as a feminist. For the next part of the analysis for this regression, we look at Table 10, which shows the Maximum Likelihood Estimates. According to Table 10, those in the age groups 25-34 ($p=0.0196$), 35-44 ($p=0.0003$), 45-54 ($p=0.02$), and 55-64 ($p=0.0122$) are slightly less likely to describe themselves a feminist than those in the 75+ age group.

For the final part of analyzing the logistic regression, we look at Table 11, which shows the Odds Ratio Estimates. According to the Odds Ratios in Table 11, women are 2.4 times as likely to describe themselves as a feminist when compared to men. Additionally, compared to those who identify as “very liberal”, those who identify as conservative are only 0.098 times as likely to describe themself as a feminist and those who identify as “very conservative” are only 0.073 times as likely to describe themself as a feminist.

A chi square goodness-of-fit test was run on the variables "PARTY" and "GENDISC." For the variable "PARTY", the individuals were asked "In politics today, do you consider yourself a…" and responded with one of the answers "Republican", "Democrat", "Independent", or "Something else". For the variable "GENDISC", the individuals were asked "When it comes to discrimination against women, which do you think is the bigger problem for our country today?" and responded with one of the answers "People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist" or "People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist". The chi square test indicated there was a significant association between the variables political party and views on discrimination with a p-value (<0.0001) (Table 4). Table 3 reveals the answers to GENDISC among the parties. Republicans were the only party who answered "people seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist" (54.87%) more than "people NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist" (45.13%). However, this group had the most polarizing results with 54.87% versus 45.13%. This is surprising for those identifying as conservative to have a polarizing result like this among the group and goes into our research question "are political party stereotypes true in regards to feminist views"? Of those who consider themselves a democrat, 13.37% believed that people seeing discrimination against women where it really does not exist was a bigger problem than people not seeing discrimination against women where it really does exist (86.62%). For those who self-identified as being a part of the independent party, 31.28% believed that people seeing discrimination against women where it really does not exist was a bigger problem while 68.72% of independents believed that people not seeing discrimination against women where it really does exist was a bigger problem. For those who chose "something else" as their party-identifier, 32.39% believed people seeing discrimination against women where it really does not exist was a bigger

problem than people not seeing discrimination against women where it really does exist (67.61%). In total, 31.59% of participants believed that people seeing discrimination against women where it really does not exist was a bigger problem and 68.41% of participants believed that people not seeing discrimination against women where it really does exist is the bigger problem. This total was composed of 27.85% republicans, 35.49% democrats, 27.77% independents, and 8.89% "something else" (Table 3).

To test the "ERA QUESTION 2" and "PARTY", we can also use the chi square goodness-of-fit test. For the variable "PARTY", the individuals were asked "In politics today, do you consider yourself a…" and responded with one of the answers "Republican", "Democrat", "Independent", or "Something else". And for the variable "ERA QUESTION 2", the individuals were asked "How do you feel about the ERA being added to the U.S. Constitution?" And responded with one of the answers "Strongly favor" or "Somewhat favor" or "Somewhat oppose" or "Strongly oppose". Those with the Republican party account for approximately 28% of the total, with 4% strongly favoring, 15% somewhat favoring, 6% somewhat opposing and 3% strongly opposing feeling about the ERA being added to the U.S. Constitution. Those with the Democrat party account for approximately 35% of the total, with 19% strongly favoring, 13% somewhat favoring, 2% somewhat opposing and 1% strongly opposing feeling about the ERA being added to the U.S. Constitution. Those with the Independent party account for approximately 28% of the total, with 10% strongly favoring, 12% somewhat favoring, 4% somewhat opposing and 2% strongly opposing feeling about the ERA being added to the U.S. Constitution. And those with the Something else account for approximately 9% of the total, with 3% strongly favoring, 4% somewhat favoring, 1% somewhat opposing and 1% strongly opposing feeling about the ERA being added to the U.S. Constitution (Table 5). Only 3-5% of participants are Republicans who

strongly favor the ERA being added to the Constitution. Additionally, only 0.3-0.8% of participants are Democrats who strongly oppose the ERA being added to the Constitution. There is a higher percentage of Independents who strongly or somewhat favor the ERA than strongly or somewhat oppose it. According to the Rao_Scott Chi_square test ($X^2 = 292.48$) there is a significant association between views on the ERA and political party. How a participant feels about the ERA being added to the Constitution and political parties are not independent ($p < .0001$) (Table 6).

To test the "GENDER DISCRIMINATION" and "VIEWS ON THE EQUAL RIGHTS", we can also use the chi square goodness-of-fit test. For the variable "VIEWS ON THE EQUAL RIGHTS", the individuals were asked "How important, if at all, is it for women to have equal rights with men in our country?" and responded with one of the answers "Very important" or "Somewhat important" or "Not too important" or "Not at all important" or "Refused" . And for the variable "GENDER DISCRIMINATION", the individuals were asked "When it comes to discrimination against women, which do you think is the bigger problem for our country today?" And responded with one of the answers "People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist" or "People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist" or "refused". A higher percentage of those who think equal rights is very important think that people are not seeing discrimination against women where it really does exist (58%) than those who think equal rights is very important and also think that people are seeing discrimination against women where it really does not exist (20%) (Table 7). It is important to note that 78.9% of participants think that equal rights is very important. According to the Rao_Scott Chi_square test ($X^2 = 425.42$) there is a significant relationship between the important for women to have equal rights and people seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT

exist or people NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist (p-value < 0.0001) (Table 8).

Since all of the chi-square tests are significant, we can conclude that there is an overall significant relationship between political party and views on feminism. For each question analyzed, Republicans and Democrats had a higher percentage of opposite response options. This means that when Republicans had a higher percentage of a certain response, Democrats also had a higher percentage of a response with the opposite viewpoint.

Conclusion

As stated previously, one focus of our research was to identify which demographics from the survey have the highest probability of participants identifying themselves as a feminist. We had hypothesized that in our logistic regression model, age gender would be significant predictors and employment status would not be a significant predictor. In our analysis, we found that indeed age and gender were significant predictors. We were also correct that employment status was not a significant predictor. We can conclude from our analysis that women have a higher probability of describing themself as a feminist than men, those who identify as “liberal” or “very liberal” have a higher probability of describing themself as a feminist than those who identify as “conservative” or “very conservative”, and as age increases, the probability of a participant describing themself as a feminist decreases. Further study is necessary to understand the participants responded in these ways and what factors influence these responses.

Our other focus was to investigate whether or not there is a relationship between political stereotypes and an individual’s views on feminism. Our hypothesis was that an individual’s views on feminism are associated with political party and views on gender discrimination. We can

conclude from our results that there is a significant association between political party and opinions of adding the ERA to the constitution, political party and views on gender discrimination, and views of equal rights and views of gender discrimination. For each independence test with the political party variable, the highest percentage of Democrats and Republicans had opposite responses. All of these significant associations allow us to conclude that there is a strong association between political party and views of feminism.

A limitation in this study is that those who identify as white make up more than half of the survey sample. It is possible that this could have an effect on our results. In the future, having more representation of a larger variety of races / ethnicities is necessary to have more precise results. In conclusion, Americans are still divided on gender equality, 100 years after the passing of the 19th Amendment. Future research should investigate why this divide exists.

Tables

Table 1: Univariate Statistics for Age, Gender, and Race / Ethnicity

Age - 7 Categories					
ppagecat	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Dev of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
18-24	158	261.38670	21.55039	8.8516	0.7020
25-34	428	589.58050	28.59626	19.9656	0.9003
35-44	446	508.48910	24.10897	17.2195	0.7915
45-54	454	410.04110	19.21306	13.8856	0.6583
55-64	697	582.64010	21.36782	19.7305	0.7477
65-74	529	405.00570	17.34631	13.7151	0.6124
75+	235	195.84350	13.03590	6.6320	0.4475
Total	2947	2953	25.88288	100.000	

Gender					
ppgender	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Dev of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
Male	1494	1441	32.02357	48.7820	1.0193
Female	1453	1512	33.51912	51.2180	1.0193
Total	2947	2953	25.88288	100.000	

Race / Ethnicity					
ppethm	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Dev of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
White, Non-Hispanic	1666	1892	33.59487	64.0843	0.9758
Black, Non-Hispanic	639	328.69140	13.52442	11.1308	0.4973
Other, Non-Hispanic	105	216.25550	21.46758	7.3233	0.6993
Hispanic	453	472.86710	22.12360	16.0132	0.7399
2+ Races, Non-Hispanic	84	42.77230	4.83748	1.4484	0.1662
Total	2947	2953	25.88288	100.000	

Table 2: Univariate Statistics for Ideology, Equal Rights Question 1, Party, Employment Status, and Describe Question 2.

In general, would you describe your political views as...					
IDEO	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Dev of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
Very conservative	191	196.80490	14.74326	6.6646	0.4976
Conservative	699	709.33620	25.92574	24.0210	0.8617
Moderate	1345	1327	32.24086	44.9499	1.0153
Liberal	540	538.23680	24.19364	18.2269	0.7978
Very liberal	172	181.24560	14.97031	6.1377	0.5023
Total	2947	2953	25.88288	100.000	

How important, if at all, is it for women to have equal rights with men in our country?					
EQRIGHTS1	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Dev of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
Very important	2363	2347	31.30772	79.4917	0.8380
Somewhat important	512	529.71630	24.05811	17.9383	0.7935
Not too important	54	57.93780	8.99240	1.9620	0.3032
Not at all important	18	17.95410	4.81586	0.6080	0.1629
Total	2947	2953	25.88288	100.000	

In politics today, do you consider yourself a...					
PARTY	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Dev of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
Republican	752	821.77270	28.02930	27.8285	0.9157
Democrat	1151	1043	29.48101	35.3164	0.9676
Independent	812	825.03590	28.00506	27.9390	0.9158
Something else	232	263.28820	18.38095	8.9160	0.6112
Total	2947	2953	25.88288	100.000	

Table 3: PARTY by GENDISC Chi-Square Test

Current Employment Status					
ppwork	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Err of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
Working - as a paid employee	1639	1736	34.73440	59.0460	0.9958
Working - self-employed	246	231.49230	15.50234	7.8744	0.5273
Not working - on temporary layoff from a job	10	10.33410	3.75312	0.3515	0.1276
Not working - looking for work	105	127.03510	14.02252	4.3212	0.4706
Not working - retired	701	558.89380	20.01059	19.0113	0.7176
Not working - disabled	96	95.39270	10.78183	3.2449	0.3654
Not working - other	135	180.81610	16.46183	6.1506	0.5497
Total	2932	2940	25.86957	100.0000	

[Feminist] How well, if at all, do each of the following describe you?					
DESCRIBE_b	Frequency	Weighted Frequency	Std Err of Wgt Freq	Percent	Std Err of Percent
Very well	421	429.70470	21.93343	14.6168	0.7314
Somewhat well	1099	1088	30.59593	37.0191	0.9881
Not too well	812	818.04500	27.45043	27.8266	0.9099
Not at all well	600	603.76040	25.04745	20.5375	0.8301
Total	2932	2940	25.86957	100.0000	

Table of PARTY by GENDISC					
PARTY	GENDISC	Percent	Std Err of Percent	95% Confidence Limits for Percent	
Republican	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	15.2815	0.7467	13.8173	16.7456
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	12.5667	0.6772	11.2388	13.8946
	Total	27.8482	0.9234	26.0376	29.6588
Democrat	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	4.7451	0.4385	3.8853	5.6048
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	30.7421	0.9384	28.9021	32.5821
	Total	35.4871	0.9766	33.5723	37.4020
Independent	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	8.6888	0.5901	7.5317	9.8458
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	19.0859	0.8031	17.5113	20.6605
	Total	27.7747	0.9216	25.9676	29.5818
Something else	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	2.8795	0.3683	2.1574	3.6016
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	6.0106	0.5116	5.0074	7.0137
	Total	8.8900	0.6157	7.6829	10.0972
Total	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	31.5948	0.9656	29.7014	33.4881
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	68.4052	0.9656	66.5119	70.2986
	Total	100.0000			

Table 4: PARTY by GENDISC Chi-Square Test Statistic and P-value

Rao-Scott Chi-Square	281.1002
DF	3
Pr > ChiSq	<.0001

Table 5: PARTY by ERA2 Chi-Square Test

Table of PARTY by ERA2					
PARTY	ERA2	Percent	Std Err of Percent	95% Confidence Limits for Percent	
Republican	Strongly favor	4.2996	0.4108	3.4941	5.1051
	Somewhat favor	14.7237	0.7352	13.2823	16.1652
	Somewhat oppose	5.4603	0.4694	4.5399	6.3807
	Strongly oppose	3.3645	0.3663	2.6463	4.0827
	Total	27.8482	0.9234	26.0376	29.6588
Democrat	Strongly favor	19.3132	0.7940	17.7564	20.8701
	Somewhat favor	13.0768	0.6926	11.7188	14.4349
	Somewhat oppose	2.4987	0.3251	1.8613	3.1362
	Strongly oppose	0.5984	0.1411	0.3217	0.8750
	Total	35.4871	0.9766	33.5723	37.4020
Independent	Strongly favor	10.4882	0.6219	9.2687	11.7077
	Somewhat favor	12.2286	0.6865	10.8825	13.5747
	Somewhat oppose	3.5951	0.3786	2.8526	4.3375
	Strongly oppose	1.4628	0.2376	0.9968	1.9287
	Total	27.7747	0.9216	25.9676	29.5818
Something else	Strongly favor	2.5591	0.3377	1.8969	3.2214
	Somewhat favor	4.4241	0.4503	3.5410	5.3071
	Somewhat oppose	1.0751	0.2172	0.6492	1.5009
	Strongly oppose	0.8317	0.2037	0.4322	1.2312
	Total	8.8900	0.6157	7.6829	10.0972
Total	Strongly favor	36.6601	0.9835	34.7318	38.5885
	Somewhat favor	44.4533	1.0254	42.4427	46.4638
	Somewhat oppose	12.6292	0.6852	11.2856	13.9728
	Strongly oppose	6.2574	0.4921	5.2925	7.2223
	Total	100.0000			

Table 6: PARTY by ERA2 Chi-Square Test Statistic and P-value

Rao-Scott Chi-Square	292.4817
DF	9
Pr > ChiSq	<.0001

Table 7: EQRIGHTS1 by GENDISC Chi-Square Test

Table of EQRIGHTS1 by GENDISC					
EQRIGHTS1	GENDISC	Percent	Std Err of Percent	95% Confidence Limits for Percent	
Very important	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	20.2448	3.3538	13.2489	27.2407
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	58.0080	7.1117	43.1732	72.8427
	Refused	0.6868	0.1744	0.3231	1.0506
	Total	78.9396	3.9865	70.6238	87.2554
Somewhat important	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	8.9170	2.0487	4.6435	13.1904
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	8.8720	1.8609	4.9903	12.7538
	Refused	0.3501	0.1508	0.0356	0.6646
	Total	18.1391	3.3728	11.1035	25.1747
Not too important	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	1.7217	0.5524	0.5695	2.8740
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	0.2452	0.1076	0.0207	0.4697
	Refused	0.0288	0.0228	0.0000	0.0764
	Total	1.9957	0.6090	0.7253	3.2662
Not at all important	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	0.4399	0.1923	0.0388	0.8410
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	0.2252	0.1152	0.0000	0.4655
	Refused	0.0438	0.0288	0.0000	0.1038
	Total	0.7089	0.2484	0.1906	1.2271
Refused	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	0.0898	0.0482	0.0000	0.1903
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	0.0926	0.0580	0.0000	0.2135
	Refused	0.0343	0.0372	0.0000	0.1120
	Total	0.2167	0.0826	0.0443	0.3891
Total	People seeing discrimination against women where it really does NOT exist	31.4132	5.8060	19.3022	43.5243
	People NOT seeing discrimination against women where it really DOES exist	67.4430	5.8247	55.2928	79.5932
	Refused	1.1438	0.2314	0.6611	1.6265
	Total	100.000			

Table 8: EQRIGHTS1 by GENDISC Chi-Square Test Statistic and P-value

Rao-Scott Chi-Square Test	
Pearson Chi-Square	248.5081
Design Correction	0.5842
Rao-Scott Chi-Square	425.4173
DF	8
Pr > ChiSq	<.0001
F Value	53.1772
Num DF	8
Den DF	160
Pr > F	<.0001
Sample Size = 3143	

Table 9: Logistic Regression Model Effects

Type 3 Analysis of Effects				
Effect	F Value	Num DF	Den DF	Pr > F
ppagecat	3.03	6	2926	0.0060
ppgender	99.24	1	2931	<.0001
ppethm	1.34	4	2928	0.2539
IDEO	46.77	4	2928	<.0001
ppwork	0.07	1	2931	0.7978

Table 10: Logistic Regression Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter		Estimate	Standard Error	t Value	Pr > |t|
Intercept		1.6331	0.2864	5.70	<.0001
ppagecat	18-24	-0.2483	0.2426	-1.02	0.3063
ppagecat	25-34	-0.4747	0.2032	-2.34	0.0196
ppagecat	35-44	-0.7384	0.2036	-3.63	0.0003
ppagecat	45-54	-0.4687	0.2013	-2.33	0.0200
ppagecat	55-64	-0.4660	0.1859	-2.51	0.0122
ppagecat	65-74	-0.1874	0.1834	-1.02	0.3069
ppgender	Female	0.8798	0.0883	9.96	<.0001
ppethm	2+ Races, Non-Hispanic	0.1570	0.2439	0.64	0.5199
ppethm	Black, Non-Hispanic	-0.00830	0.1161	-0.07	0.9430
ppethm	Hispanic	0.1250	0.1269	0.99	0.3246
ppethm	Other, Non-Hispanic	0.4588	0.2215	2.07	0.0384
IDEO	Conservative	-2.3158	0.2349	-9.86	<.0001
IDEO	Liberal	-0.8344	0.2400	-3.48	0.0005
IDEO	Moderate	-1.6254	0.2244	-7.24	<.0001
IDEO	Very conservative	-2.6168	0.2819	-9.28	<.0001
ppwork		-0.00623	0.0243	-0.26	0.7978

Table 11: Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates

Odds Ratio Estimates			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Limits	
ppagecat 18-24 vs 75+	0.780	0.485	1.255
ppagecat 25-34 vs 75+	0.622	0.418	0.927
ppagecat 35-44 vs 75+	0.478	0.321	0.712
ppagecat 45-54 vs 75+	0.626	0.422	0.929
ppagecat 55-64 vs 75+	0.627	0.436	0.904
ppagecat 65-74 vs 75+	0.829	0.579	1.188
ppgender Female vs Male	2.410	2.027	2.866
ppethm 2+ Races, Non-Hispanic vs White, Non-Hispanic	1.170	0.725	1.887
ppethm Black, Non-Hispanic vs White, Non-Hispanic	0.992	0.790	1.245
ppethm Hispanic vs White, Non-Hispanic	1.133	0.884	1.453
ppethm Other, Non-Hispanic vs White, Non-Hispanic	1.582	1.025	2.443
IDEO Conservative vs Very liberal	0.099	0.062	0.156
IDEO Liberal vs Very liberal	0.434	0.271	0.695
IDEO Moderate vs Very liberal	0.197	0.127	0.306
IDEO Very conservative vs Very liberal	0.073	0.042	0.127
ppwork	0.994	0.948	1.042

References

Pew Research Center. *A Century After Women Gained the Right To Vote, the Majority of Americans See Work To Do on Gender Equality.* July 7, 2020. https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2020/07/07/a-century-after-women-gained-the-right-to-vote-majority-of-americans-see-work-to-do-on-gender-equality/

Elizabeth Blair. *50 years ago sex equality seemed destined for the Constitution. What happened?* March 22, 2020. https://www.npr.org/2022/03/22/1086978928/50-years-ago-sex-equality-seemed-destined-for-the-constitution-what-happened

Code

```
libname library "D:\Thuw\Math 325\project";
```

```
run;

data library.Ammendment_pj;
set library.Ammendment;
if IDEO = 99 then delete;
if eqrights1 = 99 then delete;
if gains_ord1 = 99 then delete;
if feminism1 = 99 then delete;
if ERA2 = 99 then delete;
if party= 99 then delete;
if gendisc=99 then delete;
run;

proc surveyfreq data=library.Ammendment_pj;
table Ppagecat Ppgender Ppethm IDEO eqrights1 party gendisc ERA2 ppwork describe_2;
weight weight;
Run;

proc surveyfreq data=library.Ammendment;
weight weight;
table gendisc*party /chisq cl nofreq nowt;
Run;

proc surveyfreq data=library.Ammendment;
weight weight;
table ERA2*party /chisq cl nofreq nowt;
Run;

proc surveyfreq data=library.Ammendment;
strata party; cluster ERA2;
weight weight;
table EQRIGHTS1*gendisc /chisq cl nofreq nowt;
Run;
```