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Everywhere we find that women are excluded from certain crucial economic or political activities, that their roles as wives and mothers are associated with fewer powers and prerogatives than are the roles of men. It seems fair to say then, that all contemporary societies are to some extent male-dominated, and although the degree and expression of female subordination vary greatly, sexual asymmetry is presently a universal fact of life.

Rosaldo and Lamphere (1974: 3)

Comments made by professors to female graduate students:

"I know you're competent and your thesis advisor knows you're competent. The question in our minds is are you really serious about what you're doing?"

"Have you ever thought of journalism (to a student planning to get a Ph.D in political science)? I know a lot of women journalists who do very well."

"You're so cute. I can't see you as professor of anything."

"Somehow I can never take women in this field seriously."

Harris (1970: 295)
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This paper reviews recent findings from Western Australia, regarding the career choice of twelfth grade high school students. It examines the thesis that males and females are affected by different socio-cultural influences when they choose a career. Female students in most societies still occupy lower-level positions and are steered toward more nurturant and supportive occupations, such as nursing, social work, primary teaching and secretarial work. Males tend to have a wider choice of careers, and are taught to strive toward higher-level positions and occupations that tend to require a more scientific-technological background, such as engineering, architecture, motor-mechanics or medicine. It is hypothesized that the extent to which this is true depends, to a certain degree, upon one's socio-economic position and the historical circumstances in respect to women's position in the particular society. In this study it is assumed that the higher one's socio-economic background and the greater women's participation in the labour force, the more frequently a female student will aspire to a male-dominated high-status occupation.

The analysis based principally on the two variables of sex and social class uses correlation coefficients to test the relative impact of those two variables and other significant factors, such as, N-achievement, parental encouragement and friend's encouragement for further education, on educational aspirations and occupational expectations.

On a rather tentative basis the study is given a cross-cultural dimension by adding two smaller samples from India and the United States to discover whether the disparity between males' and females' career choices varies from one society to another, dependent upon the individual's socio-economic position and upon women's participation in the labour force of that society.
THE SEX FACTOR IN CAREER CHOICE

It is quite evident from the available statistics and literature on women in the labour forces that women are clearly under-represented in the higher status occupations (see Appendix I). This paper will not reiterate that fairly well-documented point; rather, it will indicate the types of jobs women are "attracted" to or "guided" into and will reflect on the reasons why this occurs. It will also consider whether the significant absence of women in higher level jobs can be attributed more to (1) early socialization influences, (2) later situational/structural factors, or (3) an interaction between these two. Essentially, this paper is concerned with discovering which factors might lead to a shift in the type of occupational positions women occupy.

The socialization and situational/structural viewpoints are often seen as opposing schools of thought. Orum, et al. (1975), used these two models in relating sex to political participation and described the essential differences between the schools. They felt that the two schools diverged in their perceptions of when behaviour is affected and what influences that behaviour. The socialization approach would assume that attitudes and perspectives on careers would be formed early in life by role-modeling, parental attitudes or attitudes of "significant others" and by what is communicated generally by the social mores of society. Advocates of the situational/structural approach, on the other hand, would claim that circumstances of adulthood, especially the nature of married life would be responsible for the differences in career status. They would support the notion that socializing influences affect career goals but they would suggest that the origin of sex-related differences and sex-role stereotypes are mainly a reflection of the power conflict between men and women.

This notion has been stated in more Marxist terms by Collins (1971) in suggesting that the differences between men and women in the stratification system are a product of the fact that women are universally regarded as men's sexual property and compelled to remain so by men's monopoly over the means of physical violence. In contemporary industrialized societies, he argues, this situation diminishes somewhat as women have more time and opportunity
to work and gain wealth on their own.

This paper will attempt to test Collins' argument by (1) examining the relevant literature on factors affecting women's occupational attainment and interpreting whether the factors support the socialization or the situational/structural models; (2) reflecting on other theories of social change and the effect on female participation in the labour force to see if they uphold Collins' thesis that increased industrialization will lead to higher status for women; (3) reviewing recent findings regarding the career choice of Western Australian twelfth grade high school students, with special attention to the different socio-cultural influences that affect male and female career choices; and (4) comparing the Western Australian students' aspirations with those of similar students from the United States and India.

FACTORS AFFECTING WOMEN'S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT

According to Angrist (1972), the factors that predict occupational choice and commitment for men are not the same for women. This contradicts the previous assumptions of Ginzberg (1951) and Super (1963) that knowing a person's qualities should facilitate prediction of occupational preference. This assumption is only marginally applicable to women (Almquist and Angrist, 1970; Psathas, 1968).

Even though women must range as widely as men in personality types, mental abilities and academic qualifications, they do not participate in equal proportion to men in jobs at all levels of the occupational hierarchy. Most countries in the world have a dual labour market that is divided essentially into the male and female occupations. In Australia, for example, the 1971 Census showed that 32% of the workforce was female, with a total of 67.8% of these employed in only twenty different occupations, each of which was comprised of a disproportionate number of women (Power, 1975; Encel, et al., 1974). Oppenheimer (1968) commenting on the situation in the United States estimated that between 1900-1960 well over half of all women were in occupations in which at least two-thirds of the work force were female. And that somewhere between 30 and 48 percent were consistently employed in
occupations in which 80 percent or more were female. Obviously, men are found in as great a percentage in male-dominated professions. However, men tend to work in a wider range of occupations and to earn higher wages than women.

Howe (1977) has described women in the female-dominated occupations as the "pink collar workers". The work they do often involves repetitive, low-level skill work or service-oriented work that is often seen as an extension or commercialization of the housewife/mother role. She notes that "while it has become commonplace to discuss how the lines between so-called blue collar and white collar work have been fading, it has barely been observed that the most dramatic distinctions continue between what can most descriptively be termed pink collar work and work in the male and integrated markets" (1977:11).

According to an analysis by Garfinkle (1975) in the Monthly Labor Review, an official publication of the United States Department of Labor:

Between 1962 and 1974 the number of employed women increased by 10 million or 45 percent, and their proportion of the work force increased from 34 to 39 percent. The largest employment gains for women occurred in those occupations in which women have been more likely to be employed. The largest gain, 4.8 million, occurred in clerical occupations in which women accounted for almost 70 percent of all employees in 1972. By 1974 women held almost 4 out of 5 jobs in this category and - undoubtedly - the rapid rate of growth of women's employment in this occupation helped to account for a substantial portion of the overall increase in the number of women in the work force. At the detailed occupational level .... women cashiers increased from 82 percent to 88 percent of all such workers, women bank tellers from 72 to 92 percent, women payroll clerks from 62 to 77 percent.

In comparing figures from Australia with those that Howe compiled on the United States jobs that she felt were some of the "pinkest of pink collar" occupations, it is obvious that the two countries are similar in the way in which women are concentrated in a dozen or so occupations:
## TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Classification</th>
<th>Percent Female in 1975 in U.S.</th>
<th>Percent Female in 1975 in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurse</td>
<td>Certified Nurse</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>Primary Teacher</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist</td>
<td>Stenographer/typist</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Operator</td>
<td>Telephonist/phonogram operator</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Stenographer/typist</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>Hairdresser/barber</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter/waitress</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing aide</td>
<td>Nursing aide/hospital attendant</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer/Stitcher</td>
<td>Dressmaker</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household worker</td>
<td>Domestic private household</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Why are women clustered into lower level occupations with between 70 and 80 percent in Australia and the United States found in the two categories of middle or semi-professional and clerical groups? Men are dispersed much more widely in the occupational hierarchy but also there are jobs that are male-dominated and almost exclusively filled by men, such as engineering, electrician, mechanic, etc.

One reason is that few women are prepared to plan for work as a central part of adult life, equivalent to the centrality of family (Angrist, 1972; Monally, 1968). Surveys of college women over the last 20 years in the United States show that virtually all expect to and want to marry (Angrist, 1972). Many want to combine a career and a family but very few would consider work to be more central to their life than a family. A study of student nurses found that sixty percent felt that having a career was important, but only one-fourth said they would be very much displeased if they should marry and never work at nursing (Goldsen and White).
In general, there appears to be a low level of occupational commitment among women. About 70 percent of female teachers view teaching only as an adventure (Mason, et al., 1959). It may be that females prefer the "pink collar" jobs because they feel that these types of jobs more easily combine with the home and generally do not require extensive training and upgrading. Long (1958) remarked on the importance of the short work day to a woman with a reference to her need to be able to "type till five o'clock, and still have time to shop for a cheap roast or a rich husband."

There is also some evidence which suggests that both men and women share an ideology that is antagonistic toward the idea of women in high-status jobs (Keniston and Keniston, 1964).

What are some of the barriers to women entering higher level jobs and those that are currently thought of as male-dominated? Rossi (1972) indicates that the perceived reasons for the low representation of women in medicine, engineering and science are:

1. A job in this field is too demanding for a woman to combine with family responsibilities;
2. Women today want to work only occasionally and on a part-time basis, which they seldom do in this field;
3. Most parents discourage their daughters from training for such a field;
4. Men in this field resent women colleagues;
5. To enter this field before marriage restricts a woman's chance to marry;
6. Women are afraid they will be considered unfeminine if they enter this field;
7. Such a job requires skills and characteristics women do not have. (1972:77).

Peterson (1964) noted the rather defensive quality of the myths used to explain the current occupational differentiation by sex. Women are supposedly more likely to be sick, to be absentees, and to quit their jobs. In fact, men lose more work days through illness than women, the sex rates for absenteeism are identical, and only the rates for quitting
show women markedly higher. Even this latter result cannot be used to defend keeping women out of high status jobs, for the quit rates turn out to be purely a function of the skill level of the job. Further, Peterson (1964) noted that when the researchers control for skill level, the sex difference disappears.

Those women who have tried to gain entrance to the prestigious, male-dominated professions find many externally set limits to their career advancement. Epstein (1970) notes that one of the institutionalised channels of recruitment and advancement that is not available to women is the protégé system, being trained, groomed and sponsored for promotion by your superior, for the latter are usually males and do not take their female colleagues seriously.

Another interesting area of research is the determination of characteristics that identify career saliency, or commitment to enter a specific career, such as engineering. Why do some women choose to be housewives and others doctors? Or why do some women decide to pursue a career at all? Angrist and Almquist (1970, 1971) were curious about these questions and set up a longitudinal study of the graduates from Carnegie-Mellon University in 1969 to look at, among other things, the relationship between career salience and sex role models. They found that the crucial role models for career salient women are those who explicate a broad life style encompassing career and family. In addition, they indicated other factors which differentiate career salient women from those who are non-career salient:

Career salient women more often have working mothers, tend to hold a variety of part-time and summer jobs during college, select male-dominated occupations, and see themselves as more influenced by teachers and occupational role models than by family and peers. The non-career salient women more often are sorority members, date steadily or are engaged, have mothers active in leisure pursuits, and select traditional women's occupations (Angrist, 1972:88).

Others have concurred with these findings but recently found a rise in the number of career salient women from the 30 percent of freshmen women that Angrist reported at Carnegie-Mellon to 43 percent at Kansas State University (Erickson and Nordin, 1974). They also found a higher
percentage of career salient women who were from urban backgrounds and had mothers who worked. Baruch (1972) found that having working mothers was a good predictor in determining career-salient women, but in addition the mothers had to find their jobs satisfying and be successful in integrating work with family life. Simpson and Simpson (1961) in a study of occupational choice among career-oriented college women indicated that those who were more career-salient would stress intrinsic features of work and also would be most influenced by teachers, professors and people in intended career rather than by parents, relatives and peers. Other factors that were related to career salience were making a definite career choice and making the decision at a younger age. Richardson (1975) reported that women who were high in self-esteem were more likely to report a congruent relationship between self and career concepts and were more likely to be career-oriented.

Finally, even when women do enter careers, there appears to be wage discrimination for equal status jobs. Suter and Miller (1973) found that the income return relative to increases in education and occupational status for their sample of career women was only half that of males. This suggests that while encouragement of female investment in higher education and their pursuit of higher status occupations will affect the earnings of females relative to other females, a large gap in the earnings of males and females will remain. One interpretation of these findings is that the need for social structural change (change in the opportunity structure) is as great or greater than the need for individual change (Ayella and Williamson, 1976).

Others would suggest that even if all the structural barriers were eliminated, women would still occupy lower positions than men and earn less. They argue that it is the early socializing factors that determine women's career goals. Feldmen (1974) in reviewing the research on gender socialization noted that Komarovsky (1953) felt that girls were socialized to be neater, more restrained, gentler, more emotionally demonstrative, more dependent, and more family-oriented than boys. Maccoby (1970) believes women are socialized to be less analytical in their thinking than men; Turner (1964) states that women are socialized to be less ambitious than men; and Auvinen (1970) maintains that women are socialized to be more aware of their
traditional sex role than men.

However, more recent findings are showing that women are as achievement-oriented as men (Winkler, 1976) and aspire to higher education as or more often than men (Beswick, 1975). There still seem to be sex differences in self-esteem (Beswick, 1975; Connell et al., 1976; Smith, 1975; Jacklin and Maccoby, 1974). Nevertheless, even in this area, when closer analysis is done on self-esteem, it has been found to vary situationally and not to be lower across different achievement situations (Lenney, 1977).

It is also reported in most studies that the sex differences in self-esteem and achievement motivation are not as important as home background or parental encouragement in their impact on occupational aspiration or subsequent status (Sinclair, 1977; Bardsley, 1978). This is apparent when examining the type of women who enter male-dominated careers. They tend to come from higher socio-economic backgrounds and to be the most intellectually able, introspective, autonomous women with high self-esteem, high need for achievement and able to identify with the positive aspects of the masculine stereotype, namely independence, competence, direction and lack of emotionality. However, they tend also to retain their femininity, placing emphasis on personal relationships and lack of competitiveness, thus incorporating most positive aspects of both the masculine and feminine stereotypes in their identity (Stein and Bailey, 1975).

The question still remains as to whether women are disproportionately absent from higher level jobs because of their early socializing or because of external barriers that limit access to these occupations. From the above study, it appears that those women who entered male-dominated careers were socialized into the value system that would correspond to high-level achievement. But why are there not more women with similar value systems? Is social class the intervening variable?

Barnett (1975) examined that question by holding socio-economic status constant and looking at the sex differences between occupational preferences. She questioned a sample of 2,519 young people from the
ages of 9 to 17 who were fairly homogeneous with respect to socio-economic status with approximately 87% who were from the upper-middle class. She found significant differences between males and females in the type of occupations they preferred. This difference was evident for males and females of all the age groups. She concluded that "on the basis of these data women may be under-represented in prestigious occupations not because they opt for such roles and are thwarted but rather because early in their development many women learn not to aspire to such positions." She also noted that these findings may result from females internalizing the rebuffs suffered by previous generations.

Another study that indirectly investigates this question has analysed the changing pattern of employment of women in the biological sciences in Australia, Britain and Canada (Adamson, 1977). Even though this has been a subject area in which women are found in greater numbers than in other science subjects, Adamson has discovered a declining percentage of university/lecturing staff in the biological sciences (see Table below). She feels that this is mainly a result of increasing competition that has resulted from the expansion of tertiary education. With the increased competition from individuals from all social classes, more men are entering what traditionally were considered to be female-dominated occupations. Adamson predicts that the decline seen in the employment of women in the biological sciences will be followed in the social sciences, in teaching and in other areas of employment which were once traditionally high employers of women.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the same time, it is important to note that women are beginning to move into the so-called "masculine" occupations. Safilios-Rothschild remarked that:

"the first occupation that becomes redefined as a "feminine" occupation, in countries in which women are freer to choose their occupation, is pharmacy. Then, second comes dentistry and in fewer countries chemistry and medicine, but all three often become almost equally "feminine" or "masculine" fields. Law and architecture never become "feminine" fields or equally divided between the two sexes; men always dominate the fields, but a considerable number of women take the options. Finally, "technical" fields such as engineering, aeronautics and agriculture remain "hardcore" masculine occupations. (1971:57)"

In those societies that have removed many of the structural barriers to women working in all fields (compare Sweden, Poland and USSR to USA and Australia in Table 3), the percentage of women in male-dominated fields has increased. There are still fields which are sex-stereotyped and the more economically and politically important positions in these societies are still dominated by males. Also, the last area that remains a major roadblock to role change is the division of labour in the home. Haavio-Mannila (1975) in studying Sweden, Finland and the Soviet Union found relatively high levels of work options and strong publicly espoused emancipation ideologies but these had not affected to a great extent the home domain.

Another interesting example is in Israeli kibbutzim where egalitarian ideologies have been espoused and women and men have been given equal opportunities to participate in various jobs. Also, the function of mother as child-rearer has been eliminated with the creation of houses especially for children. Nevertheless, a division of labour appears to have developed with the men in jobs that are seen as more productive and require more physical strength whereas women are more often seen in jobs that are non-productive, in education and service oriented jobs that require them to be nearer the home.

Mednick (1975) has reported that the women who are members of the second generation are less interested in community involvement than were their pioneer mothers and seem quite content to function in their private personal domain and leave the public life to men (1975:90).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Percentage of Women Employed</th>
<th>Percentage of Women Graduates out of Total Graduates</th>
<th>Percentage of Women Graduates in Law</th>
<th>Percentage of Women Graduates in Dentistry</th>
<th>Percentage of Women Graduates in Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>39.7 (1967)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>35.7 (1966)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>28.2 (1965)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>46.0 (1970)</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R</td>
<td>49.0 (1966)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of investigators have considered why this division has developed in the kibbutzim. One writer has identified the biological factors of child-bearing and rearing (Talmon, 1965) as the ultimate determinant; others looked to psychodynamic factors to explain the women's flight to feminity and overemphasis of mothering (Bettelheim, 1969; Spiro, 1970). However, Mednick's arguments are, I believe, more persuasive.

She delineated the following factors as significant for a complete understanding of the failure to achieve permanent role change on the kibbutz. (Several of these are also pertinent to other societies):

1. The atmosphere of economic and military crisis and the nature of the ideology combined to create a society based on masculine tasks, traits, and values, with a concomitant devaluation of those classically ascribed to women.

2. The emancipation found in the early days was a response to crisis as much as an effect of ideology.

3. The ideology did not contain a full analysis of the implications of sex-role change for both men and women, therefore consciousness about roles did not change.

4. Certain role areas never changed. Most important was the area of child care and education, always defined as woman's work.

5. The values of the kibbutz as well as the external society are heavily pro-natalist.

6. The only female activity that is rewarded and a source of self-esteem for women on the kibbutz is child bearing. Furthermore, having many children is viewed in masculine terms, that is, producing members for the kibbutz and thus perpetuating the community.

7. The attribution of biology as an explanation for woman's role is overdetermined by the pronatalism and the emphasis placed on physical strength. This widely-held view operates as an impediment to change.
Mednick is essentially suggesting that for change in sex-role divisions to be more permanent, societies will have to "emancipate" men. She feels that there has been an emphasis on freeing women from their "condition" or "oppressed" state whereas there has been little attention given to the need for complementary changes in the role of men. It is becoming more evident that societies seeking equality of the sexes will have to re-evaluate the traditional values and goals of men. The notion that change in men's roles toward more feminine values may be to their advantage has been expressed by Scandinavian social scientists and politicians (Dahlstrom, 1971; Palme, 1972).

Why has there been more movement toward equality of sex roles in some countries and less in others? Certainly males and females are socialized into different value orientations but are there any universal, structural developments that have affected sex-role changes? What can explain the sex-role inertia when it comes to the family and home? What theoretical perspectives can help us explain why changes have occurred and also why there is still female subordination to some degree in every society?

Theoretical Perspectives on Social Change and Sex-Role Change

The theoretical perspectives on social change and sex-role change can be grouped into two categories: those that view change from the individual's point of view and those that view change from the societal point of view. Most psychologists and anthropologists look at change in behaviour and values at the individual level; whereas, social scientists examine change mainly from the societal point of view. Broadly speaking, the focus on the individual is more concerned with attitudinal changes and the societal perspective is more interested in structural changes.

Some people disparage those who investigate attitudinal changes because they feel these fail to explain why the change takes place. Holter (1975), for example dismisses psychological explanations for this reason. She feels psychologists do not explain why attitudes have not changed; rather they give attitudinal differences as the main reason for the division of sex roles.
For instance, there are some societies that espouse egalitarian ideologies, yet children are still socialized into different sex roles. The attitudinal model cannot explain this unless it returns to psycho-biological theories, especially those relating to personality or temperament and sex differences that may arise from psychic-biological origins. Of course, those who support the societal perspective would argue that any remaining sex role divisions in a society espousing egalitarian ideologies would result from the fact that structural impediments had not been entirely removed. For they see the economic requirements of society as the prime moving forces of shifts in sex roles.

Diagram 1 shows a schematic description of both of these theoretical perspectives and writers who have expressed opinion that are basically within one model or the other. First, looking at theories which use structural factors as the main forces changing society and sex roles, they can be grouped into four categories: (1) economic, including technological changes resulting in modernization or industrialization; (2) family structural changes, often affected by urbanization and greater mobility; (3) crises, such as war, revolution, disease, affecting a population decline or differential number of males and females; (4) legislation that may affect fertility rates, labour participation, child care, etc. Second are the theories which view sex differences as derived from different value orientations that may arise from innate factors or from an interaction between biological and environmental influences. It is unwise to say that some of these writers are in one "camp" or another for several writers use both structural and attitudinal factors to explain sex role changes. For example, Simone de Beauvoir, according to Holter (1975), has attempted "to link historical materialism to a conception of man as being of transcendence, seeking always to dominate the other, to exercise his sovereignty in an objective fashion." De Beauvoir argues that a change in sex roles requires "not only changes in the economic and social order, but first of all women's attainment of authenticity" (Holter, 1975: 8).

Another writer who feels that changes will have to take place at various levels all at the same time is Mitchell (1966). She focuses on the situation of women with respect to production, reproduction, socialization and sexuality.
### Diagram 1

**Schematic Description of Theories on Sex Role Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Factors</th>
<th>Writers</th>
<th>Attitudinal Values/Psychic Dimension</th>
<th>Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Technological</td>
<td>Marx, Engels, Lenin</td>
<td>Perception of Time</td>
<td>Cottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization/Industrialization</td>
<td>Collins, Safilios-Rothschild</td>
<td>Complexity of Play</td>
<td>Lever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure/Urbanization/Mobility</td>
<td>Goode, Engels, Lenin</td>
<td>Agency/Communion</td>
<td>Bakan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bott</td>
<td>Field Independent/Dependent</td>
<td>Witkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises/War/Revolution/Disease</td>
<td>Haavio-Mannila</td>
<td>Anima/Animus</td>
<td>Jung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocentric/autocentric</td>
<td>Schachtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Stucker, Conlin</td>
<td>Sexual Cycles</td>
<td>Nissen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>De Beauvoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental/Affiliative</td>
<td>Rowlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other women have noted the need to develop consciousness-raising groups at the same time that structural barriers are lifted so that women can act in greater solidarity and with more permanent changes in their attitudes and value systems (Mednick, 1975; Holter, 1975). It has been pointed out by Holter that it is not enough for women to gain higher education and for some women to move into higher positions. For she noted the following:

Various Norwegian data indicate that women with a higher level of education are more politically active, report less submissiveness, less conflict avoidance and more gender-egalitarian norms than do women with lower education. Higher education may, however, not be especially conducive to the development of solidarity among women. And higher education alone is not enough for women to gain power (Holter, 1975: 17).

Implicit in the above statement is the notion that women in different social positions will have different value systems and will have varying opinions about sex roles. Even though most investigators of sex role divisions are aware of the effects of social class on gender norms, few models try to build this aspect into their perspective. One model that looks at the degree of social inequality in society as well as building in other aspects of the society's value system and their effects on sex-role divisions is that of Giele (1977).

Thus, rather than discuss at great length the theoretical models noted in the schematic diagram, which have been reviewed quite adequately by Holter (1975) and Carlson (1975), I will turn now to Giele's model and discuss why it is preferable as a theoretical statement about sex role divisions in society than that of Collins' referred to earlier. As you might recall, Collins' argument was based on the notion that with increasing industrialization the differences between men and women in the stratification system would diminish. To a certain extent, I would agree with him; however, along with the changes that industrialization might bring, there also have to be changes in the consciousness of both men and women. Moreover, it is important to note that these changes are more likely to occur in societies which espouse an egalitarian ideology that will lift all individuals in their society to a higher level and where social divisions or class divisions are minimized.
Giele built her theoretical position on Lenski's (1966) notion that the type of society has an effect on social inequality and also on Blumberg's and Winch's (1972) findings that the type of society is related to different types of family structures. Lenski proposed to explain why inequality is greater in agrarian societies than in simple hunting-gathering societies or advanced industrial nations. He hypothesized a curvilinear relationship between level of industrialization and degree of social inequality. Giele remarked that "Blumberg and Winch were the first to extend the curvilinear hypothesis to power differences within families. They found simple nuclear families to be most common in hunting-and-gathering and industrial societies. Complex extended families that lodge power in a male head were most frequent in agrarian economies that relied on the plow" (1977:10). (Figures 1 and 2 demonstrate these notions.)

On the basis of data gathered from a number of societies (see Table 4) and case studies of eight societies at different stages of industrialization, Giele drew a graph of sexual stratification, as shown in Figure 2, that demonstrated a curvilinear relationship between societal complexity and the status of women. She explained this relationship with the following remarks:

For instance, a hunting-and-gathering or horticultural society which gave women an important role in communal decision-making would be near the upper limit on the left-hand side of the graph whereas a society that confined women to an isolated position would be near the lower limit. At the modern end of the continuum, women's status is nearer the upper limit in a society with a socialist tradition such as Poland, and nearer the lower limit in a society with a Muslim tradition, such as Bangladesh or Egypt. Countries with non-Western traditions, such as Japan, fall somewhere between these upper and lower limits on the right side of the graph. Countries with mixed horticultural, agrarian or early modern elements, such as Mexico and Ghana, should be described by several points lying both to the left and to the right of the dip on the curve (Giele, 1977:10-11).

I was attracted to Giele's theoretical position for I recently (1977) proposed a similar curvilinear relationship between occupational attainment and societal complexity when comparing findings from Uganda with other non-
Figure 1: Degree of social inequality by type of society. Source: Lenski, 1966: 417.

Figure 2: Relative status of women by type of society and family structure (theoretical female solidarity groups are described in Sunday, 1964, 1974. Reciprocal labor of males and females (y) and individualized female labor (z) appear in Johnson and Johnson, 1975.)
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Table 1: Percentage of Women in Parliaments, Local Assemblies, and the Total Labor Force, Nonagricultural and Agricultural, in Selected Countries since 1960*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Parliamentary Men (%)</th>
<th>Parliamentary Women (%)</th>
<th>Local Assemblies Men (%)</th>
<th>Local Assemblies Women (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Women of Total Labor Force (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Women of Nonagricultural Workers (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of Women of Agricultural Workers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.0 (1970)</td>
<td>3.9 (1971)</td>
<td>7.5 (1966)</td>
<td>11.5 (1970)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.6* (1969)</td>
<td>13.5 (1973)</td>
<td>33.9 (1973)</td>
<td>35.3 (1968)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.6 (1969)</td>
<td>31.9 (1968)</td>
<td>2.4 (1971)</td>
<td>34.5 (1972)</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8.2 (1970)</td>
<td>50.3 (1970)</td>
<td>8.0 (1970)</td>
<td>38.9 (1972)</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>8.8 (1963)</td>
<td>52.4 (1970)</td>
<td>36.0 (1971)</td>
<td>34.6 (1970)</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>9.3 (1968)</td>
<td>32.0 (1972)</td>
<td>9.5 (1972)</td>
<td>37.1 (1972)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>10.4 (1968)</td>
<td>22.8 (1972)</td>
<td>37.1 (1972)</td>
<td>38.3 (1972)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>11.2 (1970)</td>
<td>27.0 (1972)</td>
<td>10.5 (1970)</td>
<td>40.1 (1972)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>12.4 (1968)</td>
<td>54.8 (1970)</td>
<td>15.4 (1968)</td>
<td>46.0* (1970)</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>17.6 (1967)</td>
<td>49.5 (1970)</td>
<td>19.9 (1967)</td>
<td>44.7 (1970)</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>28.0 (1968)</td>
<td>49.9 (1970)</td>
<td>42.8 (1968)</td>
<td>50.4 (1970)</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grateful acknowledgment is made to Elizabeth Dunn for help in the construction of this table and assistance with research on which it is based.

*Seats reserved for women.

*Five of six women were appointed.

*Includes unpaid family workers.

industrial and industrial societies. These findings and the above theoretical hypothesis suggest that linear, evolutionary theories relating aspects of stratification to societal complexity cannot easily be supported with empirical data. In order to move toward greater social equality, it is apparent that societal complexity is not the only criterion, for societies that are regarded as relatively less complex as well as societies that are highly complex appear to resemble each other more than those that lie somewhere in between. Ideology, family structure, group solidarity and a number of other factors affect social and sexual stratification.

**WESTERN AUSTRALIAN CAREERS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT: PRELIMINARY RESULTS**

In order to gain greater insight into the relationship between social inequality and sexual inequality, it is important to look more deeply at some of the relationships noted above within one society as well as to compare findings cross-culturally. In this section, I will examine briefly some of the differences in career aspirations and expectations of male and female Western Australian twelfth grade students.

These findings are based on the questionnaire responses of 1,521 secondary school students who were in their twelfth year of twenty-one different schools in the State of Western Australia. These students completed the questionnaire in their schools in October, 1977. The schools were randomly selected on a stratified basis of rural and metro, government and non-government, with an over-selection of rural schools to allow sufficient numbers for analysis with the metro schools. However, due to the non-co-operation of the two non-government Protestant boys' schools selected, the sample is not a truly random one. Nevertheless, despite the importance of this missing sector, a number of significant results can be reported comparing the following types of schools: metro/rural, Government/non-Government, Catholic/Protestant/Government, and Co-ed/Girls'/Boys'.

The Government schools in the Perth metropolitan area were located in a variety of socioeconomic neighbourhoods while the schools outside Perth were in towns ranging in size from 1,595 population (Mt. Barker) to 15,457 population (Geraldton). The distance of schools outside the metropolitan area varied considerably — Port Hedland in the Northwest while others were in agricultural districts closer to Perth (See Map 1). The non-Government schools were mainly concentrated in the Perth metropolitan area but one was located in Geraldton. These were essentially of two types: Those that recruit students from their local neighbourhoods (the Catholic parish schools) and those that recruit students from all over the State and tend to represent a higher socioeconomic student population. Thus, all of these schools could be described as having somewhat different value orientations that could influence the career choices of students.
TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government metro (co-ed)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government rural (co-ed)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gov't Catholic (2 girls', 2 boys', 1 co-ed)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gov't Protestant (2 girls')</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE

The Western Australian students chose a wide variety of occupations from all levels ranging from cook and radio mechanic to medical doctor and electronic engineer. There were 122 different occupations chosen by all students with the male students choosing 101 different occupations and the females 74 different ones. What is more striking, though, is that over 50 percent of the males chose one of 8 occupations and 50 percent of the females chose one of 3 occupations (see Table 6). These were, for the most part, clustered into occupations that are traditionally stereotyped as either male or female occupations.

In response to the question "When you have finished your formal education, what occupation are you most likely to take up?" The most frequently chosen occupations by males were the following:

accountant (65), engineer (52), administrative/office assistant (45), farm manager (35), doctor (24), self-employed manager (23), lawyer (21), psychologist (20), biologist (14), architect (13), and pharmacist (11).

For the female students, the most frequently chosen occupations were the following:

teacher (198), nurse (149), therapist (50), social worker (23), creative artist (22), typist (20), librarian (12), salesperson (14) and veterinarian (11).
### TABLE 6

**SEX DIFFERENCE IN OCCUPATIONS SELECTED**

Percentage of students responding to the question:

"When you have finished your formal education, what occupation are you most likely to take up?"

Percentage of students responding to:

"If you were completely free to choose any occupation, which one would you choose?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Occupations Most Frequently Selected by Male Students</th>
<th>Occupations Most Frequently Selected by Female Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2.09 (13)</td>
<td>8.1 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 (16)</td>
<td>5.4 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0.5 (4)</td>
<td>0.1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 (4)</td>
<td>0.1 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Occupations listed in this table are those chosen either by at least 10 male or 10 female students. Those in bold type are occupations which students say they are most likely to enter while those in italics are occupations students would desire to enter.*

N = 681 males

795 females
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Veterinarian</th>
<th>Nurse</th>
<th>Therapist</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Creative Artist</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>Typist</th>
<th>Sales Person</th>
<th>Social Worker</th>
<th>Homemaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
<td>0.5 (3)</td>
<td>0.6 (4)</td>
<td>10.3 (67)</td>
<td>1.8 (12)</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
<td>1.1 (7)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 (12)</td>
<td>0.5 (3)</td>
<td>0.8 (5)</td>
<td>5.8 (34)</td>
<td>1.5 (3)</td>
<td>0.2 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.7 (4)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>1.4 (11)</td>
<td>18.7 (149)</td>
<td>6.3 (50)</td>
<td>24.9 (198)</td>
<td>2.8 (22)</td>
<td>2.1 (17)</td>
<td>2.5 (20)</td>
<td>1.4 (14)</td>
<td>2.9 (23)</td>
<td>0.8 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 (23)</td>
<td>13.5 (101)</td>
<td>8.8 (51)</td>
<td>17.9 (134)</td>
<td>2.7 (20)</td>
<td>1.6 (12)</td>
<td>0.4 (3)</td>
<td>2.1 (16)</td>
<td>3.6 (27)</td>
<td>1.6 (18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6 (contd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Journalist</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>1.2 (8)</td>
<td>0.5 (3)</td>
<td>2.8 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 (12)</td>
<td>1.7 (10)</td>
<td>7.4 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>1.2 (17)</td>
<td>0.8 (6)</td>
<td>3.4 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 (31)</td>
<td>2.7 (20)</td>
<td>5.2 (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1446
NA = 70
TOTAL = 1516

I

Occupations Chosen Almost Equally By Both Male and Female Students

N


Journalist and physical education teacher/athlete were chosen almost equally by both male and female students (see Table 6).

Another question that was asked to discern the difference between the students' occupational expectations and aspirations was: "If you were completely free to choose any occupation, which one would you choose?"

The responses to this question are shown in Table 6 in italics and can be contrasted with the responses in bold print to the question that was to discover which occupation the students were most likely to take up. It is fascinating to note the differences between their desired occupation and the one they think they will actually enter. For the males there were several discrepancies between those students who aspired to enter a particular profession and those who actually expected to enter it: doctor (45 aspired, only 24 expected), airline pilot (30 aspired, only 5 expected), veterinarian (12 aspired, only 1 expected), and government official (10 aspired, only 1 expected). Sadly, for many male students there was also the reverse discrepancy where fewer students aspired to enter a particular profession but they expected to have to take up that occupation: accountant (65 expected, only 36 aspired), teacher (67 expected, only 34 aspired), engineer (52 expected, only 32 aspired), psychologist (20 expected, only 3 aspired), and administrative/office assistant (20 expected, only 3 aspired).

A similar pattern was revealed for the females. But, in their case, it was fairly obvious for some females that they aspired to higher status occupations but actually expected to enter lower status ones. For example, 50 female students aspired to be doctors; however, only 17 female students expected to actually enter that profession. Whereas, 149 female students expected to be nurses while only 101 actually desired to enter the nursing profession. The other discrepancies noted between aspirations and expectations for females were: veterinarian (23 aspired, only 11 expected) and airline pilot (7 aspired, no one expected). The reverse discrepancies noted where more expected to enter a profession than actually wanted to were: teaching (198 expected, only 134 aspired), typist (20 expected, only 3 aspired), and administrative/office assistant (34 expected, only 9 aspired).

A surprise difference noted was that 12 females desired to be homemakers,
but only 6 expected to be. Many of those who aspired to be homemakers described their choice as "the wife of a millionaire!" Few women would reject the chance to fill that occupation; however, not many thought of that choice as an option, even when given the "freedom" in their choice.

There appear to be fairly marked differences between the types of occupations the students would desire and the types they would expect to enter. However, most students did not vary greatly between their desired and expected occupations from one extreme of the occupational hierarchy to the other.

Generally, most students aspired to professional or semi-professional level occupations and expected to enter fairly high status occupations but they may have varied their choice from high professional to medium or semi-professional, for example from doctor to pharmacist or nurse.

When examining the sex differences in the students' expected and desired occupational level, there were significant differences in both and surprisingly the females in each case had higher occupational choices. Tables 7 and 8 indicate that a larger percentage of females expect (36.0 percent) and desire (36.2 percent) high status occupations than males expect (24.9 percent) and desire (30.0). Also, considerably more males expect and desire occupations which would fall into the low occupational level. It is obvious from these tables that both males and females have high occupational aspirations and expectation; moreover, what is striking is that females have higher aspirations and expectations than males.

INFLUENCES ON OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE

One question was put into the study to discover if males and females were guided into occupations that were stereotypically either male or female occupations. Eight occupations were chosen ranging from electrician to hairdresser and the students were asked to respond to the following question: "Have your parents, a guidance officer, a teacher or any other adult ever indicated that you should consider becoming any of the following?" Table 9 shows the glaring evidence that students are given advice, according to their sex, to enter occupations that are stereotypically either male or female.

1. The occupations were coded into 829 categories according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Classification and Classified List of Occupations, revised, June 1976, and then divided into three status groups (high, medium and low).
**SEX DIFFERENCES IN EXPECTED OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Occupational Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>24.9 (162)</td>
<td>30.9 (201)</td>
<td>44.2 (288)</td>
<td>100.0 (651)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>36.0 (286)</td>
<td>40.1 (319)</td>
<td>23.9 (190)</td>
<td>100.0 (795)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Sq. = 67.51 with 2 degrees of freedom.  \( p < .00 \)
Gamma = -.31
Cont. Coef. = .21

N = 1446
NA = 70
Total 1516
# Table 8

## Sex Difference in Desired Occupational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Occupational Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>30.0 (178)</td>
<td>22.4 (133)</td>
<td>47.6 (282)</td>
<td>100.0 (593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>36.2 (272)</td>
<td>36.9 (277)</td>
<td>26.9 (202)</td>
<td>100.0 (751)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi. Sq. = 65.76 with 2 degrees of freedom  \( p < 0.00 \)

Cont. coef = 0.21

Gamma = 0.26

\[ N = 1344 \]

\[ NA = 172 \]

\[ 1516 \]
### Table 9

**SEX DIFFERENCE IN CAREER GUIDANCE INTO SPECIFIC OCCUPATIONS**

Percentage responding to:

"Have your parents, a guidance officer, a teacher or any other adult ever indicated that you should consider becoming any of the following?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Electrician</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Lawyer</th>
<th>Doctor</th>
<th>Social Worker</th>
<th>Primary Teacher</th>
<th>Nurse</th>
<th>Hairdresser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>96.6 (112)</td>
<td>89.9 (160)</td>
<td>59.3 (146)</td>
<td>57.3 (146)</td>
<td>19.9 (70)</td>
<td>24.6 (127)</td>
<td>6.3 (23)</td>
<td>6.3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>3.4 (4)</td>
<td>10.1 (18)</td>
<td>40.7 (100)</td>
<td>42.7 (109)</td>
<td>80.1 (281)</td>
<td>75.4 (389)</td>
<td>93.7 (342)</td>
<td>93.7 (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (116)</td>
<td>100.0 (178)</td>
<td>100.0 (246)</td>
<td>100.0 (255)</td>
<td>100.0 (351)</td>
<td>100.0 (516)</td>
<td>100.0 (365)</td>
<td>100.0 (95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The occupations listed above were arranged randomly on the questionnaire. Here they are arranged from most male dominated to most female dominated according to the 1971 census figures.*
For example, 96.6 percent of the students who were advised to become electricians were males, whereas 93.7 percent of the students who were advised to be nurses were females. The only occupation that did not follow the pattern, according to the 1971 census figures, was that of social worker, which is more female-dominated but is an occupation in which more males are currently entering. Following this pattern, it was expected that a larger percentage of males would be advised to enter social work than primary teaching. However, the percentage of males advised to enter primary teaching was greater than that for social work which was a reversal to what was expected.

Another area of interest was to discover the role model or person who guided the students in their occupational choice. Overwhelmingly, the students answered that no one influenced their choice. Slightly more than 50 percent of both males and females answered "myself" or "no one" to the question: "Who and/or what most influenced your choice of occupation?" There was no significant difference between males and females. Other than themselves, the students most often mentioned that their parents were influential in their choice. Less than 10 percent of the students mentioned other influences. These were in this order: friends, teachers, relatives, job opportunities existing today, work experience, books, guidance officers and career reference centre. And perhaps it should be noted that guidance officers and the career reference centre were the least frequently mentioned. When asked, "During this last year with whom did you usually discuss your future plans?", most students mentioned their parents first (61.6 percent), their friends second (15.5 percent) and a guidance officer third (8.2 percent).

The sex of the person who influenced their career choice was another concern. A significant difference was found between males and females among those who mentioned they were influenced by another person. The males said they were influenced by another male (71.7 percent) and the females by another female (47.3 percent). However, only 8.5 percent of the males mentioned being influenced by a female, whereas 33.3 percent of the females said they were influenced by a male. An equal percentage (19.3 percent) of males and females said they were influenced by members of both sexes, usually their parents.
CERTAINTY OF OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE AND REASONS FOR CHOICE

There was a significant difference between males and females in how certain they were of their occupational choice. Females tended to make their occupational choice earlier and to state that they knew exactly the kind of occupation they wanted (see Tables 10 and 11). In fact, more than 50 percent of the females said that they knew exactly the occupation they would like to enter. Also, a larger percentage of females than males stated that they chose their occupation in primary school or in the first three years of high school. Nevertheless, most of the students made their choice during their last two years of high school and many were still uncertain about their choice and considering two or three occupations. This, of course, is not unusual as many more of these students will probably change their minds during the next three or four years while they continue their education or enter the labour force.

When asked to rate the importance of different features of occupations in influencing their choice, again there were significant differences between males and females in which features they felt were important. The females more often rated the following features higher:

1. Involves helping others,
2. Involves work with people,
3. Combines career and family life.
4. Is exciting work,
5. Involves working with hands.

Whereas, the males more often felt that the following features were important in choosing an occupation:

1. Free from close supervision,
2. Has high prestige,
3. Provides stable, secure future,
4. Prospect of high income.
TABLE 10

SEX DIFFERENCE IN CERTAINTY OF OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE

Percentage responding to:
"How definite is your occupational choice?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Certainty of Occupational Choice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know exactly</td>
<td>Between 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>41.1 (283)</td>
<td>41.7 (287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>52.9 (435)</td>
<td>37.1 (305)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Sq. = 28.5  p < .00  N = 1510
3 degrees of freedom  Gamma = -0.22  NA = 6
TOTAL = 1516
TABLE 11

SEX DIFFERENCE IN WHEN THE OCCUPATION WAS CHOSEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>When Occupation Chosen</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>First 3 yrs High Sch.</td>
<td>Last 2 yrs High Sch.</td>
<td>No choice yet</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>7.0 (48)</td>
<td>14.2 (97)</td>
<td>68.4 (467)</td>
<td>10.4 (71)</td>
<td>100.0 (683)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>14.1 (115)</td>
<td>24.0 (190)</td>
<td>52.9 (432)</td>
<td>9.1 (74)</td>
<td>100.1 (817)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Sq. = 50.85    p < .00    N = 1500
3 degrees of freedom    Gamma = -.28    NA = 16
TOTAL = 1516
The reasons for choosing an occupation appear to coincide with the students' occupational expectations. The females selected occupations that involved helping others and working with people; whereas, the males more often selected occupations that would give them a high income and prestige and were freer from close supervision. It appears that even though the male students may not want to become engineers or accountants, they realize these occupations will provide them with stable, secure futures and the idea of having a secure future appears to be more important than having an occupation that interests them.

INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL CLASS ON CAREER CHOICE

In a recent article examining some main themes from Kohn's Class and Conformity (1969), Wright and Wright (1976) argue for a refinement of the idea of social class. They found that the overall social class effect was apparently due more to parents' educational attainment than occupational prestige. Kohn's study, exploring the link between social class and values, hypothesizes the following:

Parents in different strata develop value systems (mobility orientations, social and cultural values, political ideologies and so on) which rationalize or are otherwise consistent with social life in the stratum; these values in turn are passed to children through socialization, thereby "equipping" the child to remain in the parental stratum once adulthood is reached. Middle-class parents are said to value achievement, creativity, deferred gratification and so on; once inculcated among their children, such values facilitate success in school and later, successful functioning in middle-class employment. Working-class parents, on the other hand, are said to value mostly the opposite traits, making children's school performance difficult and upward mobility less likely. Values, then, mediate the relationship between parents' and children's socioeconomic statuses (Wright and Wright, 1976: 528).
To explore these relationships in our sample, a correlation matrix was created to examine the various effects of parental education and occupation, father's and friends' encouragement for education, and student's N-achievement on their educational aspirations and occupational expectations (see Table 12). It is important to note that those coefficients given in parentheses are not statistically significant at the .05 level.

First, looking at the correlations between each of the variables and the student's aspirations, all of the variables were significantly correlated with the student's educational aspirations. However, three of the variables were more strongly associated with educational aspirations than the others: father's education, friends' encouragement for education and N-achievement.

When examining the correlations between the independent variables and the dependent variable, occupational expectations, again, three variables appear to have a greater degree of association with the dependent variable. They are sex, N-achievement, and educational aspirations. The latter two have a substantial and positive association with occupational expectations while the other, sex, is negatively correlated with occupational expectations. This indicates that the females have higher occupational expectations than the males which was mentioned earlier when discussing Table 7. It is important to note that although parental education and occupation are positively and significantly related to the students' occupational expectations, the parental influence is apparently mediated through educational aspirations and N-achievement which substantiates Kohn's and Wright's and Wright's argument that the parents influence their children by developing different value systems; in this case, middle-class parents are passing on their value of higher educational aspirations and the need to achieve.

In sum, social class influences career choice among Western Australian youth, however, the effect is largely through parental encouragement for higher educational aspirations and the development of the students'
# TABLE 12

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS** for Western Australian Secondary School Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Father's Education</th>
<th>Mother's Education</th>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Mother's Occupation</th>
<th>Father's Encouragement</th>
<th>Friends' Encouragement</th>
<th>N-Achievement</th>
<th>Educational Aspirations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Edu.</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Edu.</td>
<td>(-.04)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Occup.</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Occup.</td>
<td>(-.04)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Enc.</td>
<td>(-.01)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend's Enc.</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Achieve.</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu. Aspir.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Pearson correlation coefficients.

( ) = not significant at the .05 level

N = 1177

NA = 339

TOTAL = 1516

\(N = 1177\)
desire to achieve higher status. Although influence of social class is significant in Australia, its effect on occupational choice is slight compared with other countries. A comparison of these findings with a similar group of students from India and the United States show that social class influences students' occupational choice to a greater extent in those societies than it does in Australia.

**CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE: AUSTRALIA, INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES**

On a rather tentative basis this study has been given a cross-cultural dimension by adding two smaller samples from India and the United States who answered the same questions in an attempt to discover whether the disparity between males' and females' career choices varies from one society to another, dependent upon the individual's socio-economic position and upon women's participation in the labour force of that society. The three samples are really not "country" samples but rather from specific areas within each of the three countries. The Australian sample has already been described as a randomly selected sample of Western Australian schools. Both the Indian and United States samples were chosen by convenience. The Indian sample is actually from two schools in New Delhi. The schools were private, exclusive, co-educational schools and catered for the elite of New Delhi. The United States school was a public high school in Ithaca, a large town in New York State.

These schools cannot easily be compared with the total sample of Western Australian schools; therefore, the SES level of the schools was calculated and several schools were chosen from the Western Australian sample because they resembled fairly closely the socio-economic status level of the Indian and American students. Table 13 indicates the mean SES level of the schools in each country and the mean occupational level of the students showing the sex differences.

It was hypothesized that the greater women's participation in the labour force, the more frequently a female student will aspire to a male-dominated high-status occupation. According to Giele's figures in Table 4, this would mean that females in the United States would aspire
TABLE 1

MEANS FOR THE OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATIONS* OF AUSTRALIAN, AMERICAN AND INDIAN STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN SES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIAN SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Boys' School</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.3158</td>
<td>.8235</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.9318</td>
<td>.8136</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Girls' School</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.0465</td>
<td>.8438</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.8571</td>
<td>.8096</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Co-ed School</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.2308</td>
<td>.8724</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.2632</td>
<td>.8280</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in High Status Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.9160</td>
<td>.8692</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
<td>.8239</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The occupational levels ranged from a high of one to a low of three. The closer the mean was to one, the higher the occupational choice.
to higher status occupations more frequently than females in Australia or India. Contrary to what was expected, the females in India had the highest occupational expectation mean (1.8333) of any group in the three countries. The next group that had the highest occupational expectation mean (1.8571) were the females in Australia's government school. The Indian males were next in order with a mean of 1.9160, followed by the females from the Australian Protestant Girls' school with a mean of 1.9318. The United States males and females and the Australian Catholic school males had the lowest mean occupational expectations, all below a mean of 2.20.

It is important to note that the occupational expectation means appear directly related to the mean SES level of the schools. Here, it must be pointed out that the SES levels for the Australian school sample ranged from a high mean SES level of 2.2029 for the government school noted in Table 13 to a low mean SES level of 2.9615. Therefore, the Indian and American schools resembled the more exclusive schools in Western Australia and the one government school in the sample which was located in a very high status area. The Indian school had the highest mean SES level of the schools from the three countries and consequently the students from those school had a higher mean for their occupational expectations than those from the other countries.

Although this cross-cultural comparison is based on data that is not statistically generalizable, it does indicate a plausible direction for further research. These findings demonstrate that the socioeconomic background of students is much more important than their country of origin in predicting occupational expectations. Another surprising and significant finding is that the females in each country had higher occupational expectations than the males, except for the American sample where the differences between the sexes were not as great but the males had slightly higher occupational expectations.

This may be indicative of a future trend. However, this could be indicative of unrealistic expectations on the part of the females and many will not realize these expectations. More of these females will probably enter the work force than their mothers and more will engage in full-time careers; however, most of these females will still regard the welfare of their family as being more central to them than their career. In these three countries,
the vast majority of females expect to marry in their twenties and have two or three children. But, until the domestic domain becomes a place where duties are shared more equitably, the women in these countries will continue to pursue lower-status occupations, even though they may have higher occupational aspirations and expectations than the males.
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APPENDIX

TABLES AND GRAPHS

SHOWING EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PARTICIPATION OF AMERICAN WOMEN
### Table 2.4. Major occupation groups of employed women, 1940, 1950, 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major occupation group</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical workers</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, officials, proprietors (except farm)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, foremen</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm laborers</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household workers</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers (except private household)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, farm managers</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers, foremen</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data are for April of each year.
2 Not reported separately in 1940.

**Source:** Handbook of Women Workers, 1969, Table 40.

From Kreps, 1971: 37
DEMAND AND SUPPLY

Figure 2.2 LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF WOMEN BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED AND AGE, 1968 (18 YEARS AND OVER)

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics
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Chart A

The Number of Women Workers Doubled between 1950 and 1974 — And They Now Account for Nearly Two-fifths of All Workers

Number and proportion of women workers in the civilian labor force, April 1950 - 1971

Source: Howe, 1977: Appendix
The number of unemployed women has increased greatly, and women account for an increasing proportion of all unemployed persons.

Source: Howe, 1977: Appendix.
Source: Howe, 1977: Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Ph.D.'s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Epstein, 1975, p.xviii