

The Effect of Occupational Expectations on the Educational Attainments of Males and Females*

E. Dianne Looker

Karen L. McNutt

acadia university

Data from a longitudinal study of 400 youth in Hamilton, Ontario show that males and females differ in educational attainment. Males are more likely to go to university and females more likely to attend non-university post-secondary institutions. The majority of male and female youth say their occupational plans affected their educational decisions. Regression analysis shows a key gender difference in the status and gender typing of the youths' occupational expectations. Gender affects occupational expectations which, in turn, affect educational attainment.

Des données tirées d'une étude longitudinale portant sur 400 jeunes de Hamilton, en Ontario, indiquent que les garçons et les filles diffèrent quant à la durée et à la nature de leurs études. Les garçons ont de plus grandes chances de se retrouver à l'université; les filles, elles, ont plus tendance à poursuivre leurs études dans des institutions post-secondaires non universitaires. La majorité des garçons et des filles disent que leur choix de profession a eu des répercussions sur leurs décisions quant à leurs études. Une analyse de régressions indique une différence importante entre les garçons et les filles pour ce qui est de leurs attentes quant à leur profession. Le sexe a donc une incidence sur les attentes professionnelles, ce qui se répercute à son tour sur la durée et la nature des études.

INTRODUCTION

In understanding young adults' educational attainment one better understands how gender influences attainment. Our study takes a slightly different approach from the usual research on educational attainment. Rather than try to identify what combination of variables accounts for most of the variation in people's education, we ask about the effect of a particular variable, gender, on educational attainment. To do this we also examine how gender interacts with other variables known to affect attainment.

* The authors acknowledge financial support provided by the Canadian Department of Manpower and Immigration, the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the Harvey T. Reid Fund of Acadia University.

Our life skills, intellectual development, and socialization embody the type and amount of our formal schooling (see Martin & Macdonnell, 1982, chapters 3 and 4). In Canada, education has a crucial role in allocating people to work. Level of educational attainment presages a person's employability, of having a job or actively seeking one (Boulet & Lavalée, 1984, p. 8). For those in the labour force, education correlates with chances of unemployment (Statistics Canada, 1984a, p. 19, Chart 14) and with number of hours worked in a year (Boulet & Lavalée, 1984, p. 51). In addition, education influences the status of the job one is likely to have and income from employment (Boyd, 1982; Boulet & Lavalée, 1984; Cuneo & Curtis, 1975; Wanner, 1985). Given these effects, educational attainment warrants ongoing attention.

Males and females have differed historically in educational attainment. Until quite recently, females were more likely than males to finish high school and males dominated post-secondary institutions (Marsden & Harvey, 1971, p. 18), especially universities (Boulet & Lavalée, 1984, p. 28). This means males were more likely to have the advantages that come to university graduates. However, this gender difference has not received the attention it deserves, partly because many researchers ignore non-university post-secondary institutions in examining educational attainment (Breton, 1972; Sewell, Haller, & Portes, 1969). It is these "other" institutions that females tended to enter if they went beyond high school. As Monk-Turner (1983, p. 403) points out, "Different types of [post-secondary] educational institutions exist. To neglect this fact . . . is to ignore the reality of the higher education system today." The effect of this omission is that gender differences may have been overlooked.

The relevant question with respect to gender and education is why these differences exist. As to why females are less likely than males to attend university, Russell thinks "adolescent girls are under pressure not to make any personal commitments because they are to remain fluid and malleable in personal identity in order to adapt to the lives of the men they will meet and marry" (1979, p. 62). Williams reports that educational decisions have a greater saliency for males, whereas for girls the decision is "regarded of less import" (1972, p. 123). George and Kim find that fathers show greater interest in their sons' education than in their daughters', a factor the researchers consider to account for the lower educational aspirations of girls (1971, p. 358). Synge notes the parental tendency to regard women's education and training as less serious men's (1977, p. 304). Similarly Marsden and Harvey (1971, p. 25) that sex differences in programs of post-secondary education embody the different values parents place upon educating males and females. Hunter's survey finds that "parents less often think that their female children ought to or will go on to higher education, and they are less

often willing to provide financial assistance for them to do so" (1981, pp. 150–151).

Synge (1977) goes on to suggest that females are not only more readily accepted into typically "female" occupations but also refrain from lengthy training that may interfere with marriage and/or family plans. Porter, Porter, and Blishen write that boys are often directed by guidance counsellors and parents "to seek further training in order to obtain a better paying, more interesting job. For girls, further training is very often seen as a waste of time and money, since it is commonly thought that they will not use their skills for long (or even at all) in the work world" (1982, pp. 214–215).

On this reasoning, parents and young people see a career and advanced education as less important for females than for males. Presumably females plan marriage and family and do not need the high levels of education required by career-oriented males. Our data call this reasoning into question. We show that occupational plans matter to females as much as they do to males. In fact, it is by examining the type of occupations that females and males plan to enter that we can understand the gender difference in educational attainment. Although sociologists have in some degree recognised the importance of occupational plans for educational attainments (e.g., Porter, Porter, & Blishen, 1982, pp. 99, 214), few have examined the relationship carefully (exceptions include Anisef, Paasche, & Turrittin, 1980; Gaskell, 1981; Lyson, 1984; Maxwell & Maxwell, 1984).

We examine Canadian male/female differences in educational attainment, youths' reasons for educational decisions, and the role of their occupational plans. We use data on, first, explanations that the youth themselves gave when asked why they made the educational decisions they did and, second, the effect of gender on education when other variables shown to affect educational attainment are considered. These variables include mother's and father's education, occupation, and occupational and educational preferences for their children—as well as the youth's school performance and self-concept (Looker & Pineo, 1983). We assess explanations youth give for their educational decisions and others that sociologists traditionally consider.

We considered important Canadian events and changes between 1975–1981. In the early and mid 1970s, gender differences in post-secondary enrollment were clear, with more males in universities and more females in other post-secondary institutions (see Marsden & Harvey, 1971, p. 20). Data from the 1973 National Mobility Study (special runs: see Boyd, 1982) document that for all age categories and all regions of the country more females than males listed some non-university post-secondary as their highest level of education. On the other hand, more males than females reported university-level education. In 1975, males made up 56% of all university undergraduates.

There was a dramatic increase in the overall number of university degree holders between 1971 and 1981, particularly during the period 1976–1981, a 37% increase in five years (see Statistics Canada, 1984b, Chart 1). By 1981, 50% of all university undergraduates (and 50% of all those earning degrees) were female. However, some gender differences remained: females accounted for 57% of part-time and only 46% of full-time undergraduates (Association of Universities and Colleges, 1986, p. 10), and female masters (41%) and doctoral (32%) students were in the minority (Boulet & Lavallee, 1984, p. 28).

The educational and occupational plans of youth in 1975 provide a baseline for comparisons, and this cohort also provides information on how and why these changes were occurring.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA

Our data come from a study of four hundred youth aged 17–18 from Hamilton, Ontario. The first phase of data collection took place in 1975, with intensive interviews, and included persons born in 1957 and living at home with both parents. The age criterion produced a sample of older teenagers with realistic educational and occupational plans. The residence requirement was a design decision to obtain information from the youth and both parents, information used in subsequent analyses (Looker, 1977). Separate random samples were drawn of males and females from the Hamilton Regional Assessment Lists. These lists include information on the gender and year of birth of every individual in each dwelling unit, and allow us to study school dropouts omitted from many school-based studies.

The final sample consisted of 201 males and 199 females, 87% of eligible youth (according to our criteria). In addition to detailed interviews with the youth, we gave questionnaires to both parents. Eighty-seven percent of fathers and 88% of mothers responded.¹ In 1981, we contacted and interviewed again the same young people to gain information on their educational and occupational attainments, and their activities in the intervening six years. We obtained information during this follow-up stage from 76% of the original four hundred youth.

MEASUREMENT OF KEY VARIABLES

The dependent variable is the youth's educational attainment as of 1981. This information was obtained from an open-ended question: "What is the highest level of education you have completed to date?" Responses were coded in three categories: high school certificate or less, post-secondary non-university (including apprenticeships, commercial, business or trade schools, teachers' college, and other non-university training beyond high school) and

university, whether or not a degree or certificate had been completed.² The major independent variable is gender.

One of the strengths of this data set is that it contains a number of open-ended questions, asking respondents to say why they made educational and occupational decisions and why they gave specific answers to certain questions. Most questions for this analysis were in the 1981 interview, thus producing retrospective accounts of decision making. Ideally one would like this type of data from both phases of the research. However, the 1975 interview emphasized youths' plans and expectations; the 1981 asked primarily the detailed "why" questions.

A number of questions in both phases asked about occupational preferences and expectations. Our analysis begins with the 1975 question, "what job do you realistically expect to go into after you have completed ALL your formal education and training?" We think this variable intervenes between gender and educational attainment and accounts for much of the relationship between the two. If we are correct, the relationship between gender and education should reduce to non-significance when occupational plans are taken into account. This does not mean that gender has no effect on education but rather that gender affects occupational plans which in turn affect education.

Also included in the later part of the analysis is information on the parents' education and their educational expectations for their son or daughter. The 1975 parental questionnaires provide this information which was coded in the same three categories used for youths' educational attainment (high school, non-university post-secondary, and university).

With data at two points in time we are in a much stronger position than researchers with only one set of cross-sectional data. We want to argue not only that occupational plans are linked to educational plans but also that these occupational plans influence youths' educational decisions. From the 1975 information on their plans and the 1981 data on their attainments, it is clear that plans preceded educational attainments. Having longitudinal data as we do gives powerful support for our causal arguments.

FINDINGS

Table 1 shows how males and females in our sample differ in terms of educational attainment. Notice that equal proportions of males and females went no further than high school (42% and 43%, respectively). There is a gender difference, but restricted to the post-secondary level. The gender difference takes the form of a greater proportion of females than males (42% versus 28%) reporting non-university post-secondary education, and a correspondingly greater proportion of males (31% versus 16% of females) attending university.

TABLE 1
Gender by Educational Attainment (1981)

<i>Gender</i>	<i>1981 Educational Attainment</i>		
	<i>Grade 13 or less</i>	<i>Non-university post-secondary</i>	<i>University</i>
Male	42%	28%	31% (N=154)
Female	43%	42%	16% (N=154)

Chi square = 11.6
.01 significance

We wanted, next, to know why youth made their educational decisions. Given Table 1, the question becomes: what factors influence males and females to attend particular types of post-secondary institutions?

We look first for an answer in questions from the 1975 interview. Female respondents were asked whether or not they planned to work at various stages of their life cycle: before marriage, after marriage but before having children, when they had preschoolers, when all children were in school, or when all their children had left home. If education gender differences were simply an effect of females' familial commitment, we would expect non-traditional females (those who planned to work at every stage) to go on to university, and traditional ones (who did not plan to work) to take less education. This turned out not to be the case (data not shown). These variables did not explain the difference between females who did or did not go on.

We next examine youths' explanations of their educational and occupational decisions (from 1981). The most frequent reason whether to pursue education beyond high school was that post-secondary education was (42%) or wasn't (9%) needed for a job. The only other popular category was "always planned to" at 11%. Without prompting, over half the respondents said their occupational plans affected their educational decisions. Both males and females indicated that job plans were a major consideration. In this open-ended question 50% of the males and 52% of the females mentioned job plans.

Females who took non-university post-secondary programmes said things like: "I decided I wanted to go into nursing and knew I had to go to college to take that," "Because I wanted to be a secretary and I knew you had to have a college degree to have a good position," "I wanted to be a hairdresser and weighed the pros and cons of just doing an apprenticeship or going to school, and decided school was better," or, more generally, "Needed more education for a better job." Males who went to non-university institutions made similar

kinds of comments: "I liked electronics and thought that I'd get a better job if I studied it," "Because I knew what I wanted at the time—to be a mechanical drafting technician," or "There weren't any job opportunities for what I wanted to do without further education." The specific jobs differ, but the message is similar: post-secondary education gets you either a specific job that you want or a "better job" than you could get otherwise.

Responses from those who went to university raise the same issues. Females said "I wanted to teach and therefore had to go to university" or "Because the profession I wanted needed a university degree." Young males said "I was interested in going to university and wanted to become a teacher," or "I wanted to have a profession . . . and you need a university degree for that."

A set of structured questions in the 1981 interview asked how important each of the following were to the teenager's decision about how much education to get: liking school, doing well in school, type of job wanted, desire to make money, parents' opinions, friends' opinions, teachers' opinions, willingness to work hard, how bright he/she is, whether he/she could get a job with less education, and whether he/she wants to get married fairly soon. The answers showed that type of job wanted was the factor the highest proportion of both males (66%) and females (67%) thought very important; only the item on the importance of liking school showed a statistically significant gender difference. That is, there is no gender difference in the proportions saying job plans were important. Nor is there a gender difference for the item on the importance of marriage plans. It is not the case that females are less likely to go to university because they see education as a stop-gap before marriage, or because they take job plans less seriously than males.

Thus most teenagers see job plans as the most important factor in educational decisions. But, there is no gender difference in reports of how important job plans are that would explain youths' differential educational attainment. The next step was to investigate gender differences in specific types of jobs they expect. Gender differences in occupational expectations could help explain differences in educational attainment. If males plan to enter occupations that require university training whereas females plan to enter those requiring other post-secondary training, we can account for the pattern in Table 1.³ We turn to the information on occupational expectations from the 1975 interviews.

Since the educational differences we are trying to explain occur at the post-secondary level, we discuss the job plans of those who, by 1981, had taken at least some post-secondary education. The males who went on to non-university post-secondary education said they expected to be (in decreasing order of frequency) engineers, skilled tradesmen (cabinet makers, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, die casters, or mechanics), lawyers, accountants and managers, secondary school teachers, doctors, or dentists. The females

expected to be: nurses, teachers (mostly elementary or nursery school), technicians, clerical and secretarial workers, doctors or dentists, or other professional workers (accountants, managers, opticians, archeologists, physiotherapists, pharmacists, interpreters, recreation directors, or draftsmen).

Gender segregation of the labour market is apparent in these lists. Aside from teaching and some professional positions, jobs expected by males and females overlap little. The literature on gender segmentation of the labour force is extensive (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1975; Armstrong & Armstrong, 1983, p. 7; Boyd, 1982; Fox & Fox, 1986, p. 15; Phillips & Phillips, 1983). As Maxwell and Maxwell point out, "the most common finding on female aspirations indicates that most girls aspire to a few typically female occupations" (1984, p. 382). However, given the presumed effects of the women's liberation movement in the 1960s and 1970s and evidence that gender differences in educational attainment are declining, one might have expected these teenagers to choose occupations in a less gender-stereotyped way. After all, just because jobs are male or female dominated at a particular time does not mean young people *entering* the labour force will make gender stereotyped choices.

We classified the jobs our teenage respondents expected in 1975 in terms of whether the occupation listed is male or female dominated according to the 1971 census. This census information offers an accurate picture of the labour force our young people saw around them in 1975. Virtually all males (over 90%) planned to enter occupations predominantly (that is, more than 50%) male. In fact, most young men (85%) expected to enter jobs that, in 1971, were 70% or more male. Our female respondents were less restricted by gender stereotyping of jobs.⁴ About one third listed a predominantly male job as the one they expected to enter. This illustrates a shift from the more extreme stereotyping reported in much literature. Even so, half of our young women listed occupations predominantly female in 1971 as their expected job.

Here three patterns emerge. First, job plans reported by youth are equally important to the educational decisions of males and females. Second, women's liberation and other social changes notwithstanding, these teenagers were planning their future jobs in terms of the traditional gender segregation of the labour force. Third, male teenagers' occupational plans in 1975 were much more gender stereotyped than those of the females.

In the 1975 interviews, youths were asked two questions explicitly about gender stereotyping, whether they would consider entering an occupation predominantly held by the other gender, and how comfortable they would feel if they ended up in such an occupation. Almost two thirds (63%) of young men said they would *not* consider going into a predominantly female occupation; only 29% of the females said the same of a male occupation.

Similarly 64% of girls indicated they would feel comfortable in a predominantly male job, but less than half of the males said they would feel comfortable in a female one.

There may well be reasons for choosing a gender-stereotyped occupation. For example, Gaskell (1981, pp. 182–183) writes that an advantage of predominantly female positions in clerical and secretarial work is that one can go straight into a job from high school, a relatively secure if not well paying job at that. Many male jobs offer higher status, higher pay, or both. But recognising these differences does not help explain the gender stereotyped choices of those entering the labour force. Why, for example, do some males prefer low-status, dirty, low-paying manual work to the cleaner, more secure, and possibly better paid clerical jobs that females enter? The youths' answers to our questions on this suggest that gender stereotyping in and of itself is an important matter.

Males who said they wouldn't consider a predominantly female occupation made comments like: "I guess I'm a male chauvinist," "I'd be embarrassed," "It's just not normal," "Female jobs are for women," or "I'd feel out of place." Half of the 133 males who gave a reason for their aversion to a female job mentioned some aspect of negative gender stereotyping. Some of the young women made similar comments: "Men are men and if that's their job let them do it," "I'm old fashioned in roles," or "Girls should be girls and men should be men." However, only 17 (29%) of the 59 reasons females gave could be coded this way. Again we see the pattern of gender roles restricting a much larger proportion of males than females.

There are also status differences in occupations expected by males and females. The kinds of jobs expected by the men, especially those who get post-secondary training, tend to be either high status professional jobs or lower status⁵ skilled jobs (both traditionally male). The females also listed some high level professional positions but more often choose nursing and teaching, traditionally female and lower in status than the male professions of engineering and law. The lower status jobs expected by females who go on to post-secondary education (secretarial and technical) tend to have higher status (if not necessarily higher pay) than the skilled male jobs. This is consistent with a number of analyses that indicate that females tend to cluster in the middle of the status hierarchy (Boyd, 1982, p. 10; Harvey & Blakely, 1985, p. 53).

Our analysis has so far used data from youths' own explanations for the decisions they took. The next step is to see how consistent this is with an analysis of statistical relationships between variables. We shall have to consider gender typing as well as the status of youths' expected occupations. To do this, as well as measure the gender composition of 1975 occupational plans we coded them according to occupational status on the Blishen scale (Blishen & McRoberts, 1976).

Both gender typing and status of one's expected job are inferentially linked to educational attainment. Males who expect high status male jobs tend to end up in university; males who expect low status male jobs go either straight into the labour force from high school or to non-university post-secondary education. Very few males (about 5%) listed a predominantly female job as the one they expect. On the other hand, about a third of females expected to enter predominantly male jobs. These tend to be the higher status male positions. Consistent with their plans, these females go to university, as do their male counterparts. Females who plan to go into predominantly female jobs, whether high or low status, either enter the labour force directly from high school or go to non-university post-secondary institutions. Very few females (7%) gave a low status male job as the one they expected to enter.

We now turn to a regression analysis that allows us to examine more systematically the effect of teenagers' occupational plans on their educational attainment. We have provided evidence so far that gender as well as the gender typing and status of one's expected job affect the amount of education one gets. We could simply look at the simultaneous effect of gender and occupational plans on education.⁶ However, this would ignore the possible impact of other variables, such as parental expectations or one's grades in school, which we know affect attainment.

Multiple regression allows us to examine the simultaneous effects of several variables. In so doing it provides us with the following useful pieces of information: (a) if we look at the possible effects of several relevant variables at once, it tells us which ones have an effect on educational attainment, (b) it indicates how much effect each of these variables has, and (c) it summarizes how much of the variation in educational attainment is explained by this set of variables. Multiple regression cannot itself allow us to establish the causal ordering of the variables. However, since our dependent variable, educational attainment, was measured in 1981 and all the others in 1975, we can be confident that we know which ones came temporally first.

We ran a regression analysis on the variables in the data set which, according to earlier analyses, affect education. These include father's occupation⁷, father's and mother's education,⁸ father's and mother's educational expectations for the youth, the youth's high school grades, stream in high school, level of educational expectations, and type of job expected. Expected job was classified two ways, in terms of its status as measured by the Blishen scale (see Blishen & McRoberts, 1976) and in terms of the gender composition of that occupation according to the 1971 census. If we omit those variables which had no significant direct effect on educational attainment, we are left with the variables and the pattern of relationships presented in the left-hand column of Table 2, Regression 1.

The variables that affect educational attainment are as follows: father's education, grades in high school, father's educational expectations for the

TABLE 2
Regression Analysis of Factors Affecting Educational Attainment ($p \leq .05$)

<i>Independent variables</i>	<i>Path coefficients (betas)</i>	
	<i>Regression 1</i>	<i>Regression 2</i>
Father's education	.11	.11
Grades in school	.19	.20
Father's educational expectations	.33	.33
Expected job—% female	-.18	-.14*
Expected job—status	.24	.24
Gender	—	-.05*
R ² (squared multiple correlation)	.500	.501

youth,⁹ and both the status and gender composition of one's expected job.¹⁰ The path coefficients (betas) indicate the relative effect of each variable on educational attainment. Father's educational expectations of the youth has the biggest effect (beta=.33), followed by the status of one's expected job (beta=.24). The minus sign with the coefficient for the percent female in one's expected job indicates that those who expect a predominantly female job tend to have lower educational attainment. The less female-dominated the expected job, the higher the educational attainment. This is consistent with findings that, for female jobs, one tends to go no further than high school or, at most, to a non-university post-secondary institution. The R² at the bottom of the table tells us that this set of variables accounts for half (50.0%) of the variance in educational attainment.

The next step is to add gender to this list of variables to see if it has any separate effect on educational attainment. We saw in Table 1 that gender had a definite relationship to educational attainment. If the effect of gender is due to differences in the gender typing and the status of the youths' occupational plans, these variables, not gender, should be linked to education in the regression analysis. In other words, controlling the effect of occupational plans as an intervening variable, the relationship between gender and education should disappear.

The results are presented in the second column of Table 2. The effect of gender is very small (beta=.05) and is not statistically significant. In other words, gender does not have any effect on educational attainment separate from the gender differences that exist in these other variables.¹¹ Thus, it is not simply whether one is a male or female that affects educational decisions; it is that fact that males and females expect different jobs, perform differently

in school, and get different messages from their parents. Further, R^2 is unchanged from the first regression (from .500 to .501), indicating that gender has no effect separate from those of other variables already in the analysis.

Referring to the questions at the beginning of this analysis, we find: that these males and females do differ in their educational attainments, with males more likely to go to university and females more likely to go to other post-secondary institutions; that the majority of youth, both male and female, tell us their occupational plans affected their educational decisions; and that the statistical analysis shows that controlling for the status and gender typing of occupational plans helps explain the relationship between gender and education.

CONCLUSIONS

Our major finding, then, is that occupational expectations account for much of the gender difference in educational attainment. This is consistent with our respondents' information that most males and females think job considerations are of primary importance in their educational decisions. More specifically we found that both the status and the gender-typing of the expected occupation are relevant, with males planning to enter almost exclusively male positions, with either high or low status. Females, on the other hand, select from traditionally female or high status male occupations.

We argue that our females based their educational decisions on occupational considerations as did the males. As indicated earlier, this view of females is at odds with some portrayals of females in the literature. We find that, at least in terms of their educational decisions, job considerations are as important to our 1975 females as they are to the males.

Some of the patterns which we have observed may be due to social changes of the period (1975–1981) both in education and in the occupational world (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1983). A number of shifts in the gender composition of particular occupations saw women increase their share in management, natural science, social science, artistic work, sales, service, and other crafts. However, "in two occupations, teaching and machining women actually lost ground" (p. 236), despite a 3.3% increase in the female share of jobs. Boulet and Lavalée (1984) summarize other changes in the decade from 1971 to 1981. They document the increased occupational diversification of females in the labour force. They find that "the more an occupation was male-dominated, the greater was the tendency for women to enter the field" (1984, p. 18).

Changing educational requirements for predominantly female occupations (nursing, social work, library science, and elementary school teaching)

encourage university entrance. In the past, it was sufficient to get a few years of post secondary and/or on the job training to qualify for such positions. Now, in more and more areas, a university degree is required. More females will, in consequence, go to university. Some will expect to enter predominantly male occupations.¹² Some new university females will be there by virtue of changing requirements in female dominated occupations.

More females are entering university, more females are entering traditionally male occupations, but the majority of youth (especially males) are following gender stereotyped paths in their education and their occupations.

If greater proportions of females aspire to high status male positions, we can expect the gender differences in education to decrease. With continuing high unemployment occupational concerns will play an even greater role in educational decisions as young people (and perhaps not so young people) seek to increase their chances of employment by obtaining a particular type of education. Our results support the argument that these occupational aspirations are a cause rather than an effect of educational decisions. In other words, educational attainment and corresponding occupational attainment of females and males are only likely to change when and if their occupational aspirations change. But our respondents' explanations of their choices indicate that economics or other objective characteristics of the work world are not the only considerations. Rather, their jobs appear to be part of the ongoing process whereby many young people, particularly males, reaffirm their gender identity.

NOTES

¹ See Looker (1977), Looker and Pineo (1983) for more details of the 1975 data collection. For this phase of the research, P. C. Pineo was the principal investigator.

² Since the question asks about highest level, it is an indication of how much education the teenager had received by 1981, not a measure of whether an individual was enrolled in university or some other educational institution in 1981.

³ Lloyd and Niemi (1979) find a negative relationship between the percent female in an occupation and the number of years of education it requires. See their Table 3.8, pp. 142–143.

⁴ This finding has been presented and discussed elsewhere (see Looker, 1985). It is worth emphasizing that this gender stereotyping of occupations affects males more than it does females. For a similar finding see Marini and Greenberger, 1978, pp. 159–160.

⁵ These statements about the status of youths' occupational expectations are based on the Blishen scale (Blishen & McRoberts, 1976).

⁶ The relationship between gender and educational attainment reported in Table 1 reduces to nonsignificance when one controls on the status and gender typing of one's expected job (data not shown).

- ⁷ We have information on mother's as well as father's occupation, but, given that fewer than half of the mothers were working either full or part-time, including this variable in the analysis would have severely reduced the case base. Checks on the effect of mother's occupation found it had no impact on youths' educational attainment separate from the effect of father's occupation. This is not overly surprising in that husbands and wives are frequently quite similar in their occupational status.
- ⁸ The questions about parental occupation and education are essentially measures of the youths' social class background. By including these variables, we are controlling the possible effects of social class on educational attainment. In other analyses (see McNutt, 1985) we have demonstrated that the gender difference in educational attainment shown in Table 1 holds when social class, by itself, is controlled.
- ⁹ Mother's education and mother's educational expectations for the youth did not have as large an effect as father's, and, once father's characteristics were taken into account, mother's effect was negligible. This is the same pattern reported in note 7. Mothers and fathers are frequently similar in educational background and their educational expectations of their teenage sons or daughters.
- ¹⁰ If one runs the regression separately for males and females, different sets of variables have significant effects on educational attainment. For males the relevant variables are: father's expectations, grades in high school, and the status of the youth's expected job. For females they are: father's education, the youth's educational expectations, and both the status and the gender composition of the expected occupation. Since we were interested in the effect of gender on educational attainment the more relevant analysis is the regression presented in Table 2.
- ¹¹ Of variables examined, only parental expectations for the youth and high school stream were linked both to gender and to educational attainment, thus mediating the effect of gender on attainment. However, given these variables were all measured in 1975, it is difficult to sort out whether they affect or were affected by youths' occupational plans.
- ¹² It is worth noting that *none* of the females in our sample went to university in order to enter nursing; non-university training programmes were still an option at that point. Five of the females who went to university said they expected to be secondary school teachers. While teaching in general is and has for some time been female dominated, secondary schools have been a predominantly male preserve. Females who expected to be elementary or nursery school teachers, went to non-university post-secondary institutions.

REFERENCES

- Anisef, P., Paasche, J., & Turritin, A. (1980). *Is the die cast? Educational achievements and work destinations of Ontario youths*. Toronto: Minister of Colleges and Universities.
- Armstrong, H., & Armstrong, P. (1975). The segregated participation of women in the Canadian labour force, 1941-71. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 12, 370-384.
- Armstrong, P., & Armstrong, H. (1983). *A working majority: What women must do for pay*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (1986). *Compendium of university statistics: 1986 edition*. Ottawa: AUCC, Research and Analysis Division.

- Blishen, B. R., & McRoberts, H. A. (1976). A revised socio-economic index for occupations in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 13, 71-79.
- Boulet, J. A., & Lavallée, L. (1984). *The changing economic status of women*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Boyd, M. (1982). Sex differences in the Canadian occupational attainment process. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 19, 1-28.
- Breton, R. (1972). *Social and academic factors in the career decisions of Canadian youth*. Ottawa: Information Canada.
- Cuneo, C., & Curtis, J. (1975). Social ascription in the educational and occupational status attainment of urban Canadians. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 12, 6-24.
- Fox, B. J., & Fox, J. (1986). Women in the labour market, 1931-1981: Exclusion and competition. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 23, 1-21.
- Gaskell, J. (1981). Equal educational opportunity for women. In J. Wilson (Ed.), *Canadian education in the 1980s* (pp. 173-193). Calgary: Detselig.
- George, P. M., & Kim, K. Y. (1971). Social factors and educational aspirations of Canadian high schools students. In J. E. Gallagher & R. D. Lambert (Eds.), *Social processes and institutions: The Canadian case* (pp. 352-363). Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Harvey, E. B., & Blakely, J. H. (1985). Education, social mobility and the challenge of technological change. In *Transitions to work* (pp. 46-65). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- Hunter, A. (1981). *Class tells: On social inequality in Canada*. Toronto: Butterworths.
- Lloyd, C. B., & Niemi, B. T. (1979). *The economics of sex differentials*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Looker, E. D. (1977). *The role of value elements in the intergenerational transmission of social status*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.
- Looker, E. D. (1985). Fuelling a gender-segregated labour market: Gender and the transition from school to work. In *Transitions to Work* (pp. 150-168). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- Looker, E. D. & Pineo, P. C. (1983). Social psychological variables and their relevance to the status attainment of teenagers. *American Journal of Sociology*, 88, pp. 1195-1219.
- Lyson, T. (1984). Sex differences in the choice of a male or female career line: An analysis of background characteristics and work values. *Work and Occupations*, 11, 131-146.
- Marini, M., & Greenberger, E. (1978). Sex differences in occupational aspirations and expectations. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 5, 147-178.
- Marsden, L., & Harvey, E. B. (1971). Equality of educational access reconsidered: The postsecondary case in Ontario. *Interchange*, 2(4), 11-26.
- Martin, W., & Macdonell, A. (1982). *Canadian education: A sociological analysis*. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall.
- Maxwell, M., & Maxwell, J. (1984). Women and the elite: Educational and occupational aspirations of private school females 1966/76. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 21, 371-394.
- McNutt, Karen L. (1985). *Gender differences in educational attainment*. Unpublished honours thesis, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.
- Monk-Turner, E. (1983). Sex educational differentiation, and occupational status: Analyzing occupational differences for community and four-year college entrants. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 24, 393-404.

- Phillips, P., & Phillips, E. (1983). *Women and work: Inequality in the labour market*. Toronto: Lorimer.
- Porter, J., Porter, M., & Blishen, B. (1982). *Stations and callings: Making it through the school system*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Russell, S. (1979). Learning sex roles in the high school. *Interchange*, 10(2), 57-66.
- Sewell, W., Haller, A., & Portes, A. (1969). The educational and early occupational attainment process. *American Sociological Review*, 34, 82-92.
- Statistics Canada. (1984a). *Women and the work world*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Statistics Canada. (1984b). *Schooling in Canada*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Synge, J. (1977). The sex factor in social selection processes in Canadian education. In R. Carlton, L. Colley, & N. MacKinnon (Eds.), *Education, change, and society: A sociology of Canadian education* (pp. 298-306). Toronto: Gage.
- Wanner, R. (1985). Trends in education and entry to the labour force: A Canadian-U.S. Comparison. In *Transitions to Work* (pp. 88-105). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- Williams, T. (1972). Educational aspirations: Longitudinal evidence on their development in Canadian youth. *Sociology of Education*, 45, 107-133.

E. Dianne Looker is in the Department of Sociology, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, B0P 1X0, and Karen L. McNutt is a private scholar in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.