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Abstract

One hundred and sixty-nine Grade 12 girls completed a questionnaire on career plans. The questionnaire surveyed job choices, education, and family plans. The Self-efficacy Instrument was developed to measure self-efficacy for jobs of different prestige levels and gender compositions.

It was hypothesized that the girls' career plans would differ according to socioeconomic status (SES) background. Using Blishen and Carroll's (1978) socioeconomic status index to rate the occupations of the participants' parents, the girls were divided into three SES groups: high \((N = 48)\), moderate \((N = 51)\), and low \((N = 70)\).

Analyses of variance and post hoc comparisons revealed that high SES girls differed from low SES girls in several aspects. High SES girls chose jobs at a higher prestige level, chose more nontraditional jobs, and planned to complete higher levels of education. On the Self-efficacy Instrument high SES girls expressed greater self-efficacy for high prestige jobs than did low SES girls. Moderate SES girls tended to be in between the two groups and did not differ significantly from either group.
The differences in career plans according to SES background have implications for educators. Career programs designed to advance the status of women in the labour force have often encouraged girls to enter nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level. These programs may not be useful to low SES girls. Alternative programs are discussed in reference to the findings of the present study.
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Introduction

The recent influx of women into the labour market has been a major change affecting society's economic, social, and political structures. Less remarkable is the fact that women continue to be concentrated in traditionally female occupations. Little changed between 1962, when 61.2% of all female employees were in clerical, service, and sales occupations, and 1981, when 60.1% of women were in these same occupations (Statistics Canada, 1985).

The restriction of occupational choices for women is not desirable for several reasons. Women are at an economic disadvantage because they choose low-income occupations and also because job opportunities are diminishing in the traditionally female areas (Brito & Jusenius, 1978; Menzies, 1981). Menzies has pointed out that electronic technology is doing more of the information processing in all industries; but the effect will be strongest on the service sector, where nearly half of the work involves information handling. The service sector is primarily made up of female workers: secretaries, bank tellers, cashiers, mail handlers, and related supervisory personnel.

Aside from the economic disadvantages, it seems unlikely that women are actualizing their interests and
abilities through work given their narrow range of occupations. If men's occupations reflect their diverse personalities and intellectual capacities, then women's occupations may only reflect their sex.

Over the past 20 years the women's liberation movement (WLM) has been a major force in encouraging women to consider their economic needs and personal satisfaction in choosing a career. The National Action Committee for the Status of Women, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, and various feminist organizations have been working to change attitudes and lobby for policies and legislation to facilitate change in women's employment patterns.

Despite the high profile of the women's movement, Statistics Canada does not show a parallel change in a gender segregated labour force. Similarly in the United States social scientists (e.g., Herzog, 1982; Stromberg, 1978) have noted that gender typing in the labour force has been resistant to social change. Herzog's explanation for continued segregation in spite of 20 years of work by the women's movement is that attitudes are changing only in that women are "allowed" into the workforce. If they work outside the home, they are expected to enter traditionally female jobs.
Another possible explanation for the segregated labour force is that changes in career choice and work behaviour vary according to socioeconomic status (SES). Perhaps a higher proportion of women from middle and upper SES backgrounds are moving into nontraditional occupations, whereas low SES women remain in traditional female jobs. In other words, a major social change may be occurring in women's careers but primarily within the middle and upper social classes. The purpose of the present study is to compare the career plans of adolescent females from differing SES backgrounds and determine the extent to which they reflect the ideals of the WLM.

The women's movement promotes gender equality in career choices in several ways for women. One is to have women move into nontraditional jobs which usually provide higher wages and benefits than traditionally female jobs. As well, access to nontraditional jobs gives women a wider range of choices for developing potential skills.

Another aspect of gender equality is the recognition that paid employment is an important part of women's lives. Marriage and family have traditionally been considered to be the first career choice for girls and paid employment the second choice. After
describing the high poverty rate for women in Canada, the National Council of Welfare (1979) concluded that marriage is not a viable route to economic security for women. Girls who do not adequately prepare for paid employment may later find themselves severely disadvantaged.

In this research girls' job choices as well as their preparation for future employment were studied. Both the actual choice and the preparation are important. For example, a girl might state dentistry as a job choice but plan to start a family immediately after high school. Although the job is nontraditional and commands a high salary, it is unlikely that she will actually achieve the position given her family plans.

If there are significant class-related differences in girls' career plans such that only a select portion of the female population is moving toward viable career options, then those working towards gender equality, particularly in career-planning programs, must also address the issue of class.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are used in the discussion of SES background and women's career plans.
Career. A career is the life plan which includes work in the home, community, and/or labour force as well as education and family plans. Career is often used to mean paid employment, but this excludes homemaking and childcare--work that is important in the life plans of most women (Astin, 1985). The terms "occupation" and "job" will refer to paid work and not include homemaking, which is rarely a salaried position.

Occupational Prestige. Prestige reflects the income and social status of an occupation. A high prestige occupation usually carries a high salary and considerable social status, while a low prestige job brings less pay or status. There are exceptions and prestige is not always a direct measure of income. Nevertheless, prestige does indicate income to some extent and can be used to evaluate whether girls are choosing jobs which will advance their economic independence.

Gender Composition. The gender composition of the job choice is a measure of whether girls are moving beyond the narrow range of traditional jobs into nontraditional areas. The following categories are those used by Farmer (1983).

Nontraditional Occupation: less than 35% of the
employees are females.

Traditional Occupation: over 65% of the employees are female.

Balanced Occupation: 35% to 65% of the employees are females.

Some researchers omit the balanced category in which case nontraditional occupations have less than 50% female employees and traditional occupations have more than 50% female employees. The criteria for gender composition will be noted when citing previous research.

**Job Orientation.** Job orientation is the importance a girl places on having a job. She may see the job as a source of personal fulfillment and/or as an economic necessity. In either case paid employment plays a prominent role in her future career, and she makes education and family plans accordingly. A highly job oriented girl might also place a high value on family. One does not have to be to the exclusion of the other although pursuing both often requires compromise.
Review of the Literature

The study of social class and female career plans draws on sociological and psychological research. The basic approach of each discipline will be outlined before discussing specific research findings. Although there is considerable overlap between the two disciplines, in general sociologists have examined the relationship between social class background and the prestige of the job choice, particularly as it applies to males. Psychologists, on the other hand, have studied gender differences in career plans with less attention to social class background.

Several sociologists have used the Wisconsin Model to study the relationship between SES and career plans (e.g., Jencks, Crouse, & Mueser, 1983; Sewell & Shah, 1967; Treiman & Terrell, 1975). Acker (1978) criticized the use of the Wisconsin Model. She claimed that the model is male biased and the factors predicting boys' occupational choices (i.e., SES, academic ability, and parental encouragement) do not adequately predict girls' choices. Acker proposed revising the model to incorporate women's experience rather than using post hoc explanations to explain women's "deviance" from the model. A revised model would include gender role socialization and marriage
and family plans as factors affecting occupational choices.

In a later paper, Acker (1980) further criticized sociologists for failing to address the issue of where homemaker fits as an occupational choice. Although homemaking is an important part of the economic structure, those who choose to be homemakers (i.e., women) suddenly drop out of the analysis of career choice. The Wisconsin Model has defined career as the prestige level of the occupation and the years of education planned. The definition is too narrow to adequately describe women's careers which almost inevitably include homemaking. Sociological studies are relevant to the present study because they provide models and data on SES background and the prestige of the job choice.

Much of the psychological research has focused on the traditional-nontraditional dimension of women's job choice and family plans. Such studies have compared women in traditional and nontraditional fields on background characteristics (Greenfield, Greiner, & Wood, 1980; Hennig & Jardim, 1977) or internal traits such as gender-role orientation (Lemkau, 1983), or locus of control (Burlin, 1976). Other studies have examined the relationship between family plans and
gender typing of the occupational choice (e.g., Greenglass & Devins, 1982; Schroeder, 1981).

The psychological literature has developed a comprehensive definition of women's careers that includes childrearing (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983). Researchers have been particularly interested in nontraditional roles for women both in the home and the labour force. The research samples, however, are usually drawn from college populations (Nieva & Gutek, 1981). The samples are biased toward a higher social class, and the results are not necessarily generalizable to low SES women. Not only are the women from a select population, but because they are enrolled in post-secondary education, their job choices are likely to be at a high prestige level and preclude occupations requiring less education. The traits that distinguish between women in law and nursing might not distinguish between women in carpentry and secretarial school.

Because both gender composition of the occupation as well as the prestige level are of interest for this study, examining the job choices of females is more complex than examining those of males. Few boys express interest in traditionally female occupations (Farmer, 1983; Looker & McNutt, 1986). Their job
choices can be assessed according to prestige level as gender composition does not vary. Girls do consider nontraditional and traditional occupations, and the interaction between the gender composition and prestige of the job becomes relevant in assessing their choices.

Nontraditional jobs offer more than the opportunity to develop different interests and abilities. If a girl wants a truly high prestige job, then she would be well-advised to consider nontraditional jobs. Few of the high prestige traditional jobs such as nurse or primary teacher reach the same levels of prestige as nontraditional jobs such as physician and lawyer (Acker, 1980). Furthermore, prestige is usually a composite score based on education and income (e.g., Blishen & McRoberts, 1976). Low prestige female jobs often require more education than low prestige male jobs, but the income is higher for the male jobs. As a result, a clerical worker is at the same prestige level as a construction labourer, but the clerical worker's income is considerably lower. One way for women to increase their income without going into high prestige jobs which require university education is to move across the gender divisions into male-dominated fields.
To maintain clarity in discussing prestige and gender typing of jobs, a model of career choice developed by Gottfredson (1981) is useful. Gottfredson's model examines job choices according to gender composition and prestige. The model serves as a map from which to discuss past findings and make predictions regarding SES and female occupational choices.

According to Gottfredson, stages of career decision-making are closely linked to cognitive development. By the age of eight, children have become gender conscious and categorize activities, including occupations, according to gender. In their image of possible occupations they eliminate those which are "inappropriate" to their own gender. In the next stage of cognitive development children become aware of social class differences and further limit their choices to prestige levels which they believe to be appropriate to their own class. Gottfredson describes the children as forming a "cognitive occupational map." In high school adolescents make career choices supposedly based on their interests and abilities. Their choices, however, are within the gender and class confines previously established.
Figure 1 depicts Gottfredson's cognitive occupational map and includes examples of occupations for each gender-prestige category. Theoretically, at an early age girls feel free to choose jobs from anyplace on the map but later learn to restrict their choices to traditional jobs. They then further restrict their choices to the prestige level equal to their own SES background.

Gottfredson predicted that because gender identity is established early in development, gender-related attitudes will be extremely resistant to change. Adolescents will first make changes in their job choice according to interest and ability, then consider changes in the prestige level if necessary, but will be most reluctant to consider jobs outside their gender appropriate category. For example, if a girl's first choice is nursing, the model would predict that she would be more willing to change to teaching than business management. Both nurse and teacher are in the traditional, high prestige category and only differ in field. Even though management is at a similar prestige level, it is gender inappropriate and, therefore, a more difficult transition.

Gottfredson also suggested that it is easier to choose an occupation in a prestige level below than
above one's social class; that is, a high SES girl can more easily go into secretarial work (moderate prestige) than a low SES girl can go into nursing (high prestige).

Gottfredson maintained that class and gender restrictions in occupational choices will continue unless there is a major social change. Although several social scientists (e.g., Astin, 1985; Fitzgerald & Betz, 1985, Herzog, 1982) regard the WLM as a major social change, Gottfredson did not offer direction on how it might affect the career choices of adolescents. If the WLM is having an influence on women's careers, then there might be "movement" on Gottfredson's map. As paid employment takes on greater importance for girls, they might consider nontraditional jobs for the income and/or status offered as well as for the opportunity to develop their abilities through work.

Strober (1986) has pointed out the increase in the numbers of women entering nontraditional fields at the high prestige rather than low prestige level. For example, in the United States 8% of the law degrees went to women in 1973 compared to 36% in 1983 (Strober, p. 6). There has not been a parallel shift in women's entry into low prestige nontraditional jobs.
Gottfredson's model has relevance in examining the trend toward high prestige nontraditional jobs for women. Based on her theory that high SES girls will feel confident to perform at high prestige jobs, it seems more likely for high SES girls (cf. low SES girls) to move into professional nontraditional occupations. For low SES girls, moving out of the low prestige female jobs requires crossing two barriers: gender and prestige. Low SES girls are unlikely to have the financial resources to pursue high prestige jobs even if they make the adjustment in self-perception to see themselves in such jobs. Prestige does not serve as the same barrier to high SES girls. Furthermore, Gottfredson noted the "macho" ideology among blue-collar workers which makes them highly resistant to accepting female coworkers. Gottfredson's theories and current trends in occupational desegregation suggest that attempts by the WLM to encourage girls into nontraditional jobs may be more feasible at the high prestige level in which case high SES girls could have an advantage over low SES girls.

The remaining sections of the literature review examine research on adolescent career choices. Studies on the prestige level of occupational choices are first
reviewed, followed by studies on the gender composition. The final section looks at job orientation. The studies are reviewed for information on possible SES differences in female career plans as well as trends over time which might reflect the influence of the women's liberation movement.

**Job Choice: Prestige Level**

The positive relationship between SES background and the prestige level of occupational choice is well documented for males but less conclusive for females (Marini, 1978). Picou and Curry (1973) found the correlation between SES and adolescent job choices lower for females than males but, nevertheless, significant for both sexes. In a state-wide Virginia study, Garrison (1979) compared the prestige level of job choices of Grade 12 students in three cohort groups (1970, 1973, & 1976). The relationship between SES and expectations was significant only for males although there was a trend for more high SES females in the 1976 cohort (cf. the two earlier cohort groups) to choose jobs at the professional levels. Tully, Stephan, and Chance (1975) examined the job choices of young adolescents (N = 1,688) and concluded that SES was a predictor of job prestige for boys but not girls. Acker (1978) and Marini (1978) both came to a similar
conclusion after reviewing the literature on adolescent career plans.

Marini (1978) proposed that boys are highly motivated to achieve status and income through an occupation and, consequently, use all available family resources to advance their careers. Males with substantial family resources can expect the support necessary to attain higher education and job prestige; those with little financial backing from their families lower their expectations accordingly. Females have been less likely to seek status and income through paid employment and, therefore, have not drawn on family resources in the same way males have.

Peterson, Rollins, Thomas, and Heaps (1982) presented a slightly different analysis than Marini: family resources are not offered to girls at any SES level. In their study families participated in a career game which required decisions for the children's education and job plans. Regardless of SES background, sons were encouraged more than daughters to advance their occupational status.

Marini speculated that with changes in attitudes toward women's employment, more women might want to attain status and income through a job, and SES could become a stronger variable in women's career plans.
Similarly, with respect to Peterson et al. (1982), parents may now be more supportive of their daughter's future employment. The relationship between SES and female job choices might be stronger now than it was in the past.

Several researchers have examined adolescent values around career choices. Although values may not necessarily be acted upon when making the actual job choice, there is evidence that high SES girls are more likely than low SES girls to value prestige in making job choices.

Block, Denker, and Tittle (1981) studied the interaction between gender and class for career values of Grade 11 students. The gender differences were consistent for both SES groups (low and moderate); for example, boys valued practical aspects of jobs and girls valued being helpful to others. The gender difference was stronger than SES differences except for prestige. The moderate SES males had the highest score for this value, but the moderate SES females were second and scored higher than the low SES males. These data lend some support to Gottfredson's theory that adolescents choose occupations at a prestige level similar to their own social class. In valuing prestige, however, the high SES girls might then be
attracted to the nontraditional professions despite the gender barrier.

In a study of adolescent females by Omvig and Thomas (1974) an inner-city low SES group expressed interest in service jobs while a sample of moderate SES females in suburban schools wanted jobs in the arts and music. Omvig and Thomas concluded that the low SES girls had an immediate need to earn money and perceived service jobs as an accessible means of income.

McLaughlin, Hunt, and Montgomery (1976) compared the career values of high school females according to SES background and arrived at a similar conclusion: immediate economic security was important to the low SES girls; they were satisfied with less education and saw education as a skills developer unlike the high SES girls who saw education as a means of "self-actualization."

It not clear whether low SES girls have certain values that lead them into low prestige traditional work, or whether they form their values according to the type of work available. The issue is beyond the scope of the present study, but the findings regarding values are relevant because they further confirm the finding that low SES girls choose low prestige traditional work.
High SES girls may differ from low SES girls in their values but not necessarily want higher prestige choices. Although Block, Denker, and Tittle (1981) found higher SES girls to value prestige, a career in the arts or attempting to self-actualize cannot necessarily be equated with valuing status and income. It is important to note that values differed according to SES background and that low SES girls had values congruent with selecting low prestige traditional jobs.

**Ideal and Expected Choice.** Laws (1976) criticized the career literature for failing to distinguish between ideal choices and expectations. Kaufman and Richardson (1982) also commented on the methodology used in studying job choice. They concluded that asking for the ideal job choice gives information about social norms while the expected job choice gives information about social class differences. There is support in the literature, particularly with male samples, that ideal job choices are in the higher prestige levels and do not differ according to SES background. People from all social class backgrounds see the higher prestige jobs as desirable. When respondents are asked for the job they actually expect to enter, however, the choices differ according to SES background. High SES subjects ideally want and expect
to attain higher prestige jobs whereas low SES subjects want higher prestige jobs but realistically expect to attain jobs at a lower prestige level. The discrepancy between the ideal and expected job is greater for low SES subjects than for high SES subjects (Bogie & Bogie, 1976; Cosby & Picou, 1971).

Several researchers have looked specifically at the discrepancy between females' ideal and expected jobs. Bogie and Bogie (1976) examined the career choices of 600 adolescents (approximately half were females) in rural schools. Among the girls there was a significant class difference reflecting a greater amount of discrepancy for low SES girls than moderate or high SES girls. Glaze (1979) studied the ideal and expected career choices of adolescent females in Ontario. Although not statistically significant, the amount of disparity was also greatest for low SES girls.

Farmer (1983) predicted a discrepancy between ideal and expected jobs but her prediction was not supported. In her study (N = 1,234) the students represented a range of SES and racial background and the schools were balanced according to urban, rural, and inner-city location. The prestige level of the expected jobs for the girls was significantly higher
than that of the boys. This finding supports Marini's (1978) hypothesis that girls today will seek high prestige jobs. Furthermore, the girls seemed to believe that these jobs were attainable. Farmer's purpose was to examine gender differences in job choices, so she did not report whether the prestige level varied according to the SES of the females.

In the past the relationship between SES and prestige of job choice has been stronger for males than females. High prestige jobs may have been considered inappropriate for females of all social classes, but with the advent of the women's movement these jobs may now be more socially acceptable (Marini, 1978). The findings of Bogie and Bogie (1976) suggest that girls in all social classes ideally want high prestige jobs, but expectations vary by social class background. Because low SES girls cannot draw on family resources to seek high prestige jobs, their expectations are lowered. Further investigation of possible discrepancies between ideals and expectations is warranted. Glaze (1979) found a nonsignificant trend for low SES girls to lower their expectations, and Farmer (1983) found no discrepancy even though the girls in her study had chosen jobs at a high prestige level.
**Job Choice: Gender Composition**

The women's movement has worked toward equal opportunity in the labour force and encouraged girls to enter nontraditional fields. Because discrimination still exists, girls might perceive traditional jobs as realistic choices even though nontraditional jobs are appealing. If girls have been influenced by the women's movement, the influence is more likely to be reflected in their ideal than their expected choices. Several researchers have compared the gender composition of the ideal and expected job choices, and these studies will be reviewed first. The second part of the review will examine studies on the gender composition of the expected job and SES background.

In general more girls state a nontraditional job as the ideal rather than expected choice. The reverse seldom occurs; that is, few girls ideally want a traditional job but realistically expect to have a nontraditional job (e.g., wanting to be a nurse but expecting to be a lawyer). Three recent studies using large samples of adolescents support the theory that a nontraditional job is more likely to be the ideal than the expectation. Currie (1982) surveyed 7,210 Australian adolescents (approximately half females) and found that female ideal choices included a greater
range of occupations and were more nontraditional than their expected choices. Three traditional occupations accounted for 50% of the girls' expected choices.

Marini and Greenberger (1978b) analysed the 1968 data from 2,495 Grade 11 students in Pennsylvania. They categorized traditional jobs as having over half females and nontraditional jobs as less than half females. In their sample 33% of the females chose nontraditional jobs as their ideal but only 25% expected to have a nontraditional job. Farmer (1983) set more stringent categories for gender typing (i.e., those used in the present study). Of the 655 females in her sample, 35% aspired to nontraditional jobs and 35% expected them.

None of the above studies noted the SES background of the females. When Glaze (1979) examined ideals and expectations she found that choices differed by SES background. Although the trend was not statistically significant, it is worth noting. There were no differences in the percentage of girls from each SES group ideally wanting nontraditional jobs. However, high and moderate SES girls ideally wanting nontraditional jobs were slightly more likely than low SES girls to also expect to attain them.
Although an interest in nontraditional jobs was examined in these studies, there is no information as to whether these are low prestige or high prestige jobs. Leuptow (1981), Herzog (1982), and Garrison (1979) suggested that adolescent girls are shifting their choices to high prestige occupations that were male-dominated in the past. The researchers did not examine ideals but compared the expected plans of high school seniors from different cohort groups (1964 to 1976). The major change over time was that more girls in the recent groups were choosing managerial and professional jobs. Garrison and Herzog classified jobs in hierarchical levels graded by education. Professions requiring a doctorate were in the top level and unskilled labour jobs were in the lowest level. Both investigators found more girls choosing professional jobs over clerical and sales jobs. Garrison also included the SES background of the students in his analysis of the data. He found a trend for more of the high SES girls (cf. low SES girls) to choose the professional jobs but the trend was not statistically significant.

The studies cited on the gender composition of the job choice have used adolescent samples. Only Garrison (1979) and Glaze (1979) noted SES background, and in
both cases it was not a significant factor. There was a tendency, however, for more high SES girls than low SES girls to choose nontraditional jobs.

Several studies comparing college women in traditional and nontraditional fields have not found SES to be a significant demographic variable. Tangri (1972) reported more high SES (cf. low SES) college women to be enrolled in nontraditional fields, but the trend was not significant. Zuckerman (1980) looked at undergraduates at a women's college. A high proportion of the women were in nontraditional fields and SES was not a significant factor.

Zuckerman concluded that in the past high SES parents might have been more liberal and encouraged their daughters to enter nontraditional careers. Today, however, (in Zuckerman's view) widespread societal acceptance of nontraditional roles for women reduces the need for parental support. She noted, however, that there was little range in SES background in her sample and was in the process of examining the college majors of women from a wider SES range.

Studies at the college level suggest that SES is not a major variable in predicting enrolment patterns. College populations, however, have a restricted range of SES backgrounds. A study of juvenile girls by
Kenkel and Bruce (1983), indicates that the majority of low SES females are heading toward traditional jobs. In 1969 Kenkel and Bruce determined the job choices of approximately 500 low SES rural females in Grade 5 and then surveyed the same girls in 1975. They did not compare their sample to other SES populations but reported a high percentage of girls choosing traditional over nontraditional jobs (78% vs 9% respectively). The gender typing of the job was determined by a criterion of 50% male or female employees.

One interpretation of these studies is that because the majority of college women are from a high SES background, they are liberal in their views of gender roles. Low SES females, on the other hand, are less accepting of nontraditional roles for women; those few low SES girls going on to college may be different and hold less rigid attitudes.

Davidson and Davidson (1977) suggested that there is a bias among social scientists to see middle-class families as more liberal than working-class families in their attitudes toward gender roles. This bias can lead to "blaming the victim": low SES girls do not seek nontraditional jobs because they hold stereotyped views of gender roles.
An alternate interpretation, as discussed earlier, is that high SES girls have access to the high prestige nontraditional jobs which usually require college education. It is not a difference in attitude that leads high SES girls into nontraditional jobs but rather a difference in opportunities. Several studies in which subjects were asked to rate the gender appropriateness of jobs have not found differences between SES groups. Dunne (1980) found low SES males to hold more stereotyped views about occupations than did high SES males, but SES was not a factor for the females' attitudes.

Medvene and Collins (1974) surveyed four groups of women for their attitudes regarding the gender appropriateness of various occupations. The feminist group, a university student women's caucus, rated more jobs as appropriate for women than did the secretaries, students, and unemployed. All groups, however, saw blue-collar male jobs as less appropriate for women than professional male jobs.

In summary several studies have reported a discrepancy between the ideal and expected job choices, the ideal being more nontraditional than the expected (Currie, 1982; Glaze, 1979; Marini & Greenberger, 1978b). The discrepancy might seem logical given the
difficulties faced by women entering nontraditional jobs. Farmer (1983), however, did not find a discrepancy; the girls ideally wanting nontraditional jobs also expected to attain them.

The research is also inconclusive on whether differences exist between SES groups on the gender composition of the job choice. Glaze (1979) reported all SES groups in her sample as having similar ideals. The low SES girls ideally wanting nontraditional jobs, however, were more likely to change their expectations to traditional jobs. Studies on expected job choices have conflicting results. Kenkel and Bruce (1983) found a high percentage of low SES girls choosing traditional occupations. Tangri (1972) and Garrison (1979) reported more high SES girls than low SES girls choosing nontraditional jobs, but the trend was not statistically significant.

Studies on gender role attitudes do not report SES differences, so there seems little reason to believe that ideals will differ between SES groups. Expectations might differ because high SES girls feel more confident than low SES girls to enter nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level. Medvene and Collins (1974) found that women generally considered high prestige nontraditional jobs as more
appropriate for women than low prestige jobs, so it seems unlikely that low SES girls will expect to enter nontraditional jobs at the low prestige level.

The distinction between ideals and expectations is an important one for researching the gender composition of the job choice. The research to date is inconclusive as to whether discrepancies exist between ideals and expectations or whether SES groups differ in their choices. Possibly ideals do not differ by SES group, but there is a discrepancy for low SES girls because they do not expect to attain nontraditional jobs. As a result more of the low SES than high SES girls expect traditional jobs.

**Self-efficacy and Job Choice**

Recently the concept of "self-efficacy" has been used to study career choices. Hackett and Betz (1981) developed the concept from social learning theory and applied it to career expectations. Through performance, verbal persuasion, and vicarious learning adolescents develop self-efficacy or "expectations or beliefs that one can successfully perform a given behavior" (p. 328). Hackett and Betz were interested in self-efficacy for gender-typed occupations and constructed an instrument which listed ten traditional and ten nontraditional occupations. Respondents used a
Likert scale to rate their ability to perform each occupation. In their survey of college students, females expressed lower self-efficacy for traditionally male jobs than traditionally female jobs whereas males did not differentiate according to the gender composition of the job.

After Hackett and Betz determined a gender difference in self-efficacy, a follow up study by Betz and Hackett (1981) found that women's actual job choices were related to their self-efficacy scores. Women did not choose jobs from areas in which they expressed low self-efficacy. In the Betz and Hackett study there was no gender difference in college entrance scores or grade point average, yet females had lower self-efficacy ratings than males for some nontraditional jobs and were less likely to express interest in pursuing those jobs.

Brown and Lent (1984) have recommended further studies of self-efficacy based on job prestige as well as gender composition. They proposed research questions such as: Do women express low self-efficacy for high prestige jobs as well as nontraditional jobs? How does SES background relate to self-efficacy for jobs of differing prestige levels? These questions are of interest to the present study as well as the
possible difference between SES groups in self-efficacy for nontraditional jobs.

The studies reviewed thus far have analysed the prestige level or gender composition of the ideal and expected job choices. Self-efficacy studies offer a further examination of attitudes toward prestige and gender typing. For example, rather than determining the prestige level of the final choice, the respondent's self-efficacy scores for jobs in high, moderate, and low prestige levels can be compared. This provides information on attitudes toward the jobs that were not chosen.

Self-efficacy is particularly relevant to Gottfredson's (1981) model. She hypothesized that adolescents will view certain jobs as appropriate based on their own gender and social class. The term "appropriate" is not synonymous with "self-efficacy." A girl might believe she is highly capable of a nontraditional job but not choose the job because it is seen as inappropriate for females. Gottfredson predicted that low SES girls would perceive high prestige jobs as inappropriate and not feel confident to perform in them whereas high SES girls would see low prestige jobs as inappropriate but still feel confident to perform in them. Seeing a job as inappropriate does
not necessarily harm self-esteem. When inappropriate is also equated with one's own lack of ability, there is the potential for harm. Not only can self-esteem suffer but the range of choices becomes restricted. Investigating girls' self-efficacy for jobs varying in prestige level and gender composition furthers the understanding of SES differences in job choice and expands on Gottfredson's model.

Job Orientation

It is important that young women perceive themselves as future wage earners. As pointed out by the National Council of Welfare (1979), girls are being unrealistic to assume they will have economic security as full-time homemakers. Preparation for future employment includes making appropriate education and family plans.

Education is an investment in one's future job prospects, and several studies indicate that girls with plans for post-secondary education are highly job oriented. In studies of senior high school students Glaze (1979) found education plans to have a strong correlation with expected job commitment; and Astin and Myint (1971) found Grade 12 education plans to be the best predictor of actual job commitment five years after graduation.
When examining educational plans, there is considerable evidence that high SES girls have an advantage over low SES girls. Although SES is not a strong predictor of occupational prestige for females, it is a strong predictor of educational plans (Marini & Greenberger, 1978a; Sewell & Shah, 1967). Furthermore, in a longitudinal study by Card, Steel, and Abeles (1980) high SES women were more likely than low SES women to actually complete university levels of education.

Another aspect of education that is particularly important at the high school level is the number of mathematics courses taken. Sells (1980) referred to mathematics as the "critical filter" because not having mathematics courses severely restricts the range of job options. High SES girls may have an advantage here as well. Sherman (1982), in replicating an earlier study, found that more girls completing four years of high school mathematics were from higher SES families than girls completing fewer years.

With the current economic and social changes, the critical decision for girls may no longer be whether to enter the labour force but rather how much time they can afford to spend outside the labour force. Appelbaum (1981) studied women reentering the workforce
after full-time childrearing. She concluded that after three years, chances for successful reentry were considerably reduced. Time commitment to a job is not only an indication of the importance of the job to the girl but also an assessment of her chances for maintaining a position in the workforce.

Studies of college women show a strong correlation between family and education plans, and the importance of paid employment. Women who value paid employment are likely to seek more university degrees and rate family as less important to their psychological well-being (Greenglass & Devins, 1982). They also plan to have a family at a later age and to take less time out of their job for childrearing (Komarovsky, 1982; Tangri, 1972). When comparing women in traditional and nontraditional fields, several researchers report nontraditional women having a stronger orientation to a job than family (Shann, 1983; Tangri, 1972). Shann suggested that traditional jobs are more compatible with childrearing responsibilities. The preparation for and structure of nontraditional jobs create "role overload" for women wanting both a job and family.

The studies cited suggest that in valuing a job, particularly a nontraditional high prestige job, girls will have plans for higher education and expect to
spend less time in family work. The relationships among education, job choice, and job orientation may not be straightforward, however, when SES is included as a variable.

The research on low SES girls and job orientation presents two opposing views. Several researchers have proposed that low SES girls seek marriage and homemaking as a career and do not plan to combine job and family. Wright (1978) suggested that the working-class mother who has a low status paid job is not an attractive role model, and her daughter is more likely to want to be a full-time homemaker. Rubin (1976) drew similar conclusions from her study of low SES families. She suggested that marriage is not only an alternative to undesirable job prospects but an escape from an oppressive family situation.

In Smith's (1980) survey of high school girls, daughters of blue-collar mothers preferred the full-time homemaker role but expected to have paid employment. The moderate SES girls were more likely to want both a job and family. Smith's data were collected in 1965. A more recent study by Herzog (1982) examined girls' career choices from 1976 to 1980. She noted a significant decrease in the number of noncollege bound girls expecting to be full-time
homemakers. Possibly the noncollege girls ideally wanted to be homemakers but changes in the economy made it apparent that they would have to earn an income. Alternatively, with changing social attitudes toward the value of employment for women, more women regardless of their job options might want full-time employment.

Ferree (1984) criticized the comparison between low and moderate SES women. She questioned the validity of concluding that low SES women are less job oriented because their job options are not as attractive as the moderate SES women. Instead she suggested that low SES women are comparable to blue-collar males: both value a job for the income and social contact rather than the intrinsic rewards that the professional seeks. Furthermore, Ferree suggested that in working-class families the woman's income is likely to be important to the family's well-being, and her role as a provider will draw respect. Because the middle-class woman's income is less important to the family, Ferree portrays her as promising her family that nothing will change if she takes a job (i.e., housework and family care will continue at the same standard).
It is questionable whether the middle-class woman's income is merely perceived as "pin money." Ferree does, however, raise an important point when she suggests that the low SES woman might value a job for the same reasons as blue-collar males and thus be highly job oriented.

Interviews with Grade 12 girls reveal some of the problems girls have in planning the job-child aspect of their careers. Sherman (1982) interviewed girls in senior mathematics courses, many of whom were planning jobs in the sciences. The majority expected to marry and leave their jobs for several years to have children. They looked forward to having jobs but disliked the idea of a young child not having a full-time mother at home. Sherman's data are recent, so it cannot be argued that attitudes have changed, and girls no longer see full-time employment as incompatible with childrearing.

Gaskell (1983) also found grade 12 girls reluctant to spend time away from young children. The girls were from a suburban school and represented a range of SES backgrounds. The girls saw homemaking as an accessible role but not necessarily ideal. They were aware of the lack of prestige and the amount of work involved in homemaking, but they disliked the idea of being
employed and spending time away from their children. They did not want to use daycare and did not expect their husbands to take responsibility for childrearing. Homemaking seemed to be a likely choice, but the girls were adopting it with reservations.

Several studies indicate that high SES girls will be better prepared for the labour force than low SES girls in that high SES girls will plan to achieve higher levels of education (Marini & Greenberger, 1978a; Sewell & Shah, 1967) and complete more mathematics courses (Sherman, 1982).

It is not clear, however, if there are SES differences in family plans. Some research indicates that in pursuing higher education, girls also plan to devote more time to their jobs (Greenglass & Devins, 1982). The implication is that in having a professional job, women might enjoy the work and put less priority on a family. Ferree (1984), however, has challenged this line of thought and suggested that paid employment at all prestige levels is important to women.

In summary, the education plans of high SES girls may reflect a better preparation for the workforce, but plans to combine family and paid work may not differ according to SES.
Hypotheses

1. (a) The prestige of the ideal job will not differ according to SES, but
   (b) the prestige of the expected job will be higher for high SES girls than low SES girls, and moderate SES girls will be in between the other two groups.
   (Questionnaire items 6 & 7)

2. (a) The gender composition of the ideal job will not differ for SES groups, but
   (b) more high SES girls than low SES girls will expect to attain nontraditional jobs, and moderate SES girls will be in between the other two groups.
   (Questionnaire items 6 & 7)

3. Although nontraditional jobs exist at all prestige levels, (a) girls will choose such jobs at the high prestige level but not the low prestige level, and
   (b) this pattern of choosing high prestige nontraditional jobs will not vary with SES.
   (Questionnaire items 6 & 7)

4. (a) According to Gottfredson's (1981) model, moderate and low SES girls will express lower self-efficacy as the prestige level of the job increases, whereas high SES girls will not; consequently,
(b) high SES girls will have higher self-efficacy scores than low SES girls at the high prestige level with moderate SES girls between the other two groups.

(Part II. Self-efficacy Instrument)

5. High SES girls will express greater self-efficacy for nontraditional jobs than will low SES girls.

(Part II. Self-efficacy Instrument)

6. High SES girls will plan to attain higher levels of education than will low SES girls.

(Questionnaire items 2 & 3)

7. Will the SES groups differ in family plans?

(Questionnaire items 8, 9, 10, & 11)
Method

Pilot Study

A questionnaire investigating the relevant research questions was piloted with 176 grade 12 students in an urban school. Only the data from the 86 females were analysed. Results showed significant SES differences in job choices and thus confirmed the suitability of further investigation. Some of the questions related to job orientation did not produce significant differences; however, two of the questions might have lacked clarity and were reworded for the final study. The pilot also provided reliability information for an instrument that was developed to measure self-efficacy. The instrument will be discussed later.

Participants

Questionnaires were completed by 173 Grade 12 females in two urban schools. To ensure a range of SES backgrounds, schools serving high and low income areas were selected. Income levels were determined by a 1978 school board survey of the household incomes for the district.

Questionnaires were administered during English classes. All Grade 12 students are required to take English, so the study sample is unlikely to contain the
select group of students that might be in an Algebra or Home Economics class.

**Instruments**

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to gather information on SES background, job choice, job orientation, and self-efficacy. In the first part of the questionnaire students responded to open-ended questions about their parents' occupations and their own ideal and expected job choices. Job orientation was investigated through multiple choice questions concerning education plans, mathematics courses taken, and family plans. There was one open-ended question for the age at which the girl intended to have her first child.

**Self-efficacy Instrument.** Part II of the questionnaire was an instrument designed to measure self-efficacy for jobs in different prestige and gender composition categories. The instrument will be referred to as the "Self-efficacy Instrument." The format is similar to that used by Hackett and Betz (1981) where students were given a list of 20 jobs and asked to rate on a five point Likert type response set their ability to perform each one. For the Self-efficacy Instrument jobs were selected not only according to gender composition as in the Hackett and
Betz study but also prestige level. Jobs were selected from three levels of prestige (high, moderate, low) and gender composition (nontraditional, balanced, traditional), giving the instrument nine categories (e.g., high prestige nontraditional jobs, moderate prestige nontraditional jobs, etc.). Four criteria were used to organize the selection of jobs: prestige, gender, field of interest, and perceptions of jobs.

Using Blishen and Carroll's 1978 socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada, a large pool of occupations was sorted into three prestige levels. Blishen and McRoberts (1976) divided the prestige scores into six SES levels. For the present study the six levels were collapsed into three: high (60 points or over), moderate (40 - 59 points), and low (fewer than 40 points). Occupations at each prestige level were then categorized into traditional (over 65% female employees), balanced (35 - 65% females), and nontraditional (less than 35% females), based on 1981 census figures (Statistics Canada, 1983). The categorization of jobs by prestige and gender follows Gottfredson's (1981) model (see Figure 1).

Holland (1973) developed a model of career choice based on individual interests and personality. He organized jobs into six fields of interest: Realistic,
Artistic, Conventional, Investigative, Social, and Enterprising. People best suited for jobs in any one field will supposedly share similar interests and personality traits.

Holland did not include social class or gender in his model, but Gottfredson (1978) has pointed out that there is considerable overlap among prestige, gender, and field. Most Realistic jobs (e.g., bus driver, forester, mechanic) are in the low prestige nontraditional (for females) category. Investigative jobs require university education and tend to be in the high prestige, nontraditional category. What Holland refers to as interest and personality variables may be artifacts of gender and SES.

Although some prestige-gender categories may be made up of jobs from one particular field, the Self-efficacy Instrument has several fields represented in each category. This was to ensure that gender and prestige were not confounded with interests. For example, a student rated as "Enterprising" by Holland's criteria would not be drawn to jobs in one prestige-gender category because all the jobs are Enterprising jobs. Instead, no category has more than one Enterprising job. Holland's Self-Directed Search includes a classification of jobs by field (Bedal &
Weeks, 1979). The guide was used to select jobs for each category on the Self-Efficacy Instrument.

Adolescent perceptions of jobs were used for the final selection of jobs for each category. The objective of the instrument was to determine female attitudes toward prestige and gender; therefore, it was important that the jobs listed on the instrument were actually perceived as male-dominated or low prestige jobs. Although statistically true that the majority of engineers are males, not all girls may know enough about engineering to perceive it as male-dominated. Similarly, adolescents' perceptions of prestige might differ from Blishen and Carroll's (1978) ratings.

In an attempt to establish construct validity, two studies on job perceptions were used. Shinar (1975) asked college undergraduates to estimate the gender composition of 86 jobs. The students' estimations correlated highly with the actual composition. Males and females did not differ in their estimations; however, when asked to rate jobs according to gender appropriateness, males were more stereotyped than females.

In a similar study on prestige, Plata (1975) asked adolescents to rank 23 occupations from high to low according to prestige. He found that respondents
regardless of SES, gender, or ethnic background rated the occupations in the same manner. Plata concluded that the prestige hierarchy is well-established in our society. Both Plata and Shinar published the lists of jobs with the subjects' ratings. These lists provided a check that the jobs selected for the instrument were perceived as appropriate to their category.

The selection process generated 62 jobs. A table of random numbers was used to order the placement of the jobs on the questionnaire. The instructions to the students were worded according to Hackett and Betz' (1981) definition of self-efficacy; that is, students were asked to rate their ability to do or learn to do the job. It was stressed that ability rather than interest was important.

The results from the pilot study were then used to determine the reliability within each category. The LERTAP program provided the correlation between each job rating and the score for that particular category.

Each category was reduced to 5 jobs. Hoyt's Estimate of Reliability coefficients for each category ranged from .64 to .78 with one exception: the moderate prestige balanced category had a reliability coefficient of .49. Reliability coefficients for each category are given in Table 1. It is interesting to
note that the moderate prestige balanced category is the centre point for prestige and gender composition levels. Possibly the students had a great sense of ambivalence toward "the middle" and thus the seemingly random response to those particular jobs. A less existential explanation is that many of the jobs are on opposite borderlines. One job might be just under the criterion for a high prestige category and another just above the low prestige category; consequently, students do not perceive the two jobs as similar (i.e., moderate) in prestige.

**Procedure**

The school board made the initial arrangements with participating schools, and the researcher met with the English teachers to go over the questionnaires. Teachers were told that the purpose of the study was to develop a scale for studying adolescent career choices. To standardize the administration procedure, teachers were given a brief set of written instructions.

Males and females completed the questionnaires during their regular English classes. The males' results were not part of the present study, but having the class participate as a whole group was less disruptive than separating out the female students. Furthermore, having only the girls complete the
questionnaire might have highlighted the feminist aspect of the study and affected responses. The teachers reported that the questionnaire required 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

The open-ended questions on parents' occupations and students job choices were coded and then entered into the data analysis with the multiple choice responses. The open-ended questions were for four jobs: mother's job, father's job, student's ideal choice, and student's expected choice.

Blishen and Carroll's (1978) socioeconomic index was used to rate the prestige of all four jobs. SES background was determined by the prestige level of the parent's occupation. In cases where both parents had jobs, the higher prestige level was used. Four of the parents' occupations could not be accurately assessed because the response was too vague (e.g., "construction"). The four questionnaires were eliminated leaving a sample of 169 participants. The criteria used to form the three SES groups were the same as those used for the Self-efficacy Instrument. Based on the prestige level of parents' occupations, the 169 participants were broken down into the following SES groups: high (n = 48), moderate (n = 51), and low (n = 70).
The girls' ideal and expected job choices were coded according to prestige and gender composition. Blishen and McRoberts socioeconomic index was used for the prestige score (20 to 90 points) and Statistics Canada (1983) census data on gender composition was used to categorize the jobs as traditional, balanced, and nontraditional.

More data were lost because the participant's ideal or expected job could not be accurately coded. The participants' questionnaires could still be used in other parts of the analysis, so they were not eliminated from the sample. Only one participant seemed to respond to the questionnaire in a flippant manner. She chose "5" for every item on the Self-efficacy Instrument, so her instrument results were not included in the analysis.

Data Analysis

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on the variables in each of the four interest areas: prestige of the job choice, gender composition of the job choice, the Self-efficacy Instrument, and job orientation. The first ANOVA, a 3 x 2 (SES group x Condition) design, compared the three SES groups on the prestige of the job choice using the ideal and expected condition as a repeated measures factor.
The 3 x 2 (SES group x Condition) design was also used to examine the gender composition of the job choice, again using ideal and expected choices as a repeated measures. The scores were three categorical values based on gender composition: (1) Traditional, (2) Balanced, and (3) Nontraditional and not suitable for analysis of variance. To treat the scores as proportions, the three categories were collapsed to form two categories and recoded as (0) Traditional + Balanced and (1) Nontraditional. The division was not at the 50% point but seemed appropriate given the particular interest in nontraditional choices. The proportions were then used for the ANOVA.

To examine the relationship between the gender composition and the prestige level of job choices (i.e., Hypothesis 3), a two-way ANOVA was performed. The design was 3 x 3 (SES group by prestige level) with gender composition as the dependent variable. Prestige scores and gender composition scores were averaged for the ideal and expected job choices. The mean prestige score was then categorized according to Blishen and McRoberts' (1976) criteria: high (60 points or over), moderate (40 - 59 points), and low (fewer than 40 points). Gender composition scores for each prestige level were compared to determine whether girls were
more likely to choose nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level and whether the pattern differed for SES groups.

Data from the Self-efficacy Instrument were analysed in a three-way ANOVA (SES x prestige x gender) with SES as the between-groups factor, and prestige and gender as two repeated measures. Two repeated measures in a nonorthogonal design complicates the data analysis (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). To avoid the problem of confounded effects, subjects were randomly selected from the moderate and low SES groups to equal the sample size of the high SES group (n = 47). The analyses of variance for the original sample and the revised (equal n) sample produced similar results: the main effects and interactions were significant at the same level of probability for both analyses.

Job orientation was the fourth area of interest. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test for SES differences on the six variables used to measure job orientation. Again, as in the analysis of the gender composition of job choice, scores for categorical variables in the MANOVA were treated as proportions. Because mathematics is optional after Grade 10, the responses were coded as (0) less than Math 11 and (1) Math 11 or higher. Decision to marry
was coded as (0) Yes and (1) No + Undecided.

Following each of the four analyses, simple main effects analyses were conducted on any significant interactions. Significant main effects and post hoc comparisons following the simple main effects analyses were broken down with Tukey tests. However, because the Self-efficacy Instrument was newly developed for this study, the more conservative Scheffe method was also used for it. For the Scheffe method, confidence intervals were set at the .05 level of significance. The between-groups effects and the three levels of the third factor (gender) were taken into account in computing the standard error of the difference between means (see Winer, 1971, pp. 544-551).
Results

Hypothesis 1

(a) The prestige of the ideal job will not differ according to SES, but
(b) the prestige of the expected job will be higher for high SES girls than low SES girls, and moderate SES girls will be in between the other two groups.

The 3 x 2 (SES x condition) ANOVA for the prestige level of the job choice showed a main effect for SES, $F(2, 152) = 7.30$, $p = .001$, but not condition (see Table 2). Hypothesis 1 predicted an interaction between SES and condition: all girls would ideally want high prestige jobs, but only high SES girls would expect to attain them, and low SES girls would lower their expectations. This was not found. Instead, the SES groups differed in the same way for both their ideal and expected choices. Because there was no interaction, the three groups were compared on the main effect of SES. The main effect is the mean prestige score of the ideal and expected job choices and will be referred to as the "job choice."

Tukey comparisons revealed that the prestige of the job choice was higher for the high SES group ($M = 61.64$) than the low SES group ($M = 50.99$), $q(120, 3) =$
3.80, \( p < .05 \). The moderate SES group (\( M = 57.13 \)) was in between and did not differ significantly from the other two groups.

Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. High SES girls chose higher prestige jobs than did low SES girls, but contrary to part (a) of Hypothesis 1, this pattern was the same under ideal and expected conditions.

**Hypothesis 2**

(a) The gender composition of the ideal job will not differ for SES groups, but

(b) more high SES girls than low SES girls will expect to attain nontraditional jobs, and moderate SES girls will be in between the other two groups.

As with the prestige of the job choice, there was a main effect for SES, \( F(2, 152) = 6.30, p < .01 \), but the condition (ideal or expected) was not related to the girls' choices (see Table 3).

High SES girls choose more nontraditional jobs (\( M = .53 \)) than did low SES girls (\( M = .24 \)), \( q(120, 3) = 3.55, p < .05 \). Moderate SES girls (\( M = .38 \)) were in between and did not differ significantly from the other two groups.

Table 4 provides descriptive data on the gender composition of the job choices. Of the high SES girls,
53.6% chose nontraditional jobs and 22.3% chose traditional jobs. The pattern is almost reversed for low SES girls: 23.7% chose nontraditional jobs and 41.8% chose traditional jobs.

Hypothesis 2 was partially supported in that high SES girls were more likely than low SES girls to choose nontraditional jobs. This pattern, however, was the same for both ideal and expected conditions.

Hypothesis 3

Although nontraditional jobs exist at all prestige levels, (a) girls will choose such jobs at the high prestige level but not the low prestige level, and (b) this pattern of choosing high prestige nontraditional jobs will not vary with SES.

A 3 x 3 (SES x prestige level) ANOVA showed that the gender composition of the job choice varied significantly according to prestige level, $F(2, 146) = 6.91, p = .001$, and the relationship was similar for the three SES groups.

According to Tukey post hoc comparisons, girls were more likely to choose nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level ($M = .53$) than at the low prestige level ($M = .12$), $q(120, 3) = 7.30, p < .001$. The gender composition of jobs at the high and moderate prestige level ($M = .30$) also differed significantly,
The difference between moderate and low prestige levels was not significant. Hypothesis 3 was supported. Regardless of SES background, girls were more likely to choose nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level than the moderate and low prestige level. Hypothesis 4

(a) According to Gottfredson's (1981) model, moderate and low SES girls will express lower self-efficacy as the prestige level of the job increases, whereas high SES girls will not; consequently,

(b) high SES girls will have higher self-efficacy scores than low SES girls at the high prestige level with moderate SES girls between the other two groups. On the Self-efficacy Instrument there was a significant main effect for prestige level, \( F(2, 276) = 33.09, \ p < .001 \), with girls expressing less self-efficacy for high prestige jobs (\( M = 15.24 \)) than low prestige jobs (\( M = 17.32 \)), \( q(120, 3) = 11.40, \ p < .001 \), or moderate prestige jobs (\( M = 16.53 \)), \( q(120, 3) = 7.09, \ p < .001 \). The difference between moderate and low prestige jobs was also significant, \( q(120, 3) = 4.30, \ p < .01 \).
The overall pattern was for girls to lower self-efficacy as the job prestige increased. As predicted, however, the pattern was not the same for all three SES groups; the interaction between SES and prestige level was significant, $F(4, 276) = 3.26, p < .05$ (see Figure 2). Simple main effects analyses revealed that self-efficacy differed significantly with prestige level for all three SES groups: high SES girls, $F(2, 276) = 5.60, p < .01$; moderate SES girls, $F(2, 276) = 20.17, p < .001$; and low SES girls, $F(2, 276) = 14.33, p < .001$. However, the specific pattern of differences did vary according to SES. Tukey post hoc comparisons indicated that all SES groups expressed lower self-efficacy for high prestige jobs by comparison with low prestige jobs. For low SES girls the mean self-efficacy scores for low and high prestige jobs were 16.48 and 14.29 respectively, $g(120, 3) = 6.91, p < .001$, [Scheffé, .95 CI = (1.15, 3.21)]; for moderate SES girls, the means were 17.82 (low prestige jobs) and 15.06 (high prestige jobs), $g(120, 3) = 8.72, p < .001$, [Scheffé, .95 CI = (1.73, 3.79)]; and for high SES girls the means were 17.65 (low prestige jobs) and 16.36 (high prestige jobs), $g(120, 3) = 4.10, p < .05$.

1 Confidence intervals that do not include 0 indicate a significant difference between two mean scores, $p < .05$. 
.05, [Scheffe, .95 CI = (.27, 2.33)].

The interaction between SES and prestige level of the jobs was significant because the low and moderate SES groups differentiated between moderate and high prestige jobs, whereas high SES girls did not. Low SES girls expressed greater self-efficacy for moderate (M = 16.21) than high prestige jobs (M = 14.29), \( t(120, 3) = 6.05, p < .001, [\text{Scheffe}, .95 \text{ CI} = (1.15, 3.21)] \), as did moderate SES girls (M = 16.99 for moderate prestige jobs compared to M = 15.06 for high prestige jobs), \( t(120, 3) = 6.08, p < .001, [\text{Scheffe}, .95 \text{ CI} = (.89, 2.95)] \).

A different pattern emerged for high SES girls. The point at which they significantly lowered self-efficacy was from low prestige (M = 17.65) to moderate prestige jobs (M = 16.40), \( t(120, 3) = 3.97, p < .05, [\text{Scheffe}, .95 \text{ CI} = (.22, 2.28)] \). Unlike low and moderate SES girls, high SES girls did not differentiate between moderate (M = 16.40) and high (M = 16.36) prestige jobs.

Part (a) of the hypothesis predicted that the self-efficacy of low and moderate SES groups would vary according to prestige level, whereas high SES girls would not. This was not found. All SES groups expressed less self-efficacy as the job prestige
increased, but high SES girls formed a different pattern than the other two groups.

All SES groups had the lowest self-efficacy scores on the high prestige jobs. Simple main effects analyses revealed a significant difference between SES groups at the high prestige level, $F(2, 138) = 3.68$, $p < .05$, but not at the moderate and low prestige levels. Tukey post hoc comparisons revealed that at the high prestige level, high SES girls had higher self-efficacy scores ($M = 16.36$) than did low SES girls ($M = 14.29$), $q(120, 3) = 3.82$, $p < .05$, [Scheffé, .95 CI = (.30, 3.82)]. The moderate SES girls ($M = 15.06$) were between the two groups and did not differ significantly from either one. Part (b) of Hypothesis 4 was supported.

**Hypothesis 5**

*High SES girls will express greater self-efficacy for nontraditional jobs than will low SES girls.*

All girls regardless of SES background varied their self-efficacy according to the gender composition of the job, $F(2, 276) = 67.09$, $p = .001$. Girls expressed greater self-efficacy for traditional jobs ($M = 17.47$) than nontraditional jobs ($M = 15.26$), $q(120, 3) = 16.38$, $p < .001$, or balanced jobs ($M = 16.35$), $q(120, 3) = 8.31$, $p < .001$. The difference in
self-efficacy for balanced jobs and nontraditional jobs was also significant, $g(120, 3) = 8.07, p < .001$. The interaction between SES and Gender Composition was not significant. For the nontraditional jobs the low SES group had a mean self-efficacy score of 14.47 which was not significantly lower than the moderate SES group ($M = 15.57$) or the high SES group ($M = 15.75$). The groups were similar in that they showed greater self-efficacy for jobs at the traditional rather than nontraditional level. Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

It had been predicted earlier that girls would choose nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level rather than the low prestige level (Hypothesis 3). On the Self-efficacy Instrument, the interaction between prestige level and gender composition was significant, $F(4, 552) = 9.14, p = .001$. To determine how self-efficacy varied according to the gender and prestige of the jobs, the interaction was further investigated with particular attention to scores for nontraditional jobs at the high and low prestige levels.

Self-efficacy differed according to prestige for jobs at all three levels of gender composition: nontraditional, $F(2, 276) = 17.52, p < .001$; balanced, $F(2, 276) = 18.42, p < .001$; and traditional $F(2, 276)$
= 28.16, p < .001. Figure 3 shows the variation in self-efficacy scores according to the gender composition and prestige level of the jobs. In general girls expressed greater self-efficacy for low prestige jobs compared to high prestige jobs regardless of the gender composition.

Tukey comparisons of self-efficacy scores at the traditional level showed low prestige jobs (M = 19.03) to have higher self-efficacy scores than high prestige jobs (M = 16.57), q(120, 3) = 9.59, p < .001, [Scheffé, .95 CI = (1.68, 3.25)]. Similarly at the balanced level, low prestige jobs (M = 17.20) had higher self-efficacy scores than high prestige jobs (M = 15.16), q(120, 3) = 8.16, p < .001, [Scheffé, .95 CI = (1.39, 2.88)], and at the nontraditional level, low prestige jobs (M = 15.72) also had higher self-efficacy scores than high prestige jobs (M = 14.04), q(120, 3) = 6.58, p < .05, [Scheffé .95 CI = (.90, 2.47)].

The significant interaction occurred primarily because of the moderate prestige scale. Self-efficacy for moderate and low prestige jobs did not differ significantly at the nontraditional and balanced levels. At the traditional level, however, low prestige (M = 19.03) and moderate prestige jobs (M = 16.82) did differ significantly, q(120, 3) = 8.62, p <
surprising that the girls differentiated between moderate and low prestige jobs at the traditional level but not the other levels of gender composition. The moderate traditional category on the Self-efficacy Instrument comprises office jobs which one would expect girls to feel confident to perform.

In summary girls tended to express greater self-efficacy for low prestige jobs than high prestige jobs at all three levels of gender composition. Girls did not differentiate between moderate and low prestige jobs except at the traditional level, where they expressed greater self-efficacy for low prestige than moderate prestige jobs. It is noteworthy that girls did not express greater self-efficacy for nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level compared to the low prestige level. Data from the Self-efficacy Instrument are summarized in Table 5.

Job Orientation. The six variables related to job orientation were entered into a MANOVA with SES as the predictor variable. Hotellings $T^2$ (12, 306) = 3.17, was significant, $p < .001$. Follow up univariate $F$-tests revealed that the SES groups differed significantly on educational plans, $F(2, 159) = 10.32$, $p < .001$, and mathematics courses taken, $F(2,159) =$
4.57, p < .05. See Table 6 for a summary of the MANOVA results.

**Hypothesis 6**

_High SES girls will plan to attain higher levels of education than will low SES girls._

The measures for educational preparation for the labour force were the level of education planned and the number of mathematics courses taken. Tukey post hoc comparisons revealed that the high SES girls ($M = 4.86$) expected to complete a higher level of education than the low SES girls ($M = 3.78$), $F(120, 3) = 6.23$, $p < .001$, and the moderate SES girls ($M = 4.04$), $F(120, 3) = 4.72$, $p < .01$. The moderate and low SES girls did not differ significantly. Table 7 summarizes the percentages of girls choosing each level of education. Each level was rated from (1) High School Graduation to (6) Graduate Degree, and the ratings were used for the univariate ANOVA described earlier. Of the high SES girls, 66.0% planned to complete a university degree compared to 32.8% of the low SES girls and 37.2% of the moderate SES girls.

At the lower end of educational plans, 13.7% of the moderate and 18.6% of the low SES girls said that they would complete their education with high school graduation or a one-year vocational program. None of
the high SES girls listed these choices. Many of the moderate and low SES girls did, however, have plans for post-secondary education. Of the low SES girls, 48.6% planned to take a two-year vocational program or enroll in a college as did 49.0% of the moderate SES girls. Although not expecting to attain university degrees, these two groups indicated plans to prepare for future employment.

The high SES girls also reported taking more high school mathematics courses ($M = .89$) than the low SES girls ($M = .64$), $q(t_{120}, 3) = 4.07$, $p < .05$, and the moderate SES girls ($M = .67$), $q(t_{120}, 3) = 3.48$, $p < .05$. The moderate and low SES groups did not differ significantly. Table 8 presents a summary of the mathematics courses taken by each SES group. Only 12.5% of the high SES girls reported not taking any mathematics beyond Grade 10 compared to 37.1% of the low SES girls and 32.0% of the moderate SES girls. The enrollment pattern for mathematics was less extreme at the Grade 11 and 12 level, but again more of the high SES girls (87.5%) were taking higher levels of mathematics than either the low SES girls (62.9%) or the moderate SES girls (68.0%).

The high SES girls reported taking more mathematics courses and planning higher levels of
educational achievement than the other two groups. Comparisons of the three groups revealed that the high SES group differed significantly from the moderate and low SES groups, the latter two groups being similar in their education plans. The results support hypothesis 6.

**Will the SES groups differ in family plans?**

According to the results of the MANOVA, the SES groups did not differ significantly on any of the variables used to measure family plans. The majority of girls expected to marry (85.8% of the total sample) and have children (90.5% of the total sample), and these expectations did not differ among the SES groups.

When asked how they planned to combine family and paid employment, only 5.3% of the total sample chose a traditional role, that is, to permanently quit their jobs after marriage. Almost one half of the girls (41.4%) planned to return to the workforce by the time their children were in preschool. Overall 84% of the sample expected to be employed by the time their children were in elementary school or earlier.

When asked about the ideal plan for combining job and family, a large number of girls, regardless of SES background, preferred more time with family (42.6% cf. 5.3% preferring more time for a job). Based on the
questions used for the present study, the SES groups did not differ in their family plans.

Limitations of the Study

The girls in the present study outlined their career plans and significant SES differences were found. Plans, however, are not achievements. If the three groups were surveyed again in ten years, they might not be so different in their actual employment. Card, Steel, and Abeles (1980) found that high SES women did attain higher levels of education than low SES women, but they then took jobs for which they were overqualified. Consequently, the difference in job achievement was not as extreme between SES groups as might have been expected. Similarly, the SES differences in the present study may not be predictive of future differences in achievement. It is unlikely, however, that the low SES girls will go beyond their current job choices. Based on these choices, the low SES girls seem to be at a disadvantage.

The second limitation comes with the use of a short answer questionnaire rather than interviews. The questionnaire determines job and family plans but not the girls' perceptions of the plans. The results give general information on career plans but cannot be used to conclude differences in attitudes or feelings.
And finally it must be noted that the study was carried out with students in two city schools. Socioeconomic status differences in the present sample may not be generalizable to students in rural or even more suburban areas further out from the city.

These limitations should be kept in mind when discussing the results of the present study. Nevertheless, some clear differences among the SES groups were found and these differences provide useful information for the study of female career choices. The following section of this paper examines the results and considers the practical implications for educators.
Discussion

In examining the influence of the women's liberation movement on the girls' career plans, two questions were of interest: Were the girls considering jobs beyond the narrow range of traditional female choices? Were they making education and family plans in preparation for a position in the labour force? Central to the investigation was the extent of social class differences in the girls' career plans.

The SES groups clearly differed in their job choices. High SES girls planned to secure higher prestige jobs than did low SES girls, and they were more likely to choose nontraditional jobs. Furthermore, the high SES girls had education plans that indicated preparation for higher prestige jobs. A large number expected to complete university degrees and over half were taking higher mathematics, an important prerequisite to nontraditional jobs.

The differences were most extreme between high and low SES groups, but when including the moderate group in the comparisons, the high SES girls tended to stand out in several respects, particularly in the prestige of the job choice and the level of education planned. In essence, the high SES girls believed they were headed toward higher income and less traditional jobs.
than the other girls.

Marini (1978) proposed that as women's employment becomes more acceptable, high SES girls will draw on family resources to advance their occupational status. Low SES girls, however, will not have access to the same resources and social class differences in female job choices will be greater than they have been in the past. The results of the present study support Marini's hypothesis. High SES girls were choosing jobs at a higher prestige level than were low SES girls.

Studies using college populations have not found enrolment in nontraditional fields to differ by SES. The SES groups in the present sample clearly differed in the gender composition of their job choices. Fifty-four percent of the high SES girls compared to 24% of the low SES girls planned to have nontraditional jobs. Zuckerman (1980) suggested that because college populations have a narrow SES range, social class differences are less likely to be detected. Her comments seem valid in light of the present findings.

Although more high SES girls than low SES girls chose nontraditional jobs, it is unlikely that high SES girls are more liberated in their attitudes toward gender roles. Prestige level was found to be an important factor in the choice of nontraditional jobs.
Similar to the findings of Garrison (1979), Herzog (1982), and Strober (1986), girls were more likely to choose nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level than the low prestige level. Prestige level, however, seemed to serve as a strong barrier to the low SES girls. Compared to the high SES group, they chose jobs at a lower prestige level and their scores on the Self-efficacy Instrument indicated less confidence for high prestige jobs. If access to nontraditional jobs is at the high prestige level, then low SES girls may be more deterred by the prestige than by the men in the jobs.

Gottfredson's (1981) model was presented earlier as a base for describing women's job choices, and results from the present study support some aspects of her model. The low SES girls chose traditional jobs at the low and moderate prestige levels, whereas high SES girls chose jobs at a higher prestige level. Contrary to Gottfredson's map of job choices, a large proportion of high SES girls chose nontraditional jobs. Gottfredson proposed that gender is a stronger factor than SES in female job choices. Findings from the present study indicate that gender may be a factor at the low and moderate prestige levels but not at the high prestige level. It was predicted that "movement"
on Gottfredson's map would occur at the high prestige level and this seemed to be the case.

Although actual job choices did not completely conform to Gottfredson's model, self-efficacy scores did. High SES girls expressed greater self-efficacy than did low SES girls for high prestige jobs and all girls, regardless of SES background, expressed lower self-efficacy for nontraditional jobs compared to traditional jobs. Job choices did not always correspond to self-efficacy ratings. In particular, nontraditional jobs were more likely to be chosen at the high prestige level than low prestige level. Yet on the Self-efficacy Instrument girls expressed greater self-efficacy for nontraditional low prestige (cf. high prestige) jobs.

The inconsistency between choice and self-efficacy does not support Betz and Hackett's (1981) finding that women choose jobs according to their self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is, however, a recent concept in the study of career choice, and the findings of the present study suggest the concept is a valid one. There were significant variations in self-efficacy according to the gender composition and prestige level of the jobs as well as differences between SES groups. Further research might compare different age groups to
determine when gender composition and prestige level begin to affect self-efficacy ratings. The relationship between actual job choice and self-efficacy is not clear and could be studied in more detail.

It had been hypothesized that girls from all social classes would share similar ideals. The desire for nontraditional and high prestige jobs would not differ by SES, but lower SES girls would be less likely to expect to attain these ideals. Contrary to the hypothesis, there was a social class difference in the ideal job choices. Given that few of the girls made a distinction between ideals and expectations, it seems probable that the girls simply stated their expected plans without exploring ideals. On the questionnaire girls were asked to consider their "interests and abilities" in choosing the ideal job. The intent was to discourage flippant answers such as "movie star" or "millionaire" but not to restrict ideals. The results, however, show low SES girls choosing lower prestige more traditional jobs than the high SES girls.

There are several possible explanations for the social class difference in ideals. Perhaps the low SES girls did not ideally want the status and income of high prestige jobs. This explanation seems unlikely.
Intuitively it does not make sense, and furthermore, other researchers (e.g., Bogie & Bogie, 1976; Cosby & Picou, 1971) have not found social class differences in ideals.

Alternatively, with the relatively high rate of unemployment in the area where the data were collected, low SES girls might consider even having a job as ideal. A third possibility is that the girls responded to the particular wording of the question. That is, the low SES girls may ideally want high prestige jobs but perceive themselves as lacking the ability (rather than the opportunity) to perform these jobs. Although SES groups differed in their ideals, it would be inappropriate to conclude that high prestige nontraditional jobs are unattractive to lower SES girls.

The SES groups clearly differed in their job choices and education plans. It is somewhat puzzling, then, that they did not differ in their family plans. For example, the high SES girls planned to complete more years of education. To accommodate the extra years in university they might also plan to have children at a later age than girls planning a two-year vocational program. This was not the case. Possibly the high SES girls were being unrealistic in their
expectations to complete university and enter a profession while starting a family and will modify their plans later. The present study did not examine specific career plans, that is, comparisons of the family plans of the university bound to the nonuniversity bound. Further research might determine whether girls intending professional jobs are also making appropriate family plans.

Two opposing views on job orientation were presented earlier. Ferree (1984) proposed that employment is important to women in all social classes, whereas Rubin (1976) and Wright (1978) held that low SES girls will prefer marriage and homemaking over full time employment. The results of the present study tend to support the former view. Regardless of SES background, paid employment seemed to play an important role in the girls' career plans. The moderate and low SES girls were less likely than the high SES girls to anticipate a university degree, but they were preparing for future employment by taking some post-secondary training. Few girls anticipated a traditional role of full-time homemaker, and the majority expected to be in the labour force by the time their children were in elementary school.
This does not, however, mean that they will take less than six years out of the labour force. If they have two children and stay at home until each child is in school, they will be out of the labour force for more than six years. There seems to be consensus among SES groups, however, that children in elementary school do not need full-time mothers, and this is an appropriate time to return to a job.

When asked about the ideal amount of time to spend between a job and family, a high percentage of girls wanted more time for family. This can be interpreted several ways. Perhaps the girls do not want to be in the workforce. Ideally they want to stay at home with children but believe employment is an economic necessity. If this is the case, it is interesting to note that the sentiment is shared equally across social classes.

A more probable interpretation is that the girls want both--family time and paid employment, but there is still the stigma of the employed mother neglecting her children. Wanting to spend more time at a job is a socially unacceptable response. Furthermore, the girls may anticipate some unhappiness in not being with their children full time. While they choose to be employed, they are also aware of the compromise involved.
In summary, the SES groups shared similar family plans although they clearly differed in their education plans and job choices. Most of the girls expected to be employed by the time their children were in elementary school. This could be interpreted as meaning that regardless of SES background, girls place a similar value on paid employment. The questionnaire, however, drew general responses. Before making conclusions on the value of paid employment, there is a need to examine job orientation in more depth.

Implications

High SES girls seemed to be expanding their choices into nontraditional areas while low SES girls remained in the traditional female areas. The results from the present study suggest that the route to nontraditional jobs is perceived to be at the high prestige level, which usually requires university education. If girls in all social classes are to have access to these jobs, then greater effort must be made to help lower SES girls attain the necessary education. Such effort entails more than financial aid. Given their low scores for high prestige jobs on the Self-efficacy Instrument, low SES girls might also require help in perceiving themselves as university students and making achievements beyond those of their
Certainly not all low SES girls will go on to university, but there might be a more representative proportion. The lower social classes have not had the same access to education, and boys' career plans have reflected the social class differences (Marini & Greenberger, 1978a). The women's movement, however, has presented a challenge not only to sex discrimination but also to the class system. As Andrea Dworkin (1985) stated: "The right wing of America has reacted so strongly against the women's liberation movement because we said we wanted equality—racial equality, gender equality, class equality. And they thought we meant it."

Theoretically, the women's movement is for all women, and it is important to recognize that attempts to improve women's employment options may only be effective for a small group of women.

Rather than trying to make the job plans of low SES girls similar to those of the high SES girls, an alternative view is to accept that low SES girls are unlikely to enter high prestige jobs and to expand their choices into nontraditional jobs at the lower prestige levels. This is probably the most difficult program to implement. Low prestige male jobs are seen
as "unfeminine" and physically difficult for women. In recent years, however, mechanization has reduced the physical strength required for many of these jobs. Given the higher pay and better benefits (cf. traditional female jobs), these jobs have much to offer women.

Programs encouraging girls to enter nontraditional areas might begin by breaking down the mystique around men's jobs. Girls are seldom able to watch men in their work and see what their jobs entail (Greenglass, 1982). By learning more about the work, girls might begin to see the potential for skill development and the sense of mastery that many of these jobs offer.

Educators might also examine the structure of the school system and access to nontraditional fields at the high and low prestige level. For example, science and mathematics course are usually taught in a classroom and, in fact, are required at the junior level. Shop courses, the prerequisites to many low prestige nontraditional jobs, are not required at any grade level. Not only do girls have to initiate enrolment in such courses, they must also go to the far wing (or basement) of the school to take them.

The structure of the education system is only one possible factor to explain the preference for
nontraditional jobs at the high prestige level. However, it is noteworthy that high SES girls considering high prestige jobs might have access to a wider range of choices than low SES girls making choices at the lower prestige levels.

A final option is for educators to maintain the trend for girls to enter low prestige traditional areas but to attempt to improve the working conditions and economic security of these jobs. Legislation to bring equal pay for work of equal value is such an attempt. At the high school and vocational levels, however, training programs might be revised to educate students about job benefits, contract negotiations, and legal rights.

The SES groups did not differ in family plans but the questions were of a general nature. Further research might use more refined questions to investigate the feasibility of plans to combine job and family. The high SES girls were more likely to plan professional jobs while the low SES girls were expecting traditional, low prestige jobs. Given that their prospective choices differed in status and income, there is a need to determine whether the meaning of paid employment also differs for the SES groups.
The major finding of the present study was that the job choices varied according to SES background. High SES girls might have an advantage; their choices reflect greater diversity and higher income and status. Rather than concluding that one group is making "better" choices, it is important to point out that SES differences are occurring and begin to assess the meaning of the differences.

The findings are not surprising—few would deny that social class plays an important role in the development of students' career plans. Documentation of specific differences, however, provides educators with information for developing career programs. In wanting to expand career options for girls, nonsexist educators might reevaluate their goals with attention to social class.
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Table 1

**Hoyt Estimate of Reliability Coefficients for Categories on the Self-efficacy Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Pr Nontraditional</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pr Balanced</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pr Traditional</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Pr Nontraditional</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Pr Balanced</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Pr Traditional</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Pr Nontraditional</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Pr Balanced</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Pr Traditional</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Mod = Moderate  Pr = Prestige*
Table 2

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Prestige of Job Choice in Ideal and Expected Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES (A)</td>
<td>5638.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2819.14</td>
<td>7.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>58715.00</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>386.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition (B)</td>
<td>125.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.18</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>335.41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>167.70</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11695.31</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>76.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p = .001
Table 3

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Gender Composition of Job Choice in Ideal and Expected Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES (A)</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>6.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>48.81</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition (B)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .01$
Table 4
Gender Composition of Job Choices for Three SES Groups
(Percentage of Respondents Averaged Between Ideal and Expected Conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Trad</th>
<th>Bal</th>
<th>NTrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Trad = Traditional Bal = Balanced
NTrad = Nontraditional Mod = Moderate

¹ All totals do not equal 100% due to rounding error.
Table 5

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Scores on Self-efficacy Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES (A)</td>
<td>320.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.46</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13129.13</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>95.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige (B)</td>
<td>933.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>466.70</td>
<td>33.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>184.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.04</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3892.94</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C)</td>
<td>1031.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>515.62</td>
<td>67.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2121.38</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>250.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>9.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3788.50</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

*** p = .001
Table 6

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Job Orientation Variables: Univariate F-Tests (df = 2, 159)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hyp. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hyp. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>248.84</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marry</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Child Time</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>422.90</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Job-Child Time</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>151.24</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hotellings $T^2$ (12, 306) = 3.17, p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Score¹</th>
<th>High (n)</th>
<th>Mod (n)</th>
<th>Low (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Yr Vocational</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yr Vocational</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total²</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mod = Moderate Yr = Year

¹Score = Values assigned to each level of education.
²All totals do not equal 100% due to rounding error.
Table 8

Highest Level of Mathematics Taken for Three SES groups
(Percentage of Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>&lt;Math 11</th>
<th>&gt;Math 11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mod = Moderate
Figures
Figure 1. Nine job categories organized by prestige level and gender composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prestige Level</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>Interior Decorator</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Driver</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Baby Sitter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Composition

- Nontraditional for Females
- Balanced
- Traditional for Females
Figure 2. Self-efficacy scores: SES group by job prestige level
Figure 3. Self-efficacy scores: Prestige level by gender composition

Note. Pres = Prestige
Appendix A
CAREER PLANS QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to learn about the career plans of Grade 12 students. This information will help educators to develop programs that are useful to people like yourself. If you do not wish to participate in the study, you may withdraw at any time without hurting your academic standing. Your name is not on the paper, so all answers are confidential.

In answering the following questions try to give the response that feels most accurate for you. When you write in occupations, be clear: "salesclerk in a department store" is clearer than "work at Eaton's."

Your participation is appreciated.

PART I. Circle the letter for your choice.

1. I am a. male b. female

2. I am taking/have taken:

3. What level of education do you plan to complete?
   a. high school graduation
   b. less than 1 year of vocational training beyond high school
   c. 1 to 2 years of vocational training beyond high school
   d. some college or university
   e. university graduation (4 year Bachelor's Degree)
   f. graduate degree (e.g., Master's, Medical Doctorate, Ph.D)

4. Did your mother/guardian work outside the home in the past 5 years?
   a. yes b. no

If yes, what was her job? ________________________________
5. Did your father/guardian work outside the home in the past 5 years?
   a. yes   b. no

   If yes, what was his job? ________________________________

6. Imagine that your situation is ideal, and you can choose the job that best suits your interests and abilities. You do not have to worry about money for education, people stopping you, etc. What job would you like to spend most of your life doing?

   Be specific: __________________________________________

7. Given that conditions are not always ideal, what job are you most likely to pursue? (If it is the same job as in answer #6, write "same.")

   Be specific: __________________________________________

8. Do you plan to marry?   a. yes   b. no   c. undecided

9. Do you plan to have children?   a. yes   b. no   c. undecided

   If yes, at what age do you want to have your first child? _____

10. People differ in their plans to have a job and to raise children. Some people see their job as full time work, and they do not plan to have children. Others see children as full time work and do not plan to have a job. Still others want to combine having a job and children.

    Which of the following seems closest to your own plans for the future? Circle the letter of the most likely plan for you.

    I WILL WORK AT A PAID JOB:

    a. until I marry or have children, and then no more.

    b. until I have children, quit, and return to a job when the children are in high school (13-19 years).

    c. until I have children, quit, and return to a job when the children are in elementary school (6-12 years).
d. until I have children, quit, and return to a job when the children are in **pre-school** (3-5 years).

e. until I have children, quit, and return to a job when the children are **1 to 3 years old**.

f. continuously, taking a 6-12 month job leave at the birth of a child.

g. continuously, and possibly not have children.

11. Think about the ideal job-child situation for you. If you did not have to consider money, other people's views, etc., how might the ideal situation differ from your choice in #10 above?

a. I might spend less time working in a job and more time with children.

b. I might spend more time working in a job and less time with children.

c. No difference: my choice in #10 is very close to my ideal.

**PART II**

People usually try to choose jobs that suit their abilities and interests. Although some of the following jobs may not seem interesting to you, how confident are you in your ability to do or learn to do them?

For example, you may not be interested in delivering newspapers but feel confident in your ability to do that job or learn to do it. You would circle 4 or 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Confidence to Do or Learn the Job</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some jobs may interest you a lot, but you feel less certain about your ability to do or learn to do them.

For example, performing in a rock band might appeal to you, but if you do not play a musical instrument or sing, then you are not likely to feel as confident about your ability to do or learn to do that job. Your would circle 2 (Not At All Confident) or 3 (Slightly Confident).

If you do not know enough about the job to rate it, then circle 1 (Not Applicable or N/A).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Order Cook</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>English Teacher</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Cleaning Assistant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education Teacher</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Nursing Supervisor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Clerk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Executive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Decorator</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Administrator</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Bank Teller</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to Door Salesperson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Letter Carrier</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Helicopter Pilot</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Life Guard</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>File Clerk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Welfare Agency</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Travel/Tour Guide</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse's Aide</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Taxi Driver</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Sitter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Concert Singer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Worker</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Bus Driver</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygienist</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Telephone Operator</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV, Radio, Stereo Salesperson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>