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Gender differences were sought in phenomenological data from 320 respondents from three samples (general public, adult undergraduates, and first-year law students). The research task was to differentiate the fact of ownership from the sense of ownership and to then describe the latter. Results showed men to be significantly more focused on property as rights, with emphasis on autonomy and exclusivity. Women more frequently reported ownership to entail responsibility, self-connection, and pride, and accordingly reported feeling ownership of the people in their lives and those peoples' possessions. Thus, as Gilligan (1982) argued, women are different; they are not underdeveloped or deprived men. Political, economic, and legal theory would benefit from feminist property perspectives.

INTRODUCTION

The traditional terms of "consume,""consumer," and "consumption"misrepresent the critical issues of material culture (Rudmin & Kilbourne, 1991). These terms require a focus on the person as a mouth, a maw, a gullet, a disposal system, swallowing and digesting and getting rid of goods and services of every kind. Consumption is the sink side of production. Perhaps because of this "all consuming" focus, consumer research has been relatively isolated from issues and interpretations of material culture in other disciplines. In sociology, anthropology, and history, for example, the focus is less on the individual and more on interpersonal relationships and societal units. In law and political economics, the focus is not on using up and "consuming"things but on possessing and maintaining them over time. This paper is premised on the latter emphasis, that consumers are interested in acquiring goods for extended private possession, for use in duration. The presumption is that consumers are generally more interested in "possessing"and "owning"than they are in "consuming,"and the final using up and consumption of the property is felt to be a frustration or failure of the intent to own.

Are there gender differences in owning? This question has yet to be addressed in any systematic or conclusive way. However, it has been asked and answered in different contexts for over two millennia. For example, Pythagoras in the 6th century B.C. argued that women are more sharing and less possessive than are men:

"They must not destroy the reputation they had acquired through tradition and not put the writers of myths in the wrong; on the grounds of their recognition of the justice of women, because they give away clothes and adornments without witnesses when others have need of them, without this trustfulness resulting in lawsuits or quarrels, these poets created the myth that three women had but one eye between them because there was such concord among them. If one was to apply this to men and say that one who had first obtained something could easily part with it and even willingly added something of his own, nobody would believe it. For it is not in the nature of men." (DeVogel, 1966, pp.132-133)

Rudmin (1990a) has reviewed some of the psychological evidence of gender differences in possessing, which generally supports the Pythagorean observations. For example, in children's collecting behaviors, girls' collections are more personalized, reflecting achievements and social relationships, whereas boys' are more socially competitive, reflecting rivalry and trading relationships. In studies of wishing, women wish less for power and money than do men, and prefer instead opportunities for benevolence and personal achievement. Females typically name more possessions than do males, and more frequently self-identify with those possessions, with the exception of abstract properties like money and financial assets. Girl's typically are more sharing than boys, particularly among themselves, and share differentially based on personal relations rather on principles of equity. In accord with these review findings, Rudmin (1990a) presented data from two different studies showing women to be more sharing and less
dominating than are men.

Gender discussions also are evident in the political economic literature, particularly in the late 19th century. Morgan (1877), Engels (1884/1920), Veblen (1912/1899), Sumner (1907) and others who argued that women themselves are the archetypal property and that private ownership is essentially a patriarchal institution to subjugate women and other people and other resources for privileged economic exploitation. Such arguments have been reinvigorated by recent feminist scholarship (e.g. Hirschon, 1984; Coontz & Henderson, 1986; Lerner, 1986; Smith, 1987; Franck & Paxson, 1989). However, the empirical evidence from quantitative cross-cultural research shows little support for the idea that regimes of private ownership entail the subjugation of women or are otherwise gender bound (Rudmin, 1990b;c). Gender differences are also, of course, a topic in marketing and consumer behavior, with numerous studies and theories, many of which will be reviewed and debated in other papers in this conference proceedings.

This paper reports gender differences in the psychological meaning of the verb "to own". This is a part of an on-going enterprise to search available data bases for gender differences that might contribute to the development of a feminist theory of property. Ownership is a social institution instantiated in the minds and behaviors of the population and is thus largely invisible (Rudmin, 1991a). If it is not easy to see in the first place, it is indeed difficult to see anew. However, as Gilligan and Attanucci (1988) have argued, one approach to releasing theory from gender-bias is to seek for systematic observations of gender differences that may be disruptive to established thought and theory.

**METHOD**

The data collecting was motivated by a desire to understand what people mean by the verb "own". Ackerman (1977) has argued that there is no need for systematic, scientific study of lay conceptualizations of property since legal and judicial authorities intuitively know what the public means by "own". That argument is doubtful and itself needing empirical confirmation. In fact, there have been a number of empirical studies of the meaning of "own" but all with constrained response options (e.g. Rapoport & Fillenbaum, 1972; Rudmin, 1991b; Rudmin & Berry, 1987; Takane, 1980; Wagener & Pohl, 1986). In contrast, the present data collecting was designed to elicit a multitude of phenomenological accounts of what it means to own. The goal of phenomenology is to to achieve a fresh, atheoretical, "objective" account of the phenomenon at issue. Phenomenology is commonly done by a single scholar presenting his or her own "look" at the phenomenon, e.g. Marcel (1949). When seeking phenomenological accounts from large samples of people, the phenomenon and the task must be presented in a manner to disrupt the ready routines and explanations provided by schooling and other intervening constructive processes. At the same time, the investigator should restrict the respondents as little as possible.

For most instances of ownership, the legal or social facts of ownership coincide with the psychological sense of ownership, and it is difficult to disentangle them and bring the latter into focus. However, there are occasions in which the fact of ownership is discrepant from the sense of ownership. For this study, respondents were asked to focus on such instances of ownership, ripe with discrepancy, and to describe the phenomena they thereby encounter.

The respondents were all told on the consent form that they were being asked to "help in an exploratory study of the meaning of ownership". The task instructions were to "List as many examples as you can of a) things that you do own but for which you feel little sense of ownership; b) things that you do not own but for which you feel a sense of ownership. Then referring to your exemplars if you wish, try to describe what your sense of ownership consists of." Labelled columns of 14 lines each were provided for the exemplar listings and space was provided at the bottom of the form for the description of the sense of ownership. The order of appearance of the positive (do own but feel little sense of ownership) and negative (do not own but do feel a sense of ownership) exemplars were reversed on half of the forms, as were the corresponding report columns. The task was completed in 10 to 15 minutes by most people, though some did take longer.

The respondents were from three Eastern Ontario samples: 1) general public (n=121) recruited in
their cars while waiting at a ferry boat crossing; 2) undergraduate students (n=105) recruited in evening and summer session introductory psychology classes, and 3) first year law students (n=127) recruited in property law classes at the start of their second term. Respondents younger than 21 were not selected. For those with identified ages, mean ages were 42 for the public sample (SD=13, range=21-75), 26 for the undergraduates (SD=7, range=21-60), and 25 for the law students (SD=5, range=21-43). A Scheffe Test following a significant ANOVA for age (F=82, df=2,258, p<.0001) confirmed that the public sample was older than the other two samples, which were undifferentiated. There were no statistically significant age differences between genders within samples. Note that gender was not identified for 26 of the general public, 1 of the undergraduates, and 6 of the law students. As shown in the Tables, gender ratios were quite different in the three samples: in the public sample, there were 44 women and 55 men; in the adult undergraduate sample, 76 women and 28 men; and in the law student sample, 49 women and 72 men.

Because the samples represent populations that differ on such relevant variables as age, education, and experiences of work and ownership, and because they have different n's and different gender ratios, any finding from the aggregated data will be considered significant only if there is no countermanding evidence in any of the three samples.

RESULTS

The first task of the analysis was to group the responses into common types or categories. In accordance with the phenomenological objective of being atheoretically descriptive, this categorizing of responses was done post-hoc, seeking to identify "natural"categories appearing in the data. Numerous studies of possessions and property done in different cultures have adopted this practice (e.g. Beggan, 1991; Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Dittmar, 1989; 1991; Furby, 1976; 1978; Kamptner, 1989; 1991; Rudmin & Berry, 1987; Schrader, 1966; Sherman & Newman, 1977), however, there has yet to emerge a consensus or a standard categorization scheme.

For the this study, categorization proceeded by first listing the content words actually used by the respondents, and then sorting these alphabetically. Categories that were synonymous were merged, and those with few members were added to larger categories where it seemed reasonable. The categories for things owned and things not owned were determined in common, though the actual counts of category frequencies were done separately. The 52 final exemplar categories are here listed alphabetically: Air or Sun, Beliefs or Values, Body or Organs, Books, Businesses, Cars or Trucks, City or Region, Clothes, Culture or Art, Debts, Education, Emotions, Environment, Family, Food or Drink, Freedom, Furniture, Government Property, Health, Ideas or Thoughts, Institutions, ID Cards, Jewelry, Job or Employment, Land, Life or Destiny, Money, Name, Nation, Parks or Lakes, Patronized Places, People, Personal Space, Personality, Pets, Recreation Items, Residence, Rights or Vote, Roads or Walks, Stocks or Bonds, Sundries, Things or Stuff, Time, Toiletries, Tools, Trash, TV or Stereo, Utilities, View, Work Site, and, of course, categories for No Response and for Miscellaneous. This last category contained the following: "not car," "not jewelry," "not books," "not heirlooms," "not food," "letters," "contents of letters," "glasses," "stuffed bear," "war," "right to decide about others," "actions and decisions of loved ones," "joint papers," and two illegible responses.

Many respondents gave qualified responses, such as "my boyfriend's tapes," or "borrowed things". These qualifications were categorized and tabulated separately from the actual objects of ownership. Using the procedure just described, 21 such categories of qualifiers were identified: Borrowed XXX, Employer's XXX, Family's XXX, Former XXX, Found XXX, Friends' XXX, Given XXX, Hidden XXX, Mortgaged XXX, Paid For XXX, Nearby XXX, Public XXX, Rented XXX, Shared XXX, Societal XXX, Stolen XXX, Temporary XXX, Unimportant XXX, Used XXX, Valuable XXX, and, of course, No Response. There was no need for a Miscellaneous category.

The determination of the categories for the sense of ownership was done in the same fashion: the respondents' key words were tabulated and alphabetized, and clusters of categories were organized. However, each respondent's descriptions were re-examined to check for any miscategorizations or misrepresentations of the
descriptions, arguments, and examples, and adjustments were made. By this method, 45 categories were identified: Accessible, Acquired, Belong, Bought or Paid For, Can Share, Can Dispose Of, Care For, Claim, Clear or No Lien, Cognitive, Communal, Complete or Total, Control, Degree or Priority, Earn or Achieve, Emotion or Attachment, Enjoy or Like, Exclusive, Familiar, Family, First, Gift, Intangibles, Keep, Legal Title, Made or Changed, "Mine," Need or Utility, No Ownership, Not Disruptive, Permanent, Personal Meaning, Possess or Have, Pride, Protect or Defend, Responsible For, Right, Self, Tangible Things, Unrestrained, Use, Value or Asset, Want or Desire, and again, categories for No Response and Miscellaneous. This last category contained: "not a gift" (three times), "not legal" (twice), "not belong" (twice), "not purchased," "not in possession," "not a necessity," "not by labour alone," "not stamp or coin collections," "not a concept in awareness," "may be distant," "expensive or cheap," and "land ownership is sexist".

Admittedly, these labels are inadequate to describe each category. However, due to space limitations, only those of the categories which differentiate females from males will be presented in tabular form and illustrated with several of the most frequent types of responses.

To examine the reliability of the categorization process, a female undergraduate research assistant independently placed the responses into categories identified by these minimal labels. Cohen's (1968) kappa was used as the measure of nominal scale agreement. Kappa ranges from -1 to +1 and can be interpreted like a correlation coefficient. For the object exemplar categories, k=.85, with most disagreement on the categories of Patronized Places and Tools. For the exemplar qualification categories, k=.86, with most disagreement on the category of Temporary XXX. For the sense of ownership categories, k=.83, with most disagreement on the Cognitive and Degree or Priority categories.

There are several options for tabulating the data and for testing gender differences. The data could be tabulated categorically (whether or not a category was mentioned by the respondent), by frequency (how many times the subject mentioned the category), by relative frequency (what proportion of the respondent's mentions were of a particular category), and as "first-mention" (what was the category of the first mentioned response). The categorical tabulation was chosen for this analysis because it makes no presumptions about the relative importance of the responses, and because it seems most robust for any artifacts due to the recording, coding, and categorization process.

Because the test of gender difference for a category takes the form of a two (female, male) by two (not mentioned, mentioned) table, the statistic of choice was the chi-square. With 52 object categories and 21 qualification categories for the examplars of things owned, and the same 73 categories for the examplars of things not owned, and 45 categories for the sense of ownership, repeated chi-square testing using a significance criterion of p<.05 would tend to falsely identify gender differences. However, with the further conjunctive criterion of no reversed direction of difference on any of the three samples (p=.25), the risk of Type-I errors is considerably moderated. A Monte Carlo examination of 10,000 random samples showed the significance level of the combined criteria to be p=.02, which would indicate 3 or 4 possible false findings for the number of tests here made. Where there is concern or doubt, future studies might be commissioned to test specific gender differences more rigorously.

Respondents generally had difficulty thinking of examplars of things that they own but for which they feel little sense of ownership. For both women and men, 17% listed nothing, and their mean number of exemplars were 2.6 and 2.5, respectively, which were not significantly different. Nevertheless, as shown in Table 1, more women than men listed Furniture ("furniture," "household items," "appliances"), and more men than women listed Public XXX ("government," "public property," "crown corporations") and Government Property ("government," "public property," "crown corporations"). These last two categories, though not totally coincident, were redundant and their mention was highly correlated (r=.66, p<.001).

For things not owned but still sensed to be owned, respondents overall listed a mean of 4.0 examplars, which was significantly more than the positive property examplars just discussed (t=8.8, df=319, p<.001). Furthermore, as shown in
Table 2, women listed significantly more exemplars (M=4.3, SD=2.5) than did men (M=3.7, SD=2.4). Because gender differences in amount of response did not occur for the other tasks, this significant difference should not be interpreted as merely a gender difference in response style, linguistic facility, or experiment reactance. Rather, it would seem to be an indication that women experience, at least report, a less distinct sense of property boundaries than do men. There is more of the world that they do not own but sense that they do.

As shown in Table 2, women more than men reported this proprietary expansiveness in reference to People ("children","boyfriend","friends"),Family's XXX ("parents","family's","spouse's"),Friend's XXX ("friend's","boyfriend's","roommate's"),Pets ("cat","dog","pets"),Work Site ("workplace","office"),Clothes ("clothes","shoes"),Family ("family","parents","siblings"),View ("landscape","view","autumn color"),Employer's XXX ("company's","client's","office's"),Beliefs or Values ("values","faith","attitudes") and Emotions ("feelings","friendships","pride"). As shown at the bottom of Table 2, men more than women reported proprietary expansiveness towards Public XXX ("government","public property","crown corporations"),Government Property ("government","public property","crown corporations"),Parks or Lakes ("parks","lakes","public land"), and Shared XXX ("shared","joint").

Again, the categories of Public XXX and Government Property are largely redundant (r=.74, p=.001). It may seem incorrect, or at least curious, that men should more frequently report owning public and government properties but feeling that they don't, and not owning them but feeling that they do. The data suggest, however, that these reports came from two quite distinct subpopulations of men, since the correlations of the two positive claims with the two negative claims for all three samples combined were uniformly near zero (r=-.02, r=.05, r=-.05, r=.00).

Gender differences in the descriptions of the sense of ownership are shown in Table 3. More women than men used expressions of Responsible For ("responsibility","responsible for","entrusted"), Self ("express self","part of myself","identify with"), and Pride ("pride in","proud of"). Note that the category of Responsible For was distinct from expressions of care and maintenance. More men then women used expressions of Unrestrained ("as I wish","do as I please","without interference"), Clear or No Lien ("clear","no debt","no worries"), Complete or Total ("complete","absolute","total"), and Right ("cannot be taken away","right").

**DISCUSSION**

These findings, of course, are tentative and require replication before they can confidently be considered to describe gender differences in cognitions about ownership. Replication needs also to be extended to other cultural settings. However, based on data from these phenomenological, open-ended inquiries, the results do suggest several provocative lines of thought and might serve to inform or excite further research and theoretical developments.

First, this analysis does seem to support Gilligan's (1982) argument that women are more contextual and interpersonal and less rule-governed than are men. Men seem responsive to principles in the abstract, here seen in their focus on rights, exclusivity, and absolutes. Women, however, seem to be more responsive to networks of real relationships, here seen in their focus on family, friends, worksites, and other nodes of network. However, it is yet unclear how this direction of thought might develop into a feminist theory of material relations which would have application in law, economics, or consumer research.

Certainly, it does seem from this analysis that for men ownership is more a mechanism disconnecting and separating people, for making private realms of isolated autonomy. For women, on the other hand, ownership seems to be more a mechanism for connecting and uniting people. The poles for the tension to develop a feminist theory of ownership might be held at these extremes: connectionist vs. disconnectionist regimes of ownership. Most classical political, economic and legal theory would seem to be over-dosed with disconnectionism, which gained ascendency in Western Civilization during the Renaissance and the Reformation (MacPherson, 1962; Macfarlane, 1978). Property as stewardship, entailing responsibility and social utility, held sway in earlier periods, albeit with highly religious overtones (Avila, 1983; Schlatter, 1951). It may
be that a feminist theory of ownership would serve as a re-Renaissance, to bring back some balance between connectionist and disconnectionist perspectives. Rose's (1990) recent feminist focus on property seems to be just such an attempt.

It is also important to keep in mind that connectionism and disconnectionism need not be all or none. Bankart and Vincent (1989), writing on a similar and related dichotomy of communion (archetypally feminine) and agency (archetypally masculine), concluded that communion mitigates agency in men analogously to the way agency mitigates communion in women. These authors perceived a balanced androgeny to be an ideal state, though that is certainly not necessary for the theory.

Rather, it may be part of the role of a feminist theory of ownership to develop new interpretations and new appreciations of some traditional roles, to give those roles a new dignity in a plurality of material relationships. Hirschon (1984) and some of her contributing authors seem to take that perspective: what appears as clear objectification and exploitation of women from an outsider's ethnocentric perspective, may not be that from women's perspective within the culture. From the present data, it may be that women's readiness for affiliative relationships, is a positive property relationship and not merely a means of coping with impoverishment, dependency, or powerlessness.
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TABLE 1

Things Owned but with Little Sense of Ownership
Response Categories with Significant Gender Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>PROPORTION MENTIONING THE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Sample 1: Gen. Adults (N=320 df=1)</th>
<th>Sample 2: U.G. Students</th>
<th>Sample 3: Law Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=44; n=51)</td>
<td>Female Male</td>
<td>Female Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=76, n=28)</td>
<td>(n=49, n=72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENTIONED BY
MORE WOMEN THAN MEN

Furniture 12.0 .0005 .25 > .12 .28 > .18 .10 > .01

PUBLIC'S XXX 5.8 .02 .00 < .04 .00 < .04 .06 < .11
Gov. Property 5.5 .02 .04 < .16 .03 < .04 .08 < .13
TABLE 2

Things not Owned but with Some Sense of Ownership
Response Categories with Significant Gender Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>PROPORTION MENTIONING THE CATEGORY</th>
<th>TEST OF DIFFERENCE (N=320 df=1)</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample 1: Gen. Adults</td>
<td>Sample 2: U.G. Students</td>
<td>Sample 3: Law Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family's XXX</td>
<td>17.3 .00003</td>
<td>.34 &gt; .18</td>
<td>.63 &gt; .14</td>
<td>.51 &gt; .29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends' XXX</td>
<td>9.5 .002</td>
<td>.14 &gt; .02</td>
<td>.26 &gt; .18</td>
<td>.22 &gt; .11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>7.5 .006</td>
<td>.14 &gt; .06</td>
<td>.21 &gt; .11</td>
<td>.12 &gt; .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Site</td>
<td>6.4 .01</td>
<td>.14 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.04 &gt; .036</td>
<td>.06 &gt; .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>5.5 .02</td>
<td>.00 .00</td>
<td>.05 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.04 &gt; .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>5.1 .02</td>
<td>.05 &gt; .04</td>
<td>.09 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.18 &gt; .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View</td>
<td>4.5 .03</td>
<td>.07 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.00 .00</td>
<td>.04 &gt; .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer's XXX</td>
<td>4.4 .04</td>
<td>.23 &gt; .10</td>
<td>.04 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.08 &gt; .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs or Values</td>
<td>4.0 .05</td>
<td>.02 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.05 &gt; .04</td>
<td>.04 &gt; .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>3.8 .05</td>
<td>.05 &gt; .02</td>
<td>.05 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.06 &gt; .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Number of Items Mentioned (t=2.2, df=318)
- .03
- 3.70 > 3.68
- 4.57 > 3.32
- 4.37 > 3.79

Mentioned by More Women than Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>PROPORTION MENTIONING THE CATEGORY</th>
<th>TEST OF DIFFERENCE (N=320 df=1)</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample 1: Gen. Adults</td>
<td>Sample 2: U.G. Students</td>
<td>Sample 3: Law Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public's XXX</td>
<td>11.7 .0006</td>
<td>.11 &lt; .24</td>
<td>.01 &lt; .07</td>
<td>.16 &lt; .26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Property</td>
<td>7.0 .008</td>
<td>.18 &lt; .24</td>
<td>.03 &lt; .07</td>
<td>.12 &lt; .22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks or Lakes</td>
<td>6.0 .01</td>
<td>.27 &lt; .41</td>
<td>.05 &lt; .07</td>
<td>.22 &lt; .25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared XXX</td>
<td>4.3 .04</td>
<td>.00 .00</td>
<td>.01 &lt; .07</td>
<td>.00 &lt; .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

Descriptions of the Sense of Ownership
Response Categories with Significant Gender Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>PROPORTION MENTIONING THE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Test of Difference</th>
<th>Sample 1: Gen. Adults (N=320 df=1)</th>
<th>Sample 2: U.G. Students (n=76, n=28)</th>
<th>Sample 3: Law Students (n=49, n=72)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female (n=44; n=51)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.18 &gt; .10</td>
<td>.26 &gt; .11</td>
<td>.16 &gt; .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.07 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.17 &gt; .04</td>
<td>.06 &gt; .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.16 &gt; .04</td>
<td>.08 &gt; .00</td>
<td>.02 &gt; .00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENTIONED BY
MORE WOMEN THAN MEN
- Responsible for: 8.8, p = .003, Female > Male
- Self: 8.8, p = .003, Female > Male
- Pride: 8.1, p = .004, Female > Male

MENTIONED BY
MORE MEN THAN WOMEN
- Unrestrained: 10.8, p = .001, Male > Female
- Clear or No Lien: 7.2, p = .007, Male > Female
- Complete or Total: 6.6, p = .01, Male > Female
- Right: 5.2, p = .02, Male > Female
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