UC Irvine
CSD Working Papers

Title

A Gender Gap in Citizenship Norms? The Importance of Political, Civil and Social Rights and Responsibilities

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/71x598x2

Authors

Bolzendahl, Catherine
Coffe, Hilde

Publication Date

2008-12-02

Citizenship has always been a gendered concept.[1] Less than one hundred years ago most women did not have the right to vote in nations that were otherwise considered democratic, and even the granting of that right did not secure women's equal access to or exercise of social, political, and civil power. Today, all Western industrialized democracies guarantee women and men's formal equality as citizens, but some research suggests women are less likely to take advantage of that equality. Some findings indicate women may be less engaged citizens than men, and participate in politics less frequently, along with being less knowledgeable about and interested in the political sphere (Verba, Burns and Schlozman 1997). Yet, regardless of a potential gender gap in participation, concerns over the quality of citizenship have become widespread among Western industrialized countries more generally. Discussions often centre on perceived decreases in social and political engagement and solidarity, and simultaneous increases in social egoism. Analysts lament that citizens eagerly claim their *rights* but abhor their *duties* as citizens. However in all of these discussions, what is largely neglected are citizens' own conceptualizations. In other words, does it mean to be a 'good citizen'?

Research on norms of citizenship can provide important insights into a variety of citizenship behaviours, but in particular it may shed light on previous findings of a gender cleavage in citizenship. More generally, gender remains a fundamental social and political cleavage across all nations, and specifically, citizenship has always been a gendered concept. Indeed, even though all Western industrialized democracies guarantee women and men's formal equality as citizens, *de jure* is quite different than *de facto* when it comes to men and women's citizenship measured along a variety of dimensions (O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Lister 1995, 2003). Men and women's lives are typically quite different, with different time demands, particularly in terms of care work, access to resources and compensation for economic activity. Men and women are also socialized to behave differently and hold differing values. Finally women still face a variety of forms of discrimination that may alter their perceptions of government and society more broadly. In sum, such differences may lead to a gender cleavage in citizenship norms.

In our focus on citizenship norms we investigate opinions toward both responsibilities and rights as inherently linked to and foundational for democratic citizenship. We also distinguish the diversity of citizenship norms by including dimensions of political, civil, and social responsibilities and rights. Whereas such differences have been emphasized in theories of citizenship (Marshall 1950; Lister 2003) empirical analyses of these distinct norms presently remain underdeveloped. Further, any current research tends to be limited to one nation, and even to sub-groups within one nation (Dalton 2008b; Conover, Searing, and Crewe 2004). In this study, we examine these issues across 18 Western, industrialized democracies using data from the 2004 Citizenship module from the International Social Survey Program, thus greatly increasing the scope and generalizability of our findings. Our results show that men and women

do not differ in their emphasis on political rights and responsibilities, but that women place far greater weight on social and civil dimensions of citizenship than men, both in term of rights and duties. Thus we suggest that a narrow focus on political citizenship (e.g., voting), will potentially underestimate women's citizenship norms by failing to capture women's greater investment in civil and social rights and responsibilities.

Our paper is structured as follows. We begin by presenting the concept of citizenship and citizenship norms. As mentioned, our central question relates to gender differences with respect to citizenship norms. We briefly review theoretical insights on gender and citizenship and present our expectations based on these insights in the second section. Thereafter, our data and measurements are introduced. The analyses are presented in the following sections. We conclude with a brief summary of the results, a further discussion of our findings, and some suggestions for further research.

What is Citizenship?

Though political theorists have argued about citizenship for centuries, even today citizenship is a highly contested concept. At its most basic, citizenship entails membership in a community, the rights and obligations that flow from that membership and equality of status to other members (Marshall 1950). It is not only about the relationship between individuals and the state but also that between individual citizens within a community. Within these relationships, citizenship entails both rights and obligations, and their balance of the two is often a source of major cleavages (Lister 2003; Janoski 1998).

Responsibilities versus Rights

As a whole, *rights*-based approaches to citizenship are grounded in the liberal political tradition of equality of the individual. In particular, the right to participate in decision making in social, economic, cultural and political life is seen as basic to the lexicon of rights-based citizenship. A great deal of literature and scholarship has focused on access to rights as foundational to the meaning of citizenship in democracies. Such a preoccupation is reasonable given the many past and continuing instances where even basic rights come under threat. In his essay on citizenship rights, Marshall (1950: 10-11) notes that rights tend to expand progressively in democracies.[2] First, citizens secure civil rights which guarantee individual freedom, such as liberty of person and freedom of speech, thought and faith. Such rights often form the basis of demands for political rights which secure an individual's participation in the exercise of political power. Finally, democracies have come to recognize social rights that protect a minimum of economic welfare and security. The turn toward social rights has been challenged by neo-liberal scholars who see them as an attack on individual freedoms. Yet social rights have been shown to be important for guaranteeing the effective use of civil and political rights, including promises of autonomy (Orloff 1992; Esping-Andersen 2002; O'Connor 1993). More specifically, citizens need economic welfare and security in order to realize the full exercise of civil and political rights.

Yet citizenship also implies *duties*. This perspective emerges from more ancient notions of civic republicanism, but can be traced forward to more recent work on 'communitarianism'

(Sandel 1996). In the late twentieth century, the liberal (rights) perspective was challenged by a duty-based discourse emphasizing citizenship obligations over rights. Mead (1986) and Novak and Cogan (1987) both appeal to the common good in identifying as the prime obligation engagement in paid work by welfare recipients to support their families. Many contest an emphasis on responsibilities before rights with the argument that the right to freedom is not guaranteed where it is linked to compulsory duties. Thus there is a great deal of debate concerning the importance of citizenship obligations. While not all scholars agree, it is generally accepted that citizenship is not only passive, but also agentic, requiring the fulfilment of a variety of responsibilities (Delanty 2000: 19).

Integrating the two perspectives can lead to complex hierarchies of rights and responsibilities. For example, certain political rights (like voting) may be withheld if civil responsibilities (obeying the law) are not fulfilled (Manza and Uggen 2006). Yet such complexities highlight the utilities of disaggregating responsibilities and rights. Empirical research of Conover, Searing, and Crewe (2004) on the concept of citizenship revealed that both sides of citizenship are also present in citizens' mindset. Their focus group data from six communities in the United States and Great Britain illustrated how citizens think of citizenship in terms of both rights and duties or responsibilities. Hence, citizenship as membership of a (political) community is more than a matter of rights; it also demands an identification and commitment to the community (Faulks 2000).

Domains of citizenship: Political, Civil, Social

In addition to acknowledging differences between responsibilities and rights, the literature discussed above suggests the importance of looking at citizenship according to substantive domains. Clearly, as discussed above, Marshall's (1950) work demonstrates that rights have civil, political, and social components. This exposition of three elements has been taken as a starting point in the majority of modern theoretical accounts of citizenship, even those critiquing this description (O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Lister 1995). However, empirical work focusing on citizenship rights rarely considers all three aspects. From an explicit citizenship perspective, a great deal of work focuses on political rights – the right to vote, to participate in political organizations, and engage in a variety of forms of governance (e.g., Paxton, Kunovich and Hughes 2007; Dalton 2008b; Manza and Brooks 1998; Pintor and Gratschew 2002). In comparison, research looking at social rights is often conflated with the study of welfare state provision, rather than social citizenship, per se (Brooks and Manza 2007; Esping-Andersen 2002; O'Connor, Orloff and Shaver 1999). Further, research on civil and social rights tends to focus on a particular substantive concern and social group, such as marital rights for same-sex couples, or employment rights for minority racial groups (Haider-Markel and Joslyn 2005; Josephson 2005; Quadagno 2000). It is important to note that while previous work establishes the importance of these rights in general, it is not explicitly focusing on support as expressed by citizens. It is not clear then, that the distinctions found in previous literature will translate to public opinion. In sum, while we know little about citizenship norms in general, and we know even less about the importance of political, civil and social rights to the average citizen.

Although it has been less explicitly outlined in the literature, responsibilities to the community and the state may, like rights, be differentiated according to political, civil, and social duties. As a political obligation, citizenship means fulfilling political responsibilities, a

commitment to the common good (above individual interests), and an emphasis on the public sphere where the citizen is a political actor. For example, many nations legally require citizens to vote (Lijphart 1997), and almost all nations take steps to encourage and enable voting such as providing transportation to the polls, requiring employers to allow employees to vote, or providing absentee ballots (Bollen 1980; Lijphart 1984). Often, it is taken for granted that 'good citizens' will have a sense of civil responsibility: obeying laws of the community, paying taxes and serving in public capacities. The link to rights is clear, and for example, the right to personal safety may be tied to the duty to serve on community watches in neighbourhoods and in the military. Discourses surrounding social responsibilities are also prevalent. Increasingly in post-industrial societies, responsibilities such as caring for others and maintaining a clean and safe environment are discussed as citizenship duties. Again this reflects a related trend of emphasis on tolerating and accommodating the needs and interests of different groups (so long as it does not violate other civil or political rights) (Inglehart and Welzel 2006; Janoski 1998).

Gender and Citizenship

Previous empirical studies of citizenship that focus on political participation and engagement generally find that women have less political interest and knowledge (Kenski and Jamieson 2000; Paxton, Kunovich and Hughes 2007), with women also being less involved than men in political and social life (Schlozmann, Burns, and Verba 1999). Given this, we might expect women to be less concerned with political participation as an important dimension of citizenship, and thus place less emphasis on both political rights and responsibilities in comparison to men. Yet, we also know that women are generally more law-abiding (Steffensmeir and Allan 1996; Tyler 2006), which suggests women might be more supportive of political responsibilities than men, even if they are not participating as much as men. Thus theory and previous empirical research in this case suggests slightly competing hypotheses.

Whereas women face higher burdens of care work–due to their role as being responsible for the household and child-caring–which prevent fuller participation in 'traditional' political citizenship (Schlozman, Burns, and Verba 1994), these burdens and women's involvement in social work may lead them to place more emphasis on social aspects of citizenship, both responsibilities and rights. Previous research has found that when asked to name and prioritize important political issues women tend to focus more so on family and cultural issues, while men place higher priority on the economy or defence (Campbell 2004; Inglehart and Norris 2000; Manza and Brooks 1999). From a civil rights perspective, women are more likely than men to support policies that regulate and protect citizens, consumers and the environment (Shapiro and Mahajan 1986; Diekman, Eagly, and Kulesa 2002), and work by Inglehart and Norris (2000) claims that although women were once thought of as being more conservative than men, this is no longer the case, and women have moved to the left, especially on social and cultural issues.

The expectation that women will hold more social and civil norms is also supported by socialization research and theory, which notes that men and women are socialized into different value orientations. Rather than values of competition and aggression, women develop an 'ethic of caring,' and as such, this ethic predisposes women to think more socially and less in terms of individual gain than men (Jelen, Thomas, and Wilcox 1994; Studlar, McAllister, and Hayes 1998). In other words, the gender differences in socialization result in women being more concerned about affective processes and social relationships, while men tend to be more

4

instrumental and more individualistic. As a consequence women are more likely to reflect others' need as well as obligations to others while men seek to fulfil personal goals (Chaney, Alvarez, and Nagler 1998; Cross and Madson 1997; Studlar, McAllister, and Hayves 1998). Similarly research suggests that women are more pro-social, empathetic and altruistic (Beutel and Marini 1995), while men are more likely to support violent or forceful options across an array of social control and law enforcement situations (Smith 1984), and be more open-minded about non-conformist behaviour than women (Coffé and Geys 2007).

Data and Measurement

Based on previous theory and research, we now turn to an analysis of whether there is a gender gap in citizenship norms. We utilize data from the 2004 International Social Survey Program (ISSP) module on Citizenship. The ISSP is a cross-national collaboration of surveys, each of which is fielded by a scientific organization within the member nation, mainly as part of a larger random survey of the adult non-institutionalized population (ISSP 2007). Detailed information about the sampling procedures and any deviations are available in the study report (Scholz, Harkness, and Faaß 2008). We look at Western industrialized countries and include in our analysis 18 countries: Austria, Flanders,[3] France, Germany, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the USA, resulting in 25,263 respondents. Listwise deletion of observations with missing data on either the dependent variables or the independent variables was used (Allison 2001). The final sample size is 17,863.[4] Before turning to the analyses, in the next sections we discuss the dependent and independent variables. Coding, mean, proportions, and standard deviations of all dependent and independent variables are presented in Table I. Gender differences are noted and will be discussed more fully in the results below.

Dependent Variables: Measuring Citizenship Norms

The ISSP offers the possibility to investigate the two-dimensional structure of citizenship: responsibilities and rights.

　　Citizenship Responsibilities. With respect to responsibilities, the respondents were asked how they think a 'good citizen' should behave. The ISSP asks: 'To be a good citizen, how important is it for a person to…' From nine items in this series we create three dependent variables: political, social and civil responsibilities.[5] Theoretically responsibilities may be fulfilled according to political, civil, and social aspects (as confirmed by principal factor analysis available upon request).[6] Each item was originally scored from 1 if considered extremely unimportant to 7 if considered extremely important. The items were grouped to form additive scales, recoded with zero as the base value. First, a scale of *political responsibilities* (α=.63) assesses how important it is for good citizens to 'always vote in elections,' be 'active in social and political associations,' and 'keep a watch on the actions of government.'

Table I. Means/proportions for all variables (standard deviations in parentheses); N=17,863

	Range	Men	Women	T-Test
Dependent Variables				
Political responsibilities	0-18	12.559 (3.564)	12.687 (3.544)	*
Civil responsibilities	0-12	9.647 (2.484)	10.341 (2.084)	***
Social responsibilities	0-24	16.588 (4.541)	17.697 (4.322)	***
Political rights	0-12	10.335 (1.987)	10.662 (1.768)	***
Social and civil rights	0-18	15.908 (2.673)	16.357 (2.351)	***
Independent Variables				
Education (*ref*: less than degree)				
University degree	0/1	.192 (.394)	.178 (.382)	*
Age	15-95	47.796 (16.34)	46.367 (16.168)	***
Employment status (*ref*: not in lf.)				
Full time employment	0/1	.623 (.485)	.381 (.486)	***
Part-time employment	0/1	.054 (.226)	.193 (.395)	***
Spouse employment (*ref*: not in lf, no spouse)				
Full time employment	0/1	.261 (.439)	.457 (.498)	***
Part-time employment	0/1	.151 (.358)	.027 (.162)	***
Occupation (*ref*: not in lf./no occupation)				
Managers and professionals	0/1	.297 (.457)	.225 (.418)	***
Technicians and associate professionals	0/1	.143 (.350)	.161 (.368)	***
Clerks and service workers	0/1	.120 (.325)	.334 (.472)	***
Skilled agriculture and craft workers	0/1	.318 (.466)	.085 (.278)	***
Elementary occupations	0/1	.062 (.241)	.071 (.257)	*
Marital status (*ref*: never married)				
Married, living together or widowed	0/1	.676 (.468)	.672 (.469)	n.s.
Divorced or separated	0/1	.075 (.264)	.107 (.309)	***
Household composition (*ref*: adult HH)				
With children	0/1	.323 (.432)	.364 (.481)	***
Place of residence (*ref*: rural)				
Urban	0/1	.262 (.440)	.273 (.445)	n.s.
Religious denomination (*ref*: no affil.)				
Roman Catholic	0/1	.364 (.481)	.396 (.489)	***
Protestant	0/1	.323 (.468)	.353 (.478)	***
Other religion	0/1	.054 (.226)	.062 (.240)	*
Religious attendance	0-7	2.055 (2.156)	2.539 (2.245)	***
Political trust/efficacy	0-16	7.066 (3.376)	6.860 (3.276)	***
Social trust	0-3	1.532 (.688)	1.506 (.683)	*

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001; *Source*: International Social Survey Program, 2004

Second, support for *civil responsibilities* (α=.70) is the importance that one 'never try to evade taxes' and 'always obey laws', Third, *social responsibilities* (α=.73) measures how important it is for good citizens to 'try to understand the reasoning of people with other opinions,' 'choose products for political, ethical or environmental reasons,' 'help people in your country who are worse off than yourself,' and 'help people in the world who are worse off than yourself.'

  Citizenship Rights. Whereas previous research on citizenship norms was often limited to the questions on good citizenship and thus to citizenship duties (Dalton 2008b; Denters, Gabriel, and Torcal 2007), we also examine beliefs about what *rights* people should receive. From the ISSP we take five items which ask the respondents how important they consider a particular right.[7] The items range from 1 if considered extremely unimportant to 7 if considered extremely important. It was possible to create two additive scales from these items. A scale of *political rights* (α=.67) asks about the importance that 'politicians take into account the views of citizens before making decisions' and that 'people be given more opportunities to participate in public decision making'. Second we create an additive scale of support for *civil and social rights*.[8] The scale (α=.72) combines three items: how important it is that 'all citizens have an adequate standard of living,' that 'government authorities respect and protect the rights of minorities,' and that 'government authorities treat everybody equally regardless of their position in society'. As with the responsibility scales, both rights scales were recoded so that zero is the basis value. An appendix of a Pearson correlation matrix of all items is available upon request.

Independent Variables: Demographic and Attitudinal Items

The main focus in this article, *gender*, is measured as a dichotomous variable, with men coded as 0 and 1 for female respondents. Further, since women and men typically have differing life course patterns and responsibilities, we control for a variety of socio-economic characteristics that may explain the bulk of any gender differences in citizenship norms. *Education* represents both individual socio-economic resources, e.g. labour market power, and socialization into a variety of social and political norms (Manza and Brooks 1999; Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Schlozman, Burns, and Verba 1994). It is measured as a dichotomous variable indicating whether the individual has attained a university degree.[9] *Age* is a continuous control variable.[10] We know age increases voting (with diminishing returns), thus it may also increase the salience of citizenship norms as suggested by related research (Dalton 2006). We also introduced a squared value for age to control for non-linearities in the effect as a life-course control.

  Previous research has indicated employment and occupational status influence political participation, and may account for gender differences in levels of political participation so it may also account for gender differences in citizenship norms (Beckwith 1986; Manza and Brooks 1998; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). *Employment status* represents three categories: full time employment, part-time employment and not employed. The latter category includes amongst others unemployed people, care workers, students, retired people, and disabled people. Some work has suggested that flexibility in work hours increases the amount of leisure time available to individuals and thus for participation (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995; Schlozman, Burns, and Verba 1999). This is of particular concern for women whose dual roles in the waged and non-waged labour forces leave little room for flexibility (Smith, 1997). Next to the respondents' employment, we also introduce the *spouse's employment*, coding similarly to

respondent's employment status. *Occupation* has been operationalized on the basis of the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupation (ISCO) and distinguishes 6 groups: (1) managers and professionals, (2) technicians and associate professionals, (3) clerks, service workers, shop and market sales workers, and armed forces, (4) skilled agriculture workers, craft workers, and plant and machine operators and assemblers, (5) elementary occupations, and (6) no occupation.[11]

    Marital status is coded into three categories: (1) respondents who are married, are living together as married or who are widowed, (2) respondents who are divorced or separated, and (3) respondents who are single and have never been married. We know that marriage increases time spent in formal community organizations and neighbourhood, and fosters political activity (Hooghe 2003; Putnam 2000; Verba, Burns, and Schlozman 1997). The *household composition* is a dichotomous variable distinguishing households with children from other household compositions.[12] Having children may change the way one views citizenship, and some work suggests people with children tend to have more social attitudes, such as being more tolerant towards immigrants, than people without children (Coffé and Geys 2007). The *place of residence* is self-assessed as either rural (0) or urban (1) residence. Membership in different denominations and religiosity may convey particular messages about appropriate behaviour as citizens, and particular gender role beliefs (Bolzendahl and Brooks 2005; Evans 1997; Heath, Taylor and Toka 1995). Thus we control for *religious denomination* according to four categories: no religious denomination, Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Other religion. *Religious attendance* is a continuous variable ranging from (0) never to (7) several time a week. There has been consistent evidence of a positive relationship between religious faiths and political and social involvement (e.g. Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Putnam 2000).

    In additional to demographic variables, we also introduce two attitudinal variables: political trust and efficacy, and social trust. As such, we control for both vertical trust and horizontal trust, referring, respectively to trust toward government and the institutions of the state and to trust that is shared among people.[13] Gender disparities in the importance of citizenship norms may reflect gender differences in social and political trust more generally (Norris 1999;Abramson 1983; Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2000; Rosenthal 1995). Since women often report feeling less politically efficacious, this may explain any gaps in norms (Abramson 1983; Banducci, Donovan, and Karp 1999; Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2000). Bennett and Bennett (1989) also show that political dispositions such as the perception that government is attentive to public opinion and belief that it is responsive to the people are important predictors for gender.

    Our indicator of *political trust/efficacy* is an additive scale including agreement that 'most of the time we can trust people in government to do what is right,' disagreement that 'most politicians are in politics only for what they can get out of it personally,' 'people like me don't have any say about what the government does,' and 'I don't think the government cares much what people like me think', Individual items were assessed on Likert-type scales ranging from 1 to 5, though the scale was recoded to being at zero and items were coded such that higher scores represent more political trust and efficacy (α=.70). One question is used to measure *social trust*: 'Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?' The possible answers range from (1) 'People can almost always be trusted' to (4) 'You almost always can't be too careful in dealing with people.'[14] All answers have been reversed so that higher values refer to more trust, and recoded to start at zero.

Finally, we control for context, broadly defined, by including the country dummy variables. A gender gap in citizenship norms may be shaped by contextual factors beyond the scope of this analyses, thus it is important to account for possible macro influences such as the type of welfare state, since they may influence citizenship norms (Lister et al. 2007).

Analytical Strategy

In the analyses below we examine gender differences in the importance of political, civil and social responsibilities and rights. Each dependent variable is analysed using OLS regression. There are three models for each set of citizenship norms: a base model containing gender and demographic and social controls, a model examining gender interactions, and finally a model including attitudinal variables. Interactions that were not significant (at $p<.05$ level) are dropped from the model in the interests of theoretical and methodological parsimony, though including all interactions does not significantly change the results. Interactions were tested based on evidence from separate models for men and women (not presented here). Since they were tested for the different rights and responsibilities separately, the interaction effects included in the models differ for the different types of responsibilities and rights, again underlining the need to distinguish between domains of citizenship norms. All models control for country through the inclusion of a country dummy-variable.[15]

Descriptive Statistics: Gender Differences in Means

In addition to describing levels of our dependent and independent variables, Table I is a useful first step in understanding potential gender differences. We find significant differences between men and women for all citizenship norms, with women scoring significantly higher than men. This effect is weakest regarding political responsibilities, suggesting it is social and civil responsibilities and rights items where women are most different from men on average. This supports our expectation that women would hold high levels of social and civil norms, rather than political norms, and may reflect women's lower level of political involvement and interest found in other research (Schlozman, Burns, and Verba 1994; Bennett and Bennett 1989).

Across nearly all the demographic controls men and women are significantly different. Differences are in accordance with previous literature, and thus will not be elaborated here. Notably, as gender and feminist scholars would suggest, women have fewer economic resources (education, employment and occupation), but greater potential burdens on resources (being divorced/separated, living with children). Turning to the attitudinal control variables, we also observe distinct differences between men and women. Women feel less politically efficacious and have substantially less trust in government and politicians than men do. They also show less trust in other people than men.

Table II. OLS regression analyses of political citizenship responsibilities in 18 Western industrialized democracies (standard errors in parentheses), N=17,863

	Political Responsibilities					
	Base		*Interactions*		*Attitudes*	
Gender						
Female	-.041	(.057)	-.067	(.093)	-.040	(.092)
Gender Interactions						
Female*Professional			.509**	(.129)	.481**	(.127)
Female*Degree			.283+	(.142)	.272	(.141)
Female*Sp. Emp. F-T			-.219+	(.109)	-.210	(.108)
Female*Sp. Emp. P-T						
Female*Church Attend.			-.046+	(.023)	-.036	(.022)
Political/Social Attitudes						
Political Trust/Efficacy					.149*	(.008)
Female*Trust/Efficacy						
Social Trust					.031	(.038)
Controls						
University Degree	.255*	(.074)	.107	(.101)	-.033	(.100)
Age	.085**	(.010)	.085*	(.010)	.089**	(.010)
Age-squared	-.000**	(.000)	-.000*	(.000)	-.001**	(.000)
Married/Widowed	-.045	(.084)	-.017	(.084)	-.019	(.084)
Divorced/Separated	-.220+	(.109)	-.207	(.109)	-.186	(.108)
Employed Full-time	-.037	(.071)	-.055	(.071)	-.095	(.070)
Employed Part-time	.144	(.092)	.139	(.092)	.091	(.091)
Spouse Employed F-T	.069	(.067)	.197+	(.091)	.166	(.090)
Spouse Employed P-T	-.089	(.101)	-.049	(.101)	-.065	(.100)
Church Attendance	.165**	(.014)	.191**	(.018)	.165*	(.018)
Catholic	.060	(.081)	.053	(.081)	.035	(.080)
Protestant	.199+	(.080)	.192+	(.080)	.145	(.079)
Other religion	.155	(.122)	.137	(.122)	.150	(.121)
Professional	.026	(.114)	-.244	(.130)	-.287+	(.129)
Technical	-.038	(.117)	-.077	(.118)	-.094	(.116)
Service	-.198	(.109)	-.193	(.109)	-.142	(.108)
Skilled Agric./Craft	-.508**	(.113)	-.604**	(.115)	-.480**	(.114)
Low Skill	-.546**	(.135)	-.580**	(.135)	-.435*	(.134)
Urban Residence	.052	(.062)	.049	(.062)	.019	(.061)
Children in HH	-.090	(.061)	-.083	(.061)	-.084	(.060)
Constant	1.749 (.241)		1.782 (.243)		9.666 (.251)	
R-squared	.142		.144		.160	

+ p<.05 * p<.01 ** p<.001; Source: International Social Survey Program, 2004

Citizenship Responsibilities

Having illustrated the descriptive statistics of the variables included in our models and having shown the relevant gender differences, we now turn to our multivariate analyses. We will start with a description of the citizenship responsibilities, and turn to the citizenship rights thereafter.
Political Responsibilities

The first dependent variable is a scale of the importance of political responsibilities, such as voting, participating in political organizations, and watching the government. The results are presented in Table II.

The descriptive statistics suggest women are somewhat more likely than men to believe that fulfilling political responsibilities is an important part of being a good citizen. However, this effect disappears with the introduction of demographic controls, indicating that gender differences were simply due to differences in social and economic attributes. Moving onto the second model that includes gender interaction terms, we find evidence that demographic characteristics matter differently for men and women in shaping their views on political. In general, female professionals are more likely to support political responsibilities, but not professionals in general. The significant positive main effect of having a university degree from the first model is now shown to be mainly due to the impact this has on women's norms rather than men's. However having a spouse who is employed full-time and attending church regularly matters more for men than women in increasing the importance of political responsibilities. Finally, we looked in the third model to see if attitudes toward political responsibilities were simply reflections of political efficacy and trust or social trust. Indeed, those who feel more politically efficacious and trusting are more supportive, but this does not vary by gender, and higher levels of social trust do not appear to matter.

Civil Responsibilities

The next set of responsibilities considered is the importance of paying taxes and obeying the law as part of being a good citizen, referring to civil responsibilities. These results are in Table III. All models show that women find these responsibilities to be significantly more important than men. The gender gap found in means remains even after controlling for socio-demographic variables and attitudes. Few of the significant effects of socio-demographic variables that were found in the first model seem to matter differently for men and women. In the interactive model, having an employed spouse tends to decrease a respondent's support for civic responsibilities, though more so for men than for women. This effect may represent the lingering 'non-traditional' nature of women's employment in its effect on their partners (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004). Church attendance has more positive influence on men than women, though as the descriptive analysis (presented in Table I) showed, women attend church more regularly than men on average. The final model for civil responsibilities suggests that higher levels of political trust and efficacy matter positively in determining the perceived importance of civil responsibilities and that this is different for men and women. The gender interaction suggests that women who feel more politically trusting/efficacious are more likely to question the importance if civil responsibilities in comparison to similar men. Yet, the interaction term does not mediate the main effect of gender.

Table III. OLS regression analyses of civil citizenship responsibilities in 18 Western industrialized democracies (standard errors in parentheses), N=17,863

	Civil Responsibilities		
	Base	*Interactions*	*Attitudes*
Gender			
Female	.552** (.037)	.604** (.057)	.779** (.087)
Gender Interactions			
Female*Professional			
Female*Degree			
Female*Sp. Emp. F-T		.168+ (.071)	.182+ (.071)
Female*Sp. Emp. P-T			
Female*Church Attend.		-.048* (.015)	-.042* (.015)
Political/Social Attitudes			
Political Trust/Efficacy			.072** (.007)
Female*Trust/Efficacy			-.025* (.010)
Social Trust			-.031 (.025)
Controls			
University Degree	-.116+ (.048)	-.121+ (.048)	-.172* (.049)
Age	.016+ (.007)	.017+ (.007)	.018* (.007)
Age-squared	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)
Married/Widowed	.324** (.055)	.312** (.055)	.308** (.055)
Divorced/Separated	.036 (.071)	.036 (.071)	.041 (.071)
Employed Full-time	-.016 (.046)	-.007 (.046)	-.022 (.046)
Employed Part-time	-.080 (.061)	-.085 (.061)	-.100 (.060)
Spouse Employed F-T	-.066 (.044)	-.157* (.059)	-.172* (.059)
Spouse Employed P-T	-.283** (.066)	-.295** (.066)	-.302** (.066)
Church Attendance	.079** (.009)	.104** (.012)	.093** (.012)
Catholic	.220** (.053)	.210** (.053)	.198** (.053)
Protestant	.418** (.052)	.412** (.052)	.391** (.052)
Other religion	.278** (.080)	.267* (.080)	.271* (.080)
Professional	.045 (.075)	.029 (.075)	.013 (.074)
Technical	.136 (.077)	.116 (.077)	.116 (.077)
Service	.228* (.072)	.208* (.072)	.229* (.072)
Skilled Agric./Craft	.088 (.074)	.069 (.074)	.124 (.074)
Low Skill	.060 (.089)	.040 (.089)	.093 (.089)
Urban Residence	-.023 (.041)	-.024 (.041)	-.036 (.040)
Children in HH	.027 (.040)	.024 (.040)	.023 (.040)
Constant	9.045 (.158)	9.024 (.159)	8.561 (.168)
R-squared	.132	.133	.139

+ p<.05 * p<.01 ** p<.001; Source: International Social Survey Program, 2004

Table IV. OLS regression analyses of social citizenship responsibilities in 18 Western industrialized democracies (standard errors in parentheses), N=17,863

	Social Responsibilities		
	Base	*Interactions*	*Attitudes*
Gender			
Female	.835** (.073)	.887** (.108)	.927** (.107)
Gender Interactions			
Female*Professional		.534** (.149)	.476* (.148)
Female*Degree			
Female*Sp. Emp. F-T			
Female*Sp. Emp. P-T		.709+ (.302)	.723+ (.299)
Female*Church Attend.		-.106** (.029)	-.090* (.029)
Political/Social Attitudes			
Political Trust/Efficacy			.138** (.010)
Female*Trust/Efficacy			
Social Trust			.485** (.049)
Controls			
University Degree	.668** (.094)	.650** (.094)	.447** (.094)
Age	.026+ (.013)	.028+ (.013)	.031+ (.013)
Age-squared	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)
Married/Widowed	-.258+ (.107)	-.255+ (.107)	-.251+ (.106)
Divorced/Separated	-.112 (.138)	-.103 (.138)	-.055 (.137)
Employed Full-time	-.275* (.090)	-.271* (.090)	-.331** (.089)
Employed Part-time	.175 (.118)	.153 (.118)	.068 (.117)
Spouse Employed F-T	.050 (.086)	.061 (.086)	.014 (.085)
Spouse Employed P-T	-.075 (.128)	-.179 (.139)	-.215 (.138)
Church Attendance	.213** (.017)	.271** (.023)	.240** (.023)
Catholic	-.347* (.103)	-.362** (.103)	-.353* (.102)
Protestant	-.200+ (.102)	-.212+ (.102)	-.254+ (.101)
Other religion	.424* (.155)	.394+ (.155)	.434* (.154)
Professional	.310+ (.145)	.009 (.163)	-.034 (.162)
Technical	.144 (.150)	.081 (.150)	.057 (.148)
Service	-.078 (.139)	-.103 (.139)	-.025 (.138)
Skilled Agric./Craft	-.398* (.144)	-.504* (.146)	-.319+ (.145)
Low Skill	-.691* (.172)	-.745** (.172)	-.513* (.171)
Urban Residence	.166+ (.079)	.162+ (.079)	.121 (.078)
Children in HH	-.134 (.078)	-.120 (.078)	-.120 (.077)
Constant	15.780 (.307)	15.764 (.309)	14.089 (.319)
R-squared	.118	.119	.136

+ p<.05 * p<.01 ** p<.001; Source: International Social Survey Program, 2004

Social Responsibilities

With respect to our third type of responsibilities, women in every model are more likely than men, on average, to support responsibilities. Women, in other words, have a stronger belief that good citizens should help others in and outside the country, should shop in a politically, ethically and/or environmentally responsible way, and should try to understand people with opinions differing from their own. So again, even after controlling for socio-demographic influences, women tend to be more civic-minded than men.

In general, the model explaining social responsibilities is more similar to the model investigating political responsibilities than civil responsibilities. Whereas the civil responsibilities include more duty-related, authoritarian items, the political and social responsibilities emphasize more of an engaged and self-expressive type of citizenship (Dalton 2008b). This may explain why people with lower skilled jobs, married and divorced people, are less inclined to support political and social responsibilities than people with no education and single people, whereas people holding a university degree are more supportive of political and social responsibilities than people without a university degree.

Interactions with gender show that professional occupations matter more in increasing women's support of social responsibilities than professional men's. Women with spouses employed part-time are also more supportive than men with part-time employed spouses. There may be a link between the non-normative status of men's part-time employment and greater support for these more 'liberal' citizenship norms. Church attendance again matters more for men than women in increasing support of social responsibilities. Turning to the final model that includes political and social attitudes, we find that greater feelings of political trust and efficacy have a significant positive relationship with support for social responsibilities. Whereas trust in other people did not matter for political and civil responsibilities, it has a significant and positive influence on social responsibilities. The effects of the attitudes do not differ significantly by gender.

In sum, after controlling for socio-demographic variables and relevant attitudes, men and women have similar levels of support for political responsibilities. Yet, women place significantly greater emphasis on the importance of civil and social responsibilities. In fact, the gender difference increases significantly for social responsibilities (*p*=.005) after controlling for socio-demographic variables and attitudes, in comparison to the base model. A variety of demographic indicators also matter differently for women than for men. With respect to the influence of attitudes, we find that feelings of greater political efficacy and trust are strongly positively associated with support for political, civil and social responsibilities. Yet, the effect of political trust on civil responsibilities is lower for women than for men. Trust in others is only significantly positively related to social responsibilities. Vertical trust seems to provide a better explanation of citizenship responsibilities norms than horizontal or social trust. As suggested by Dekker, Koopmans, and van den Broek (1997), it seems that people do not base their norms of democratic citizenship on the basis of whether they believe people can be trusted; instead, people seem to need to trust their (political) institutions in order to hold participatory citizenship norms.

Table V. OLS regression analyses of political citizenship rights in 18 Western industrialized democracies (standard errors in parentheses), N=17,863

	Political Rights		
	Base	*Interactions*	*Attitudes*
Gender			
Female	.332** (.032)	.232** (.037)	.058 (.067)
Gender Interactions			
Female*Professional		.340** (.065)	.325** (.066)
Female*Church Attend.			
Political/Social Attitudes			
Political Trust/Efficacy			-.089** (.006)
Female*Trust/Efficacy			.022* (.008)
Social Trust			.018 (.021)
Controls			
University Degree	-.210** (.041)	-.215** (.041)	-.143* (.041)
Age	.020** (.006)	.020** (.006)	.018* (.006)
Age-squared	-.000* (.000)	-.000* (.000)	-.000* (.000)
Married/Widowed	.024 (.047)	.035 (.047)	.038 (.047)
Divorced/Separated	.065 (.061)	.075 (.061)	.067 (.060)
Employed Full-time	-.023 (.040)	-.026 (.040)	-.005 (.039)
Employed Part-time	.012 (.052)	.008 (.052)	.030 (.051)
Spouse Employed F-T	-.067 (.038)	-.065 (.038)	-.054 (.037)
Spouse Employed P-T	-.120+ (.056)	-.109 (.056)	-.102 (.056)
Church Attendance	-.025* (.008)	-.024* (.008)	-.014 (.008)
Catholic	.052 (.045)	.053 (.045)	.067 (.045)
Protestant	.003 (.045)	.002 (.045)	.029 (.044)
Other religion	.115 (.068)	.112 (.068)	.108 (.067)
Professional	-.083 (.064)	-.253** (.072)	-.220* (.071)
Technical	.018 (.066)	.003 (.066)	.009 (.065)
Service	.095 (.061)	.102 (.061)	.075 (.061)
Skilled Agric./Craft	.184* (.063)	.136+ (.064)	.070 (.064)
Low Skill	.140 (.076)	.125 (.076)	.056 (.075)
Urban Residence	-.087+ (.035)	-.087+ (.035)	-.072+ (.034)
Children in Household	.024 (.034)	.026 (.034)	.027 (.034)
Constant	1.092 (.135)	1.148 (.135)	1.758 (.142)
R-squared	.047	.049	.065

+ p<.05 * p<.01 ** p<.001; Source: International Social Survey Program, 2004

<center>**Citizenship Rights**</center>

As mentioned earlier, citizenship rights are inherently linked to responsibilities in democracies. The comparison of means (presented in Table I) demonstrated that women and men differ significantly with respect to their ideas about what rights citizens should get, women being more supportive of both political, and civil and social rights. In the following section, we investigate whether these differences hold after controlling for socio-demographic variables and attitudes.

Political Rights

The first models in Table V speak to support for political rights, or agreement that the government should give more weight to citizen views and increase opportunities for participation. A base demographic model shows that women are more supportive than men of these rights. Moving onto a model with interaction effects, women are still more supportive of political rights than men, and while having a professional occupation is significantly negatively related to support for increased political rights, this is less so for women than for men. The last model includes the impact of political trust and efficacy and of social trust. After controlling for these attitudes, the gender difference with respect to support of political rights disappears. Men and women's differing level of political trust and efficacy is significant and mediates the significant effect of gender. In other words, women only appear more supportive of increased political rights because they feel less politically empowered. While social trust has no effect, political trust and efficacy are negatively related to political rights. It seems that those who feel politically powerful consider political rights less important than the less politically empowered, and thus citizens who are satisfied with their political rights may consider them as less salient (van Deth 2000).

Civil and Social Rights

In turning to support for civil and social rights in Table VI, measured as desire for an equitable standard of living and support for government protection for minority and varying status group rights, we see again that women are more supportive than men across all models. Gender interactions show some additional effects that were masked in the base model. The main effect of being in a professional occupation is negative but this is much less so for female professionals. Church attendance tends to increase support for these norms, but more so for men than women. Turning to the impact of political and social attitudes, political trust and efficacy matters significantly, but in contrast to support for political rights, social trust also has a positive significant effect. These relationships between attitudes and social and civil rights do not vary by gender. Since social trust was not significantly related to political responsibilities either, we may conclude that social trust does not significantly influence norms of political citizenship.

<center>16</center>

Table VI. OLS regression analyses of citizenship rights in 18 Western industrialized democracies (standard errors in parentheses), N=17,863

	Civil and Social Rights		
	Base	*Interactions*	*Attitudes*
Gender			
Female	.375** (.043)	.357** (.063)	.366** (.063)
Gender Interactions			
Female*Professional		.431** (.087)	.416** (.087)
Female*Church Attend.		-.048* (.017)	-.045* (.017)
Political/Social Attitudes			
Political Trust/Efficacy			.014+ (.006)
Female*Trust/Efficacy			
Social Trust			.197** (.029)
Controls			
University Degree	.098 (.055)	.088 (.055)	.046 (.055)
Age	.044** (.007)	.045** (.007)	.045* (.007)
Age-squared	-.000** (.000)	-.000** (.000)	-.000* (.000)
Married/Widowed	-.087 (.063)	-.079 (.063)	-.077 (.063)
Divorced/Separated	.041 (.081)	.051 (.081)	.065 (.081)
Employed Full-time	-.198** (.053)	-.201* (.053)	-.215** (.053)
Employed Part-time	-.047 (.069)	-.054 (.069)	-.076 (.069)
Spouse Employed F-T	-.054 (.050)	-.050 (.050)	-.062 (.050)
Spouse Employed P-T	-.140 (.075)	-.125 (.075)	-.135 (.075)
Church Attendance	.006 (.010)	.032+ (.014)	.027+ (.014)
Catholic	-.059 (.060)	-.067 (.060)	-.058 (.060)
Protestant	-.058 (.059)	-.064 (.059)	-.068 (.059)
Other religion	.323** (.091)	.309* (.091)	.322** (.090)
Professional	.022 (.085)	-.207+ (.095)	-.213+ (.095)
Technical	.061 (.087)	.028 (.088)	.023 (.087)
Service	.147 (.081)	.141 (.081)	.158 (.081)
Skilled Agric./Craft	.044 (.084)	-.029 (.085)	.012 (.085)
Low Skill	.056 (.101)	.024 (.101)	.079 (.101)
Urban Residence	.001 (.046)	-.002 (.046)	-.011 (.046)
Children in Household	-.019 (.045)	-.016 (.045)	-.016 (.045)
Constant	14.748 (.179)	14.772 (.181)	14.396 (.188)
R-squared	.058	.060	.063

+ p<.05 * p<.01 ** p<.001; Source: International Social Survey Program, 2004

Overall, the analyses of support for political rights present different pictures than those of support for civil and social rights. Political rights initially appear to be differentiated by gender, but are more consistently affected by education, occupation, and age. Ultimately the gender explanation falls to the side once differences in men and women's political trust and efficacy are considered. For civil and social rights support, the gender difference is robust. While some demographic characteristics matter independently and according to gender, they cannot explain the gender cleavage in support. Further, feelings of political empowerment and social trust exert an independent affect, but again cannot account for differences between women and men in levels of support.

Conclusion: A Gender Gap in Citizenship?

We began this research with the question 'do men and women define citizenship differently?' The answer seems to be yes…and no. In comparing mean levels of support for all citizenship norms, women placed more emphasis on political, social and civil responsibilities and rights than men. Controlling for the influence of a variety of socio-economic and relevant attitudinal dimensions, the results change in important ways. For the most commonly discussed aspects of citizenship–political responsibilities and rights–there does not appear to be a gender difference. In conflict with our expectations based on women's lower political involvement, initial tests of mean differences suggested that women were more supportive of *political responsibilities* than men, but further (multivariate) tests revealed this was due to gender-based socio-economic differences. After controlling for these attributes, men are as likely as women to believe duties such as voting in elections and participating in political organizations are as important. The gender difference with respect to *political rights* can be ascribed to women's lower levels of political trust and self-perceived efficacy. Were women to have the same (higher) levels of political trust and efficacy as men, they would not be any different in their support for political rights. Yet the entire gender gap cannot be so easily dismissed. In comparison to these political norms, gender differences in *civil and social norms* (both rights and responsibilities) remain robust, even controlling for potentially confounding preferences and attitudes. Women, it appears, place more emphasis on civil and social aspects of citizenship than men do, on average. Finally, we should emphasize that the study is not limited to one nation, but rather considers opinions and characteristics across the 18 Western industrialized democracies. All results hold even controlling for nation-specific affects.

These findings underline the need to differentiate between different dimensions of citizenship. In line with our expectations based on socialization and gender role theories, women place more emphasis on civil and social rights and responsibilities. These conclusions also highlight the need to pay more attention to conceptions of citizenship outside the traditional political sphere, as feminist scholars (e.g. Lister 2003; O'Connor 1993) have long argued. Indeed our findings show that it is important to encompass a multitude of citizenship norms, and provide a basis for greater connections between political theories on citizenship and previous empirical research on civil society and civil behaviour. Whereas the first tradition focuses on the development of a (normative) theory of citizenship, the latter concentrates primarily on citizens' behaviour in the public and political sphere, but work at their intersection has lagged. Here we borrow both from citizenship theory and prior empirical research.

An important next step for future work is now looking more specifically at linkages between citizenship norms to their behaviour in each of these three domains. Doing so may

enable a better understanding of why women are more supportive of political duties (based on our findings), yet participate less in political life. One potential explanation is that women's socialization into norms of public obedience (law and order) work to increase support for civic duties, but these attitudes discourage them at the same time from being more actively involved in politics (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996). Research linking citizenship norms to citizenship behaviour could also show how (and whether) women are translating their higher civil and social norms into civil and social behavior. Previous research can confirm that women are more law-abiding and risk averse (Beutel and Marini 1995; Steffensmeier and Allan 1996), but such findings have not been linked to citizenship per se. Doing so may be one way to better understand such attitude/behaviour connections.

Finally, our findings of gender patterns in citizenship norms hold regardless of country characteristics, yet citizenship norms occur almost by definition in a national context. The meaning of responsibilities and rights may be strongly influenced by a variety of national-level characteristics. In particular, welfare state regimes – which are associated with social rights and solidarity as well as civil obligations – may influence citizenship rights and duties (O'Connor 1993; O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Janoski 1998). As such, future comparative research should also investigate in greater detail the influence of contextual factors.

[2] As many analysts have noted, this developmental sequence best describes Western democracies and is less applicable outside that realm, however, since our sample is comprised entirely of such nations, the distinctions remain useful.

[3] The ISSP only includes data for the Belgian Dutch-speaking region Flanders.

[4] Of the full sample, approximately 29% was lost to missing values. There were 15.5% (3,926) missing on the dependent variables and the remaining 13.5% (3,474) were missing on explanatory and control variables. Missing values were distributed randomly and did not heavily alter the distribution of observations between nations. Missing values were highest in Finland, France and Canada at approximately 40%.

[5] The survey also includes the item 'Be willing to serve in the military at a time of need'. Given the high number of missing respondents, we did not include this item in our analysis.

[6] While an empirical distinction between civil and social responsibilities is less pronounced, we stress the theoretical goals of the analysis and have disaggregated these into the two dimensions.

[7] Given the high number of missing respondents on the item 'citizens may engage in acts of civil disobedience when they oppose government action', this item was not included in our analysis.

[8] As with the responsibilities, it would theoretically have been interesting to distinguish civil, social and political responsibilities. Yet, this would have left only one variable (provision of an adequate standard of living) to assess social rights. Further, in comparison to the responsibility items, it is less clear for the items which refer to civil and which to social rights. This was confirmed by empirical evidence through a principle factor analysis which revealed a two facto solution assessing political versus civil and social rights (available upon request).

[9] Previous research indeed revealed that most of the variation in educational attainment arises between high school completion and decisions to enter postsecondary education (Kam and Palmer, 2008). Additionally more nuanced

measures of education are difficult to construct in comparing samples with such a wide variety of nations in which educational systems very widely.

[10] Two nations, the Netherlands and Finland, set the minimum age at 15, but only 30 respondents fall in this age range and it does not affect the results so we have left them in.

[11] Due to a vary large number of missing values on income, it was not possible to include this measure, however, occupation may be a more useful concept overall given that it taps into differential earnings groups, and latent aspects of social class (Abbott 1993).

[12] A more nuanced measure of household composition was also measured which divided household according to single adult with children households, all adult households, and two or more adults and one or more children households. None were significant, thus a more parsimonious measure was chosen.

[13] In this regard, we agree with Letki and Evans (2005) that distrust of state structures should not be mistaken for distrust of fellow citizens.Note that the explanation of citizenship norms by political or social *trust* may face problems of *reverse causality*, however we are more concerned with whether a relationship between the sets of attitudes and how this may explain gender differences, rather than assuming a causal ordering.

[14] The ISSP 2004 survey also includes the question 'How often do you think that people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, and how often would they try to be fair?' with four response categories. The correlation between these items referring to social trust is relatively low–as has also been noted by Reeskens and Hooghe (2008) ($r=.35$, $\alpha =.51$). Hence, we decided to introduce only one item to measure social trust.

[15] The inclusion of country dummy variables is similar to creating a fixed-effects model in multi-level analyses, and controls for differences which are not independent within nations. However, we also examined models using robust standard errors clustered within nation and the results were consistent with those we present here, though slightly more conservative as would be expected. The main difference was in regard to interaction effects, which sometimes shifted to p-values in the range of .06 to .08.

References

Abbott, A. 1993 'The Sociology of Work and Occupations', *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 187-209.

Abramson, P. R. 1983 *Political Attitudes in America*, San Francisco, CA: Freeman and Co.

Allison, P. 2001 *Missing Data*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Banducci, S.A., Donovan, T., and Karp, J.F. 1999 'Minority Representation, Empowerment and Participation', *Journal of Politics* 66: 534–56

Beckwith, K. 1986 *American Women and Political Participation: The Impacts of Work, Generation, and Feminism*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Bennett, L.L.M. and Bennett, S.E. 1989 'Enduring Gender Differences in Political Interest. The Impact of Socialization and Political Dispositions', *American Politics Quarterly* 17(1): 105-122.

Beutel, A.M. and Marini, M.M. 1995 'Gender and values', *American Sociological Review* 60: 436-448.

Bollen, K.A. 1980. 'Issues in the Comparative Measurement of Political Democracy', *American Sociological Review* 45:370-390.

Bolzendahl, C. and Brooks, C. 2005 'Polarization, Secularization or Differences as Usual? the Denominational Cleavage in U.S. Social Attitudes Since the 1970s', *The Sociological Quarterly* 46: 47-78.

Bolzendahl, C. and Myers, D. 2004. 'Feminist Attitudes and Support for Gender Equality: Opinion Change in Women and Men, 1974-1998', *Social Forces* 83: 759-790.

Brady, H.E., Verba, S., and Schlozman, K.L. 1995. 'Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation', *The American Political Science Review* 89: 271-294.

Brooks, C. and Manza, J. 2007 *Why Welfare States Persist: The Importance of Public Opinion in Democracies*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R. 2004 'Gender, Ideology and Issue Preference: Is There such a Thing as a Political Women's Interest in Britain?' *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 6:20-44.

Chaney, C.K., Alvarez, M., and Nagler, J. 1998 'Explaining the Gender Gap in U.S. Presidential Elections, 1980–1992', *Political Research Quarterly* 51(2): 311–39.

Chanley, V.A., Rudolph, T.J., and Rahn, W.M. 2000 'The Origins and Consequences of Public Trust in Government', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64:239–56

Coffé, H. and Geys, B. 2007 'Participation in Bridging and Bonding Associations and Civic Attitudes', *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 18(4), 385-406.

Conover, P., Searing, D., and Crewe, I. 2004 'The Elusive Ideal of Equal Citizenship: Political Theory and Political Psychology in the United and Great Britain', *The Journal of Politics* 66(4): 1036-1068.

Cross, S.E. and Madson, L.1997 'Models of the Self: Self-Construals and Gender', *Psychological Bulletin* 122(1): 5-37.

Dalton, R.J. 2006 *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies,* Washington DC: CQ Press.

Dalton, R.J. 2008a *The good citizen. How a younger generation is reshaping American politics. Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation*, Washington DC: CQ Press.

Dalton, R.J. 2008b 'Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation', *Political Studies* 56: 76-98.

Dekker, P., Koopmans, R., and van den Broek, A. 1997 'Voluntary Associations, Social Movements and Individual Political Behaviour in Western Europe', Pages 220-241 in van Deth, J.W. (ed.), *Private groups and public life*, London: Routledge.

Delanty, G. 2000 *Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics,* Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Delli Carpini, M.X. and Keeter, S. 1996 *What American Know About Politics and Why it Matters,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Denters, B., Gabriel, O., and Torcal, M. 2007 'Norms of Good Citizenship' Pages 88-108 in: van Deth, J.W., Montero, J.R., and Westholm, A. (eds.), *Citizenship and Involvement in European Democracies, A Comparative Analysis*, Oxon: Routledge.

Diekman, A. B., Eagly, A. H., and Kulesa, P. 2002 'Accuracy and bias in stereotypes about the social and political attitudes of women and men', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 38: 268-282.

DiFrancesco, W. and Gitelman, Z. 1984 'Soviet Political Culture and "Covert Participation" in Policy Implementation', *American Political Science Review* 78: 603-621.

Esping-Andersen, G. 2002 'A New Gender Contract', in G. Esping-Andersen, D. Gallie, A. Hemerijck and J. Myles (eds) *Why We Need a New Welfare State*, London: Oxford University Press.

Evans, J. H. 1997 'Worldviews or Social Groups as the Source of Moral Value Attitudes: Implications for the Culture Wars Thesis', *Sociological Forum* 12(3): 371-404.

Faulks, K. 2000 *Citizenship,* London and New York: Routledge.

Haider-Markel, D.P. and Joslyn, M.R. 2005 'Attributions and the Regulation of Marriage: Considering the Parallels Between Race and Homosexuality', *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38:233-39.

Heath, A., Taylor, B. and Toka, G. 1995 'Religion, Morality and Politics', in R. Jowell, L. Brook, L. Dowds and D. Ahrendt (eds) International *Social Attitudes: The 10th BSA Report*, Aldershot, UK: Dartmouth.

Hooghe, M. 2003 'Participation in Voluntary Associations and Value Indicators: The Effect of Current and Previous Participation Experiences', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32: 47-69.

Inglehart, R. and Norris, P. 2000 'The Developmental Theory of the Gender Gap: Women's and Men's Voting Behavior in Global Perspective', *International Political Science Review* 21: 441-463.

Inglehart, R. and Welzel, C. 2005 *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janoski, T. 1998 *Citizenship and Civil Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jelen, Ted G., Thomas, S., and Wilcox, C. 1994 'The Gender Gap in Comparative Perspective', *European Journal of Political Research* 25(2): 171–86.

Josephson, J. 2005 'Citizenship, Same-Sex Marriage, and Feminist Critiques of Marriage', *Perspectives on Politics* 3:269-84.

Kam, C.D. and Palmer, C.L. 2008 'Reconsidering the Effects of Education on Political Participation', *Journal of Politics* 70(3): 612-361.

Kenski, K. and Jamieson, K. H. 2000 'The Gender Gap in Political Knowledge: Are Women Less Knowledgeable than Men about Politics?' Pp. 83-89 in K. H. Jamieson, *Everything You Think You Know About Politics…And Why You're Wrong,* New York: Basic Books.

Letki, N. and Evans, G. 2005 'Endogenizing Social Trust: Democratization in East-Central Europe', *British Journal of Political Science* 35: 515-529.

Lijphart, A. 1984. *Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-One Countries*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lijphart, A. 1997 'Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma', *The American Political Science Review* 91: 1-14.

Lister, R. 1995 'Dilemmas in Engendering Citizenship', *Economy and Society* 24(1): 1-40.

Lister, R. 2003 *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lister, R., Williams, F., Anttonen, A., Bussemaker, J., Gerhard, U., Heinen, J., Johansson, S., Leira, A., Siim, B., Tobio, C., and Gavanas, A. 2007 *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe: New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Manza, J. and Brooks, C. 1998 'The Gender Gap in US Presidential Elections: When? Why? Implications?', *American Journal of Sociology* 103(5): 1235-1266.

Manza, J. and Brooks, C. 1999. *Social Cleavages and Political Change: Voter Alignment and U.S. Party Coalitions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Manza, J. and Uggen, C. 2006 *Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement and American Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, T.H. 1950 *Citizenship and social class.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mead, L. 1986 *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*, New York: The Free Press.

Norris, P. 1999. *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Novak, M. and Cogan, J., Eds. 1987 *A Community of Self-Reliance: The New Consensus on Family and Welfare*, Milwaukee: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

O'Connor, J. S. 1993. 'Gender, Class and Citizenship in the Comparative Analysis of Welfare State Regimes: Theoretical and Methodological Issues', *The British Journal of Sociology* 44: 501-518.

O'Connor, J.S., Orloff, A.S., and Shaver, S. 1999 *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Orloff, A. S. 1993 'Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States', *American Sociological Review* 58(June): 303-328.

Paxton, P., Kunovich, S. and Hughes, M. M. 2007 'Gender in Politics', *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 263-284.

Pintor RL, Gratschew M. 2002 Voter *Turnout Since 1945: A Global Report*, Stockholm: Int. IDEA. http://www.idea.int/publications/vt/index.cfm

Putnam, R. 1995 'Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital', *Journal of Democracy* 6(1): 65-78.

Putnam, R. 2000 *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Quadagno, J. 2000. 'Another Face of Inequality: Racial and Ethnic Exclusion in the Welfare State', *Social Politics* 7:229-237.

Reeskens, T., and Hooghe, M. 2008 'Cross-cultural measurement equivalence of generalized trust. Evidence from the European Social Survey (2002 and 2004)', *Social Indicators Research* 85(3): 515-532.

Rosenthal, C.S. 1995 'The Role of Gender in Descriptive Representation', *Political Research Quarterly* 48:599–611.

Sandel, M. 1996 *Democracy's discontent*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Schlozman, K.L., Burns, N., and Verba. S. 1994 'Gender and the pathways to participation: The role of resources', *The Journal of Politics* 56(4): 963-990.

Schlozman, K.L., Burns, N., and Verba. S. 1999 'What Happened at Work Today? A Multistage Model of Gender, Employment, and Political Participation', *The Journal of Politics* 61: 29-53.

Scholz, E., Harkness, J., and Faaß, T. 2008 'ISSP Study Monitoring 2004', GESIS-Methodenberichte Nr. 2/2008 (www.issp.org)

Shapiro, R.Y. and Mahajan, H. 1986 'Gender Differences in Policy Preferences: A Summary of Trends from the 1960s to the 1980s', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50(1): 42–61.

Smith, T.W. 1984 'The Polls: Gender and Attitudes Toward Violence', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48: 384-396.

Smith, V. 1997 'New Forms of Work Organization', *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 315-339.

Steffensmeier, D. and Allan, E. 1996. 'Gender and Crime: Toward a Gendered Theory of Female Offending', *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 459-487.

Studlar, D.T., McAllister, I., and Hayes, B. 1998 'Explaining the Gender Gap in Voting: A Cross-National Analysis', *Social Science Quarterly* 79(4): 779–98.

Tyler, T.R. 2006. *Why People Obey the Law*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Van Deth, J. 2000 'Interesting but irrelevant', *European Journal of Political Research* 37(2): 115-147.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L., and Brady, H.E. 1995 *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics,* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Verba, S., Burns, N., and Schlozman, K.L. 1997 'Knowing and Caring about Politics: Gender and Political Engagement', *The Journal of Politics* 59(4): 1051-1072.