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## The role of women around the world
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## These differences are strongly correlated with values and beliefs

- "When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women" (from World Values Survey):
- Proportion of the population that answers 'yes':
- Iceland 3.6\%; Sweden 4.5\%; Denmark 6.0\%; Ethiopia 6.5\%; Finland 10.7\%; Norway 10.7\%
- Iran 78.5\%; Pakistan 78.8\%; Iraq 81.0\% Jordan 88.9\%; Saudi Arabia 89.7\%; Egypt 94.9\%


## These differences are highly persistent



But not that persistent: Gender norms at Çatalhöyük


## Gender norms at Çatalhöyük

- Based on archaeological evidence (lan Hodder, 2005).
- Men and women had similar diets: evidence from bones and teeth.
- No clear gender specialization of labor: evidence from carbon deposits in ribs.
- Similar social status: based on burial sites (location \& head removal).
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- Where do these cultural differences come from?
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## The question

- Where do these cultural differences come from?
- Potential answers:

1. Who knows. . .these differences cannot be explained.
2. They are historically determined through an evolutionary process.

Esther Boserup's hypothesis: The plough


Plough agriculture
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## Hoe agriculture



## Hoe agriculture
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## Examining Boserup's hypothesis

- Question 1: Is it true that historical adoption of the plough was associated with less female participation in agriculture?


## Measuring the presence of plough agriculture

- The original information, from the Ethnographic Atlas, categorizes 1265 ethnic groups into the following four categories:

1. Data missing (109)
2. Plough absent (999)
3. Plough exists but not aboriginal (18)
4. Aboriginal plough use prior to contact (141)

- Using this, we construct a variable that equals one if an ethnic group engaged in plough agriculture.


## Measuring historical female participation in agriculture

- Gender differences in agriculture (\& other activities):

1. Males only (70)
2. Males appreciably more (161)
3. Equal participation (230)
4. Females appreciably more (227)
5. Females only (32)

- We create a variable that takes on the values $1-5$, and is increasing in female participation in agriculture.

Table: Was the plough associated with differences in the gender division of labor within agriculture?

|  | Dependent variable: Traditional participation <br> of females in agriculture, 1-5 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Mean of dep. var. | 3.04 |
| Traditional plough agriculture | $-0.883^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.225)$ |
| Ethnographic controls | yes |
| Observations | 660 |
| R-squared | 0.14 |

## Distribution of historical female participation in agriculture



## Examining Boserup's hypothesis

- Question 2 (an aside): If women in plough societies worked less in agriculture, what did they do more of?


## Table: Was the plough associated with differences in the gender division of labor within agriculture?

|  | $(1)$ |  | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dependent variable: Traditional participation of females relative to males in the following tasks: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall <br> agriculture | Land clearance | Soil preparation | Planting | Crop tending | Harvesting |
| Mean of dep. var. | 2.83 | 1.45 | 2.15 | 2.86 | 3.16 | 3.23 |
| Traditional plough agriculture | $-1.136^{* * *}$ | $-0.434^{* *}$ | $-1.182^{* * *}$ | $-1.290^{* * *}$ | $-1.188^{* * *}$ | $-0.954^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.240)$ | $(0.197)$ | $(0.320)$ | $(0.306)$ | $(0.351)$ | $(0.271)$ |
| Ethnographic controls |  | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Observations | 124 | 129 | 124 | 131 | 122 | yes |
| R-squared | 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 131 |  |

Table: Was the plough associated with differences in the gender division of labor in other activities?

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dependent variable: Traditional participation of females relative to males in the following tasks: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Caring for small animals | Caring for large animals | Milking | Cooking | Fuel gathering | Water fetching | Burden carrying | Handicrafts | Trading |
| Mean of dep. var. | 3.53 | 1.73 | 3.25 | 4.65 | 3.90 | 4.64 | 3.47 | 2.78 | 2.47 |
| Traditional plough use | $\begin{gathered} 0.140 \\ (0.517) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.064 \\ (0.254) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.630 \\ (0.697) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.019 \\ & (0.108) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.638 \\ (0.403) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.052 \\ & (0.205) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.962^{* *} \\ (0.378) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.157 \\ & (0.274) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.155 \\ & (0.542) \end{aligned}$ |
| Ethnographic controls | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Observations | 88 | 95 | 48 | 173 | 159 | 154 | 135 | 74 | 59 |
| R-squared | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.10 |

## Examining Boserup's hypothesis

- Question 3: Is ancestral plough use associated with less equal gender norms today?
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## Ancestral plough use across language groups



## Ancestral plough use across countries



## Ancestral plough use across districts



## Female labor force participation



## Female labor force participation, accounting for covariates



## Share of firms with female ownership, accounting for covariates



## Share of national seats held by women, accounting for covariates



## Zooming in to the micro level

Results are similar when one looks at:

1. Variation across countries within continents.
2. Variation across districts within countries.
3. Variation across ethnic groups within countries.

## Examining Boserup's hypothesis

- Question 4: Is this really about cultural norms?


## How much of this is about values and attitudes?

- To help identify a purely cultural channel, we examine the children of immigrants born and raised within the United States or Europe.
- Benefit of this strategy:
- Children of immigrants face the same domestic institutions, markets, and policies (since they are all in the same country), but have different cultural backgrounds.


## Children of migrants to Europe

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dependent variable: "When jobs are scarce..." survey response, 1-5 scale |  |  |
|  | Father's country | Mother's country | Parents same country |
| Mean of dep. var. | 2.54 | 2.53 | 2.62 |
| Traditional plough use | $0.219^{* *}$ | 0.214** | 0.298*** |
|  | (0.091) | (0.086) | (0.096) |
| Observations | 15,545 | 15,260 | 10,535 |
| R-squared | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.17 |

## Children of migrants to the U.S.

|  | $(1)$ |  | $(2)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dependent variable: Labor force participation indicator, 1994-2011 |  |  |
| Mean of dep. var. | Father's country | Mother's country | Parents same country |
| Traditional plough use | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.60 |
|  | $-0.044^{* * *}$ | $-0.043^{* *}$ | $-0.062 * * *$ |
| Observations | $(0.015)$ | $(0.018)$ | $(0.020)$ |
| R-squared | 57,138 | 55,341 | 32,776 |

## So, what have we learned?

- Differences in cultural gender norms are explained, in part, by the history of our ancestors.
- More generally, there is accumulating evidence that current values and beliefs have been shaped by history.
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