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# Question wording and coding

All variables are coded to range from 0 to 1, unless otherwise is noted. Some of the wordings in control variables might change from year to year. We present the wordings from the 2016 ANES for those variables because it has the most comprehensive items measuring hostile sexism.

## Abortion attitudes (reversed in our analyses)

There has been some discussion about abortion during recent years. Which one of the opinions on this page best agrees with your view?

* + 1. By law, abortion should never be permitted. [Pure Pro-Life]
		2. The law should permit abortion only in case of rape, incest, or when the woman’s life is in danger. [Rape/Incest/Danger]
		3. The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman’s life, but only after the need for the abortion has been clearly established. [Clear Need]
		4. By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice. [Pure Pro-Choice]
		5. Other (specify) [Not included in the analyses]

## Hostile sexism index (coded to increase in level of sexism)

### 1.2.1 2012

* When women demand equality these days, how often are they actually seeking special favors? (Always, most of the time, about half the time, some of the time, or never / Never, some of the time, about half the time, most of the time, or always?)
	1. Never
	2. Some of the time
	3. About half the time
	4. Most of the time
	5. Always
* When women complain about discrimination, how often do they cause more problems than they solve? (Never, some of the time, about half the time, most of the time, or always / Always, most of the time, about half the time, some of the time, or never?)
	1. Never
	2. Some of the time
	3. About half the time
	4. Most of the time
	5. Always

### 1.2.2 2016

* ‘Many women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.’ Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?
	1. Agree strongly
	2. Agree somewhat
	3. Neither agree nor disagree
	4. Disagree somewhat
	5. Disagree strongly
* ‘Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.’ (Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)
	1. Agree strongly
	2. Agree somewhat
	3. Neither agree nor disagree
	4. Disagree somewhat
	5. Disagree strongly
* ‘Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.’ (Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)
	1. Agree strongly
	2. Agree somewhat
	3. Neither agree nor disagree
	4. Disagree somewhat
	5. Disagree strongly
* ‘Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she tries to put him on a tight leash.’ (Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)
	1. Agree strongly
	2. Agree somewhat
	3. Neither agree nor disagree
	4. Disagree somewhat
	5. Disagree strongly
* When women demand equality these days, how often are they actually seeking special favors? (Always, most of the time, about half the time, some of the time, or never / Never, some of the time, about half the time, most of the time, or always?)
	1. Always
	2. Most of the time
	3. About half the time
	4. Some of the time
	5. Never
* When women complain about discrimination, how often do they cause more problems than they solve? (Always, most of the time, about half the time, some of the time, or never / Never, some of the time, about half the time, most of the time, or always?)
	1. Always
	2. Most of the time
	3. About half the time
	4. Some of the time
	5. Never

### 1.2.3 2020

* ‘Many women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.’ Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?
	1. Agree strongly
	2. Agree somewhat
	3. Neither agree nor disagree
	4. Disagree somewhat
	5. Disagree strongly
* ‘Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.’ (Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with this statement?)
	1. Agree strongly
	2. Agree somewhat
	3. Neither agree nor disagree
	4. Disagree somewhat
	5. Disagree strongly
* When women demand equality these days, how often are they actually seeking special favors? (Always, most of the time, about half the time, some of the time, or never / Never, some of the time, about half the time, most of the time, or always?)
	1. Always
	2. Most of the time
	3. About half the time
	4. Some of the time
	5. Never
* When women complain about discrimination, how often do they cause more problems than they solve? (Always, most of the time, about half the time, some of the time, or never / Never, some of the time, about half the time, most of the time, or always?)
	1. Always
	2. Most of the time
	3. About half the time
	4. Some of the time
	5. Never

## Discrimination against women (reversed in our analyses)

How much discrimination is there in the United States today against each of the following groups? [Women]

* + 1. A great deal
		2. A lot
		3. A moderate amount
		4. A little
		5. None at all

## Republican Party ID

Summary of the following questions: Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a [DEMOCRAT, a REPUBLICAN / a REPUBLICAN, a DEMOCRAT], an INDEPENDENT, or

what?

Would you call yourself a STRONG [Democrat / Republican] or a NOT VERY STRONG Democrat / Republican]?

Do you think of yourself as CLOSER to the Republican Party or to the Democratic party?

* + 1. Strong Democrat
		2. Not very strong Democrat
		3. Independent-Democrat
		4. Independent
		5. Independent-Republican
		6. Not very strong Republican
		7. Strong Republican

## Conservative Ideology

Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this?

* + 1. Extremely Liberal
		2. Liberal
		3. Slightly Liberal
		4. Moderate; middle of the road
		5. Slightly Conservative
		6. Conservative
		7. Extremely Conservative
		8. Haven’t thought much about this [wording and code might change from year to year; coded as “moderate; middle of the road" in our analyses]

## Religiosity index

The index is coded to range from the least religious to the most religious responses; and it combines three variables:

*Worship attendance* The variable combines multiple branching questions to get the following responses in order:

* + 1. Never
		2. A few times a year
		3. Once or twice a month
		4. Almost every week
		5. Every week

*View of the Bible* Which of these statements comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible?

1. The Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word.
2. The Bible is the word of God but not everything in it should be taken literally, word for word.
3. The Bible is a book written by men and is not the word of God.
4. Other SPECIFY [not included in our analyses]

*Importance of religion* Do you consider religion to be an important part of your life, or not?

1. Important
2. Not important

## Religious traditions

It is a summary of major religious groups:

* + 1. Mainline Protestant
		2. Evangelical Protestant
		3. Black Protestant
		4. Roman Catholic
		5. Undifferentiated Christian
		6. Jewish
		7. Other religion
		8. Not religious

Catholic, evangelical, and Jewish respondents are coded as dichotomous variables in the model.

## Self-identified gender

We coded self identifying female respondents as 1 and male respondents as 0. Respondents who picked “other” in 2016 are coded to 0 as well.

## Self-identified race

It is a summary measure of self-identified race:

* + 1. White, non-Hispanic
		2. Black, non-Hispanic
		3. Asian, native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
		4. Native American or Alaska Native
		5. Hispanic
		6. Other non-Hispanic including multiple races

Non-Latinx white respondents is a dichotomous variable.

## Sexual orientation

Do you consider yourself to be heterosexual or straight, homosexual or gay, or bisexual? / Do you consider yourself to be heterosexual or straight, homosexual or gay or lesbian, or bisexual?

* + 1. Heterosexual or straight
		2. Homosexual or gay or lesbian
		3. Bisexual
		4. Something else (only in 2020)

Heterosexual or straight respondents are the comparison category in our models.

## Marital status

Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated or never married?

* + 1. Married: spouse present
		2. Married: spouse absent (VOL)
		3. Widowed
		4. Divorced
		5. Separated
		6. Never Married

We coded married responses into one group, and they are the comparison category in our models.

# Tables

Table A1: The relationship between hostile sexism and abortion attitudes in 2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Clear need | Rape, incest, women’s health | Pure pro-life |
| Hostile sexism | 0.34 | 1.07\*\*\* | 1.09\*\* |
|  | (0.36) | (0.31) | (0.41) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.70\* | -0.39 | -0.32 |
|  | (0.28) | (0.27) | (0.33) |
| Republican Party ID | 0.50\* | 1.19\*\*\* | 1.46\*\*\* |
|  | (0.23) | (0.21) | (0.27) |
| Conservative Ideology | 0.85\* | 1.35\*\*\* | 2.09\*\*\* |
|  | (0.35) | (0.30) | (0.41) |
| Religiosity | 2.03\*\*\* | 4.01\*\*\* | 6.39\*\*\* |
|  | (0.24) | (0.25) | (0.51) |
| Evangelicals | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.43\* |
|  | (0.17) | (0.14) | (0.21) |
| Catholics | -0.10 | 0.08 | 0.63\*\*\* |
|  | (0.15) | (0.13) | (0.19) |
| Jewish | -0.05 | -0.59 | -14.41\*\*\* |
|  | (0.39) | (0.65) | (0.36) |
| Female | -0.36\*\* | -0.24\* | -0.14 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.16) |
| Non-Latinx whites | -0.02 | 0.13 | -0.07 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.13) | (0.19) |
| Age | 0.07 | -0.71\* | -2.11\*\*\* |
|  | (0.31) | (0.30) | (0.40) |
| South | 0.01 | -0.13 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.17) |
| Education | -0.48\* | -1.39\*\*\* | -1.96\*\*\* |
|  | (0.22) | (0.23) | (0.33) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | 0.62 | 0.69 | -0.31 |
|  | (0.42) | (0.41) | (0.76) |
| Bisexual | 0.44 | -0.13 | 0.43 |
|  | (0.39) | (0.49) | (0.56) |
| Widowed | 0.07 | 0.14 | -0.30 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.23) | (0.34) |
| Divorced | -0.11 | -0.22 | -0.32 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.16) | (0.24) |
| Separated | -0.25 | -0.30 | -0.05 |
|  | (0.38) | (0.40) | (0.39) |
| Never married | -0.27 | -0.13 | -0.20 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.16) | (0.22) |
| Constant | -1.89\*\*\* | -2.79\*\*\* | -5.29\*\*\* |
|  | (0.37) | (0.34) | (0.53) |
| N | 4623 |  |  |

Source: 2012 ANES

Notes: Reference category is pure pro-choice option.

Cell entries refer to multinomial logit coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses. The models use complex survey weights to compute linearized standard errors.

Positive coefficient estimates indicate higher probability of picking the corresponding option than picking pure pro-choice option.

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A2: The relationship between hostile sexism and abortion attitudes in 2016

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Clear need | Rape, incest, women’s health | Pure pro-life |
| Hostile sexism | 2.00\*\*\* | 2.77\*\*\* | 2.80\*\*\* |
|  | (0.46) | (0.41) | (0.53) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.29 | -0.50 | -0.33 |
|  | (0.28) | (0.27) | (0.34) |
| Republican Party ID | -0.16 | 0.98\*\*\* | 0.84\* |
|  | (0.26) | (0.23) | (0.34) |
| Conservative Ideology | 1.83\*\*\* | 1.99\*\*\* | 3.65\*\*\* |
|  | (0.36) | (0.42) | (0.55) |
| Religiosity | 1.10\*\*\* | 3.11\*\*\* | 5.11\*\*\* |
|  | (0.28) | (0.30) | (0.43) |
| Evangelicals | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.07 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.16) | (0.21) |
| Catholics | -0.01 | 0.31\* | 0.09 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.14) | (0.22) |
| Jewish | -0.61 | -0.35 | -0.78 |
|  | (0.49) | (0.57) | (0.93) |
| Female | -0.02 | 0.13 | 0.29 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.17) |
| Non-Latinx whites | 0.17 | 0.27 | -0.20 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.17) | (0.20) |
| Age | 0.03 | -1.10\*\*\* | -1.68\*\*\* |
|  | (0.33) | (0.30) | (0.38) |
| South | -0.05 | -0.11 | 0.06 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.14) | (0.16) |
| Education | -0.39 | -1.01\*\*\* | -1.62\*\*\* |
|  | (0.27) | (0.26) | (0.30) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | -0.23 | 0.64 | 0.65 |
|  | (0.44) | (0.51) | (0.61) |
| Bisexual | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.37) | (0.41) | (0.78) |
| Widowed | -0.31 | 0.57\* | 0.20 |
|  | (0.32) | (0.27) | (0.34) |
| Divorced | -0.37 | -0.30 | -0.34 |
|  | (0.20) | (0.18) | (0.26) |
| Separated | 0.20 | 0.19 | 0.17 |
|  | (0.48) | (0.51) | (0.63) |
| Never married | 0.02 | -0.15 | -0.19 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.24) |
| Constant | -2.73\*\*\* | -3.50\*\*\* | -5.62\*\*\* |
|  | (0.45) | (0.40) | (0.52) |
| N | 3900 |  |  |

Source: 2016 ANES

Notes: Reference category is pure pro-choice option.

Cell entries refer to multinomial logit coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses. The models use complex survey weights to compute linearized standard errors.

Positive coefficient estimates indicate higher probability of picking the corresponding option than picking pure pro-choice option.

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A3: The relationship between hostile sexism and abortion attitudes in 2020

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Clear need | Rape, incest, women’s health | Pure pro-life |
| Hostile sexism | 0.77+ | 1.15\*\* | 1.97\*\* |
|  | (0.46) | (0.40) | (0.63) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.71\* | -0.71\*\* | -0.77\* |
|  | (0.30) | (0.26) | (0.37) |
| Republican Party ID | 0.76\*\*\* | 1.19\*\*\* | 1.54\*\*\* |
|  | (0.19) | (0.20) | (0.31) |
| Conservative Ideology | 1.78\*\*\* | 3.25\*\*\* | 4.08\*\*\* |
|  | (0.30) | (0.34) | (0.51) |
| Religiosity | 1.88\*\*\* | 3.50\*\*\* | 6.68\*\*\* |
|  | (0.23) | (0.25) | (0.41) |
| Evangelicals | -0.14 | 0.07 | -0.06 |
|  | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.25) |
| Catholics | -0.06 | 0.12 | 0.24 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.12) | (0.16) |
| Jewish | -0.56+ | -1.10\*\* | -1.55+ |
|  | (0.31) | (0.33) | (0.88) |
| Female | -0.11 | -0.01 | 0.06 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.09) | (0.17) |
| Non-Latinx whites | 0.34\* | 0.13 | -0.05 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.14) | (0.20) |
| Age | 0.07 | -0.15 | -0.93\* |
|  | (0.26) | (0.24) | (0.35) |
| South | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.23 |
|  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.17) |
| Education | -0.01 | -0.84\*\*\* | -0.86\*\* |
|  | (0.20) | (0.21) | (0.28) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | 0.50 | -0.31 | 0.89 |
|  | (0.41) | (0.55) | (0.60) |
| Bisexual | -0.18 | -0.18 | -0.11 |
|  | (0.38) | (0.40) | (0.57) |
| Something else | -1.25 | 0.98\* | 1.66\* |
|  | (0.98) | (0.40) | (0.66) |
| Widowed | -0.19 | -0.13 | 0.07 |
|  | (0.22) | (0.21) | (0.29) |
| Divorced | -0.27+ | -0.10 | -0.10 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.19) | (0.25) |
| Separated | 0.28 | 0.20 | 0.32 |
|  | (0.45) | (0.49) | (0.58) |
| Never married | -0.24 | -0.13 | -0.30 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.15) | (0.24) |
| Constant | -3.33\*\*\* | -4.43\*\*\* | -8.24\*\*\* |
|  | (0.40) | (0.32) | (0.63) |
| N | 6508 |  |  |

Source: 2020 ANES

Notes: Reference category is pure pro-choice option.

Cell entries refer to multinomial logit coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses. The models use complex survey weights to compute linearized standard errors.

Positive coefficient estimates indicate higher probability of picking the corresponding option than picking pure pro-choice option.

+ p<.10, \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A4: Logit model predicting pure pro-life vs pure pro-choice in 2012

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Hostile sexism | 0.80+ |
|  | (0.43) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.43 |
|  | (0.41) |
| Republican Party ID | 1.56\*\*\* |
|  | (0.30) |
| Conservative Ideology | 1.72\*\*\* |
|  | (0.45) |
| Religiosity | 6.64\*\*\* |
|  | (0.61) |
| Evangelicals | 0.51\* |
|  | (0.24) |
| Catholics | 0.61\*\* |
|  | (0.20) |
| Female | -0.25 |
|  | (0.18) |
| Non-Latinx whites | 0.05 |
|  | (0.22) |
| Age | -2.14\*\*\* |
|  | (0.47) |
| South | -0.08 |
|  | (0.19) |
| Education | -1.56\*\*\* |
|  | (0.37) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | -0.70 |
|  | (0.67) |
| Bisexual | 0.87 |
|  | (0.61) |
| Widowed | -0.12 |
|  | (0.42) |
| Divorced | -0.21 |
|  | (0.28) |
| Separated | -0.53 |
|  | (0.42) |
| Never married | -0.23 |
|  | (0.25) |
| Constant | -5.29\*\*\* |
|  | (0.61) |
| N | 2585 |

Source: 2012 ANES

Notes: The outcome variable has two categories: 0 = Pure Pro-Choice, 1 = Pure Pro-Life. Positive coefficient estimates indicate higher probability of picking pure pro-life option rather than pure pro-choice option. The models use complex survey weights to compute linearized standard errors. Jewish respondents are dropped due to perfect collinearity.

+ p<0.10, \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5: Logit model predicting pure pro-life vs pure pro-choice in 2016

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Hostile sexism | 2.26\*\*\* |
|  | (0.59) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.10 |
|  | (0.38) |
| Republican Party ID | 1.02\*\* |
|  | (0.38) |
| Conservative Ideology | 3.34\*\*\* |
|  | (0.54) |
| Religiosity | 4.69\*\*\* |
|  | (0.44) |
| Evangelicals | 0.04 |
|  | (0.23) |
| Catholics | 0.04 |
|  | (0.25) |
| Jewish | -0.39 |
|  | (0.89) |
| Female | 0.19 |
|  | (0.20) |
| Non-Latinx whites | -0.01 |
|  | (0.21) |
| Age | -1.74\*\*\* |
|  | (0.46) |
| South | 0.19 |
|  | (0.19) |
| Education | -1.69\*\*\* |
|  | (0.39) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | 0.42 |
|  | (0.67) |
| Bisexual | 0.41 |
|  | (0.62) |
| Widowed | 0.37 |
|  | (0.35) |
| Divorced | -0.46 |
|  | (0.29) |
| Separated | -0.12 |
|  | (0.67) |
| Never married | -0.27 |
|  | (0.25) |
| Constant | -5.24\*\*\* |
|  | (0.59) |
| N | 2572 |
| Source: 2016 ANES |  |

Table A6: Logit model predicting pure pro-life vs pure pro-choice in 2020

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Hostile sexism | 1.94\*\* |
|  | (0.73) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.90 |
|  | (0.45) |
| Republican Party ID | 1.53\*\*\* |
|  | (0.35) |
| Conservative Ideology | 3.62\*\*\* |
|  | (0.59) |
| Religiosity | 5.95\*\*\* |
|  | (0.42) |
| Evangelicals | -0.14 |
|  | (0.26) |
| Catholics | 0.07 |
|  | (0.20) |
| Jewish | -0.30 |
|  | (0.77) |
| Female | 0.11 |
|  | (0.18) |
| Non-Latinx whites | -0.24 |
|  | (0.23) |
| Age | -0.65 |
|  | (0.41) |
| South | 0.23 |
|  | (0.19) |
| Education | -0.39 |
|  | (0.32) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | 0.94 |
|  | (0.73) |
| Bisexual | -0.23 |
|  | (0.73) |
| Something else | 2.26\*\*\* |
|  | (0.60) |
| Widowed | 0.17 |
|  | (0.30) |
| Divorced | -0.25 |
|  | (0.30) |
| Separated | 0.27 |
|  | (0.62) |
| Never married | -0.36 |
|  | (0.27) |
| Constant | -7.67\*\*\* |
|  | (0.70) |
| N | 4044 |
| Source: 2020 ANES |  |

Table A7: Interactive model of select religious traditions and religiosity to explain abortion attitudes in 2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Clear need | Rape, incest, women’s health | Pure pro-life |
| Hostile sexism | 0.34 | 1.06\*\*\* | 1.08\*\* |
|  | (0.35) | (0.32) | (0.41) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.70\* | -0.41 | -0.33 |
|  | (0.28) | (0.27) | (0.34) |
| Republican Party ID | 0.50\* | 1.19\*\*\* | 1.45\*\*\* |
|  | (0.23) | (0.21) | (0.27) |
| Conservative Ideology | 0.85\* | 1.37\*\*\* | 2.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.35) | (0.30) | (0.42) |
| Evangelicals | -0.33 | 0.12 | 1.07 |
|  | (0.46) | (0.47) | (1.15) |
| Religiosity | 1.88\*\*\* | 3.87\*\*\* | 6.73\*\*\* |
|  | (0.30) | (0.30) | (0.66) |
| Evangelicals X Religiosity | 0.58 | -0.11 | -0.86 |
|  | (0.70) | (0.71) | (1.52) |
| Catholics | -0.21 | -0.44 | 0.92 |
|  | (0.31) | (0.36) | (0.81) |
| Catholics X Religiosity | 0.30 | 0.97 | -0.31 |
|  | (0.57) | (0.63) | (1.22) |
| Jewish | -0.31 | 0.32 | -10.82\*\*\* |
|  | (0.80) | (1.09) | (0.55) |
| Jewish X Religiosity | 0.65 | -2.32 | -6.41\*\*\* |
|  | (1.58) | (1.79) | (0.99) |
| Female | -0.36\*\* | -0.24\* | -0.14 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.16) |
| Non-Latinx whites | -0.02 | 0.13 | -0.07 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.13) | (0.19) |
| Age | 0.08 | -0.73\* | -2.12\*\*\* |
|  | (0.31) | (0.30) | (0.40) |
| South | 0.01 | -0.13 | 0.03 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.17) |
| Education | -0.48\* | -1.39\*\*\* | -1.98\*\*\* |
|  | (0.22) | (0.23) | (0.33) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | 0.61 | 0.68 | -0.33 |
|  | (0.41) | (0.40) | (0.76) |
| Bisexual | 0.44 | -0.14 | 0.42 |
|  | (0.38) | (0.50) | (0.57) |
| Widowed | 0.07 | 0.15 | -0.30 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.23) | (0.34) |
| Divorced | -0.11 | -0.22 | -0.32 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.16) | (0.24) |
| Separated | -0.26 | -0.31 | -0.05 |
|  | (0.38) | (0.40) | (0.38) |
| Never married | -0.27 | -0.14 | -0.19 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.16) | (0.22) |
| Constant | -1.83\*\*\* | -2.72\*\*\* | -5.53\*\*\* |
|  | (0.37) | (0.35) | (0.61) |
| N | 4623 |  |  |

Source: 2012 ANES

Notes: Reference category is pure pro-choice option.

Cell entries refer to multinomial logit coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses. The models use complex survey weights to compute linearized standard errors.

Positive coefficient estimates indicate higher probability of picking the corresponding option than picking pure pro-choice option.

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A8: Interactive model of select religious traditions and religiosity to explain abortion attitudes in 2016

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Clear need | Rape, incest, women’s health | Pure pro-life |
| Hostile sexism | 1.96\*\*\* | 2.77\*\*\* | 2.83\*\*\* |
|  | (0.46) | (0.41) | (0.52) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.28 | -0.50 | -0.33 |
|  | (0.28) | (0.28) | (0.34) |
| Republican Party ID | -0.17 | 0.99\*\*\* | 0.86\* |
|  | (0.26) | (0.24) | (0.34) |
| Conservative Ideology | 1.86\*\*\* | 1.99\*\*\* | 3.61\*\*\* |
|  | (0.36) | (0.41) | (0.54) |
| Evangelicals | 0.63 | -0.33 | -1.44 |
|  | (0.47) | (0.50) | (0.97) |
| Religiosity | 1.05\*\* | 2.83\*\*\* | 4.61\*\*\* |
|  | (0.33) | (0.36) | (0.52) |
| Evangelicals X Religiosity | -0.57 | 0.83 | 2.15 |
|  | (0.82) | (0.76) | (1.28) |
| Catholics | -0.29 | -0.06 | -0.43 |
|  | (0.38) | (0.40) | (0.69) |
| Catholics X Religiosity | 0.66 | 0.82 | 1.02 |
|  | (0.85) | (0.83) | (1.20) |
| Jewish | -1.84\* | -0.90 | 0.80 |
|  | (0.90) | (0.79) | (1.38) |
| Jewish X Religiosity | 3.04 | 1.35 | -2.93 |
|  | (1.88) | (2.04) | (2.78) |
| Female | -0.02 | 0.14 | 0.30 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.17) |
| Non-Latinx whites | 0.17 | 0.28 | -0.20 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.17) | (0.20) |
| Age | 0.02 | -1.12\*\*\* | -1.72\*\*\* |
|  | (0.33) | (0.29) | (0.38) |
| South | -0.06 | -0.11 | 0.05 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.14) | (0.16) |
| Education | -0.38 | -1.01\*\*\* | -1.63\*\*\* |
|  | (0.27) | (0.26) | (0.31) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | -0.22 | 0.65 | 0.64 |
|  | (0.45) | (0.51) | (0.59) |
| Bisexual | 0.22 | 0.02 | -0.06 |
|  | (0.37) | (0.41) | (0.79) |
| Widowed | -0.30 | 0.56\* | 0.18 |
|  | (0.32) | (0.27) | (0.35) |
| Divorced | -0.36 | -0.30 | -0.34 |
|  | (0.20) | (0.17) | (0.26) |
| Separated | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.12 |
|  | (0.48) | (0.50) | (0.63) |
| Never married | 0.01 | -0.16 | -0.21 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.24) |
| Constant | -2.72\*\*\* | -3.38\*\*\* | -5.31\*\*\* |
|  | (0.46) | (0.42) | (0.53) |
| N | 3900 |  |  |

Source: 2016 ANES

Notes: Reference category is pure pro-choice option.

Cell entries refer to multinomial logit coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses. The models use complex survey weights to compute linearized standard errors.

Positive coefficient estimates indicate higher probability of picking the corresponding option than picking pure pro-choice option.

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A9: Interactive model of select religious traditions and religiosity to explain abortion attitudes in 2020

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Clear need | Rape, incest, women’s health | Pure pro-life |
| Hostile sexism | 0.77 | 1.17\*\* | 1.98\*\* |
|  | (0.45) | (0.40) | (0.64) |
| Discrimination against women | -0.71\* | -0.70\*\* | -0.74 |
|  | (0.29) | (0.26) | (0.37) |
| Republican Party ID | 0.76\*\*\* | 1.19\*\*\* | 1.54\*\*\* |
|  | (0.19) | (0.20) | (0.31) |
| Conservative Ideology | 1.75\*\*\* | 3.22\*\*\* | 4.11\*\*\* |
|  | (0.30) | (0.33) | (0.52) |
| Evangelicals | 0.46 | 0.64 | 0.26 |
|  | (0.48) | (0.47) | (0.87) |
| Religiosity | 2.01\*\*\* | 3.66\*\*\* | 6.35\*\*\* |
|  | (0.29) | (0.29) | (0.45) |
| Evangelicals X Religiosity | -1.04 | -0.95 | -0.56 |
|  | (0.70) | (0.69) | (1.12) |
| Catholics | -0.01 | 0.21 | -1.25\* |
|  | (0.32) | (0.42) | (0.60) |
| Catholics X Religiosity | -0.11 | -0.14 | 2.05\* |
|  | (0.64) | (0.79) | (0.94) |
| Jewish | -1.29\* | -2.29\* | 0.21 |
|  | (0.57) | (1.02) | (1.95) |
| Jewish X Religiosity | 1.80 | 2.24 | -1.36 |
|  | (1.18) | (1.61) | (2.67) |
| Female | -0.11 | -0.01 | 0.08 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.10) | (0.17) |
| Non-Latinx whites | 0.33\* | 0.12 | -0.06 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.14) | (0.20) |
| Age | 0.07 | -0.14 | -0.97\*\* |
|  | (0.26) | (0.24) | (0.35) |
| South | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.24 |
|  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.17) |
| Education | 0.02 | -0.82\*\*\* | -0.82\*\* |
|  | (0.20) | (0.21) | (0.28) |
| Homosexual/gay/lesbian | 0.49 | -0.32 | 0.87 |
|  | (0.41) | (0.55) | (0.59) |
| Bisexual | -0.18 | -0.18 | -0.14 |
|  | (0.37) | (0.41) | (0.57) |
| Something else | -1.24 | 0.98\* | 1.69\* |
|  | (0.98) | (0.41) | (0.64) |
| Widowed | -0.20 | -0.14 | 0.06 |
|  | (0.21) | (0.21) | (0.29) |
| Divorced | -0.28 | -0.10 | -0.11 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.19) | (0.26) |
| Separated | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.31 |
|  | (0.45) | (0.49) | (0.57) |
| Never married | -0.23 | -0.13 | -0.30 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.15) | (0.23) |
| Constant | -3.38\*\*\* | -4.51\*\*\* | -8.03\*\*\* |
|  | (0.40) | (0.31) | (0.69) |
| N | 6508 |  |  |

Source: 2020 ANES

Notes: Reference category is pure pro-choice option.

Cell entries refer to multinomial logit coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses. The models use complex survey weights to compute linearized standard errors.

Positive coefficient estimates indicate higher probability of picking the corresponding option than picking pure pro-choice option.

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001