Certain Views of Baton Rouge Women

Women have fought for centuries to have the right to express their views on important issues. Many women died without ever being heard, but policies started changing in the past 85 years. In the last century, there were three waves of feminism. In the first wave of feminism, women's suffrage was the main concern. In the second wave of feminism, women focused on economic equality, reproductive rights, and individual rights in the household. Today, third wave feminist are currently focused on issues like sexual harassment, objectification, domestic violence, equal pay, and the overruling of a patriarchal society. I have formulated five hypotheses focusing on topics that are important to women because of past discrimination and unpleasant lifestyles. The issues include household division of labor, career opportunities, political party identification, religious service attendance, and safety.

I used data from a telephone survey to form my five hypotheses. The survey was conducted by students in section five of Sociology 2211; Methods of Sociological Research. Every student was required to administer 12 surveys. The telephone numbers were chosen randomly from the telephone exchanges in East Baton Rouge Parish. The numbers were sometimes fax machines or disconnects. This was one of the major set backs that caused time delays. The surveys were done over a period of two weeks. The respondents were from Baton Rouge and surrounding regions including Baker, Greenwell Springs, Zachary, and Denham Springs. The sample size was 431, with 230 being female, and 201 being male. It was hard to get a diverse sample size because of the tendencies of older women to always answer the phone. For our sample to be as diverse

as possible, we asked to speak to the person in the household who was over 18, and had the last birthday.

My first hypothesis tests the relationship between "gender" and "the division of work around the household." I presume that women are more likely than men to feel that the division of work in the household is unfair to them. Women usually take on more responsibility around the house because of the social belief that women must cook, clean, and care for the children. The results of the crosstabs on hypothesis one revealed that 21.9% of women felt the division of labor in the household was unfair to them but only 6.7% of men felt this way. The column percentages differ by 15.2% so there is a relationship between the two variables. The value of gamma is -.293 and the Chi-Square is significant at .001 indicating a moderate relationship that is highly significant. The sign of gamma shows a negative correlation, which means the off diagonal of the table, is dominant. The data proved my hypothesis to be reliable. (See Appendix I).

My second hypothesis tests the relationship between "gender" and "if the respondent's thinks their gender makes their promotion opportunities better or worse." I predict that women are more likely than men to feel their gender makes their promotion opportunities worse. Today, women only make 76% of a male's salary. The results of the crosstabs on hypothesis two showed that 38.7% of women felt their being a woman made their promotion opportunities worse, while only 5.4% of men felt this way. The column percentages differ by 33.3% so there is a relationship between the two variables. The value of gamma is -.569 and Chi-Square is significant at .000 showing a very strong relationship that is highly significant. The sign of gamma shows a negative correlation. My hypothesis is confirmed by the data. (See Appendix II).

My third hypothesis tests the relationship between "gender" and "party identification." I hypothesize that women are more likely than men to identify themselves as a democrat for their political party. Women might identify more with democrats because they are tied historically to obtaining some of their fundamental rights. The crosstabs on hypothesis three revealed that 46.6% of women identified themselves as a democrat, whereas 32.1% of men did. The column percentages differ by 14.5% showing a relationship between the variables. The value of gamma is -.233 and Chi-Square is significant at .010 indicating a moderate relationship that is moderately significant. The correlation of gamma is once again negative. (See Appendix III).

My fourth hypothesis tested the relationship between "gender" and "how often the respondent attended religious services." I predict that women are more likely than men to attend religious services every week or more often. The crosstabs on hypothesis four displayed that 44.7% of women attend church every week or more often, and 38.2% of men do as well. The column percentages differ by 6.5%. The value of gamma is .128 and Chi-Square is significant at .041 suggesting a slight relationship that is only moderately significant. The correlation of gamma is positive which means the main diagonal is dominant. (See Appendix IV).

My fifth hypothesis tested the relationship between "gender" and "if the respondents were afraid to walk alone at night." I hypothesize that women are more likely than men to be afraid to walk alone at night. Statistics show that women are the victims of sexual crimes more often at night. The crosstabs on hypothesis five showed that 54.9% of women were afraid to walk alone at night, but only 33.5% of men were. The column percentages differ by 21.4%. The value of gamma is .414 and Chi-Square is

significant at .000 showing a strong relationship that is highly significant. The gamma sign shows a positive correlation. The table confirms this hypothesis. (See Appendix V).

My hypotheses were confirmed, but some of them did not have that much significance. I predicted that more women than men would feel the division of work around the house was unfair to them because in the past, that was solely their job. Today women have experienced more equality in household duties, but our patriarchal society still deems household duties as "women's work." Women experience greater social pressure to conform to this idea, and this could be why they feel it is unfair to them. Women have often been discriminated against in the workforce. They are discriminated against for the better jobs, pay, and benefits. In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII prohibits the discrimination on the basis of race, religion, national origin, and sex. Even after this act was signed, women were still discriminated against. Affirmative Action became one of the ways to settle these discrepancies, but women are still not treated equally. The Equal Pay Act was signed in 1963, when women were only making 59% of men's salaries. Even though it has been 42 years since the act was signed, women are barely averaging 76% of men's salaries. I was given this information in lectures between my sociology of law class, and women's and gender studies classes, so I figured my hypothesis would be highly significant (Pedriana). Women's history with the Democratic Party has been fairly parallel with their receiving and upholding fundamental rights. Women gained the right to vote in 1920, when the 19th amendment to the constitution was ratified. President Woodrow Wilson, a democrat, announced that he would support the amendment in January of 1918, and in June of 1919 it was approved by congress. The Equal Rights Amendment was approved by congress in 1972, and was given a seven-year deadline for states to ratify it.

The amendment only needed three more states to ratify it, but by 1978, the ratification progress had almost completely stopped. Republicans withdrew their support for the ERA, which probably offended some women. President Jimmy Carter, a democrat, issued an extension until 1982. The amendment was not ratified, but today many democrats support it. Reproductive rights are also an issue that is very important to women. The Democratic Party has put into their political platform their support for reproductive rights. These are just a couple of historical reasons why women might be a little more likely than men to identify as a democrat (Wikipedia). My hypothesis regarding women and religious service attendance did not prove to be a very strong relationship. I assumed that women would more likely than men attend church every week or more often because of the social networks tied to extra weekly services. They attended church more often, but the percentage only differed by 6.5%. My hypothesis was only moderately significant. My hypothesis considered women and the likelihood of their being more afraid than men to walk alone at night. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, two-thirds of rapes and sexual assaults occur between the hours of 6p.m. and 6a.m. Rapists usually attack women that are walking from their cars to their apartments by themselves. Many women are concerned about their safety, and walking alone at night with the many rapes that occur during the night would make women more afraid. Women are more vulnerable in this situation than men (Department of Justice). My hypothesis proved to be highly significant. The survey we did was not enough to evaluate all of women's issues. A survey that is conducted solely on women and their issues may be more appropriate. It could ask questions exclusive to women, and one would be able to analyze the views on women compared to themselves and other variables.

Pedriana, Nicholas. Sociology 4471: Sociology of Law. Lectures on April 18, 2005, April 20, 2005, and April 25, 2005.

Internet Source. The U.S. Department of Justice. http://www.usdoj.gov/

Internet Source. Wikipedia Online Encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page

Internet Source. The Wage Gap. http://www.pay-equity.org/

The Wage Gap Over Time

Year	Women's Earnings	Men's Earnings	Dollar Difference	Percent
2003	$30,724	$40,668	$9,944	75.5%
2002	$30,203	$39,429	$9,226	76.6%
2001	$29,215	$38,275	$9,060	76.3%
2000	$27,355	$37,339	$9,984	73.3%
1999	$27,208	$37,701	$10,493	72.2%
1998	$27,290	$37,296	$10,006	73.2%
1997	$26,720	$36,030	$9,310	74.2%
1996	$25,919	$35,138	$9,219	73.8%
1995	$25,260	$35,365	$10,105	71.4%
1994	$25,558	$35,513	$9,955	72.0%

1993	$25,579	$35,765	$10,186	71.5%
1992	$25,791	$36,436	$10,645	70.8%
1991	$25,457	$36,440	$10,983	69.9%
1990	$25,451	$35,538	$10,087	71.6%
1989	$25,310	$36,855	$11,545	66.0%
1988	$24,774	$37,509	$12,735	66.0%
1987	$24,663	$37,389	$12,726	65.2%
1986	$24,479	$38,088	$13,609	64.3%
1985	$23,978	$37,131	$13,153	64.6%
1984	$23,453	$36,842	$13,389	63.7%
1983	$22,961	$36,106	$13,055	63.6%
1982	$22,367	$36,224	$13,857	61.7%
1981	$21,830	$36,854	$15,024	59.2%
1980	$22,279	$37,033	$14,754	60.2%
1979	$22,446	$37,622	$15,176	59.7%
1978	$22,617	$38,051	$15,005	59.4%
1977	$21,743	$36,901	$15,158	58.9%

1976	$21,738	$36,114	$14,376	60.2%
1975	$21,297	$36,207	$14,910	58.8%
1974	$21,419	$36,456	$15,037	58.8%
1973	$21,397	$37,381	$15,984	56.6%
1972	$21,185	$36,614	$15,429	57.9%
1971	$20,691	$34,771	$14,080	59.5%
1970	$20,567	$34,642	$14,075	59.4%
1969	$20,156	$34,241	$14,085	58.9%
1968	$18,836	$32,389	$13,553	58.2%
1967	$18,241	$31,568	$13,327	57.8%
1966	$17,874	$31,055	$13,181	57.6%
1965	$17,852	$29,791	$11,939	59.9%
1964	$17,368	$29,362	$11,994	59.1%
1963	$16,908	$28,684	$11,776	58.9%
1962	$16,587	$27,972	$11,385	59.3%
1961	$16,272	$27,463	$11,191	59.2%

1960	**$16,144**	**$26,608**	**$10,464**	**60.7%**

Crosstabs

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Division of Work in Your Household (R) * Gender	232.235[a]	53.9%	198.359	46.1%	430.594	100.0%
Your Gender Improves Promotion Opps (R) * Gender	396.628[a]	92.1%	33.967	7.9%	430.594	100.0%
Party Identification (simple) * Gender	412.745[a]	95.9%	17.849	4.1%	430.594	100.0%
Attend religious services (R) * Gender	426.253[a]	99.0%	4.342	1.0%	430.594	100.0%
Afraid To Walk Alone At Night (R) * Gender	422.680[a]	98.2%	7.915	1.8%	430.594	100.0%

a. Number of valid cases is different from the total count in the crosstabulation table because the cell counts have been rounded.

Division of Work in Your Household (R) * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Division of Work in Your Household (R)	Unfair to me	Count	8	25	33
		% within Gender	6.7%	21.9%	14.2%
	Unfair to spouse	Count	12	4	16
		% within Gender	10.1%	3.5%	6.9%
	Fair to both	Count	99	85	184
		% within Gender	83.2%	74.6%	79.0%
Total		Count	119	114	233
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.722[a]	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	14.338	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.443	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	233		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.83.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.243			.001
	Cramer's V	.243			.001
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.293	.141	-1.978	.048
N of Valid Cases		233			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Your Gender Improves Promotion Opps (R) * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Your Gender Improves Promotion Opps (R)	Worse	Count	10	82	92
		% within Gender	5.4%	38.7%	23.2%
	Has no effect	Count	88	79	167
		% within Gender	47.8%	37.3%	42.2%
	Better	Count	86	51	137
		% within Gender	46.7%	24.1%	34.6%
Total		Count	184	212	396
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	64.115[a]	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	71.829	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	54.359	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	396		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 42.75.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.402			.000
	Cramer's V	.402			.000
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.569	.061	-8.101	.000
N of Valid Cases		396			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Party Identification (simple) * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Party Identification (simple)	Democrat	Count	61	104	165
		% within Gender	32.1%	46.6%	40.0%
	Independent	Count	47	46	93
		% within Gender	24.7%	20.6%	22.5%
	Republican	Count	82	73	155
		% within Gender	43.2%	32.7%	37.5%
Total		Count	190	223	413
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.161[a]	2	.010
Likelihood Ratio	9.230	2	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.231	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	413		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 42.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.149			.010
	Cramer's V	.149			.010
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.233	.078	-2.921	.003
N of Valid Cases		413			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Attend religious services (R) * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Attend religious services (R)	Less often than that	Count	26	18	44
		% within Gender	13.1%	7.9%	10.3%
	A few times per year	Count	40	34	74
		% within Gender	20.1%	14.9%	17.3%
	Once or twice a month	Count	27	48	75
		% within Gender	13.6%	21.1%	17.6%
	Almost every week	Count	30	26	56
		% within Gender	15.1%	11.4%	13.1%
	Every week (or more often)	Count	76	102	178
		% within Gender	38.2%	44.7%	41.7%
Total		Count	199	228	427
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.981[a]	4	.041
Likelihood Ratio	10.035	4	.040
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.233	1	.072
N of Valid Cases	427		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.51.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.153			.041
	Cramer's V	.153			.041
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.128	.071	1.779	.075
N of Valid Cases		427			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Afraid To Walk Alone At Night (R) * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		
			Male	Female	Total
Afraid To Walk Alone At Night (R)	No	Count	131	102	233
		% within Gender	66.5%	45.1%	55.1%
	Yes	Count	66	124	190
		% within Gender	33.5%	54.9%	44.9%
Total		Count	197	226	423
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.418[b]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[a]	18.564	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	19.620	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.372	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	423				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 88.49.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.214			.000
	Cramer's V	.214			.000
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.414	.084	4.526	.000
N of Valid Cases		423			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.