

**Adolescent Work-Related Values and Beliefs: Gender Differences
and Relation to Occupational Aspirations.**

Debra M. Jozefowicz

University of Michigan

Bonnie L. Barber

Penn State University

Jacquelynne S. Eccles

University of Michigan

Abstract

Gender differences in adolescent values, expectancies, perceived abilities, and occupational aspirations were examined. Adolescent values and beliefs were then used to discriminate between those adolescents aspiring to each of 9 occupational categories. The sample was predominately white (90%) and included 603 female and 439 male twelfth-grade students from 10 high schools. The schools were located in lower-middle to middle class school districts in southeastern Michigan. Students were surveyed in their classrooms in the spring of 1990. The results indicate that sex differences in the expectancies, self-perceptions of abilities, values, and occupational aspirations of high school seniors continue to exist. Similarities in the characteristics of males and females aspiring to certain careers support the hypotheses that beliefs and values mediate the relationship between gender and occupational aspirations.

Paper Presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research on Child Development: New Orleans, Louisiana, March 28, 1993.

This research was supported by grants from the Spencer Foundation, the W. T. Grant Foundation, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development. Special thanks to Andrew Fuligni for his collaborative work on all aspects of the research project, to Mary Corcoran and Paul Courant for their contribution to the measures, and to Lisa Colarossi and the many undergraduates who assisted with the collection and coding of the data.

Large sex differences continue to exist in the labor market participation of adults in terms of both extent of participation and type of job held. In addition to the institutional barriers that contribute to such differences (e.g., overt discriminatory hiring and wage practices), researchers have also been interested in the psychological processes that influence occupational choice.

Sex differences in work and family values, expectations, personality traits, self-perceptions of abilities, and career aspirations have been proposed as mediators of sex differences in occupational behavior (Marini, 1978; Eccles & Hoffman, 1984; Eccles, 1987). For instance, it has been suggested that males have higher expectancies for success and perceptions of ability in male-typed careers when compared to females. In addition, societal gender-role stereotypes that hold males primarily responsible for household income and females primarily responsible for family needs may contribute to males valuing the status attainment of a career and females valuing job flexibility (Eccles & Hoffman, 1984; Herzog & Bachman, 1982). Finally, males have been shown to have higher perceptions of ability and preference for "thing" oriented tasks and females have been shown to have higher perceptions of ability and preference for "people" oriented tasks (Marini, 1978; Eccles & Hoffman, 1984; Eccles, 1987). In sum, the above sex differences in expectancies, perceptions of abilities, and values have been proposed to account for sex differences in occupational preference and subsequent job choice.

It has been suggested that the increasing similarity in male and female aspirations has been influenced more by females moving into male-dominated professions than males moving into female-dominated

professions. One explanation for this trend is that female-dominated professions tend to be less prestigious and of lower status than male-dominated professions. Thus, females are more motivated to aspire to non-traditional careers than males based on the status of the careers they typically occupy (Eccles & Hoffman, 1984). It follows, then, that increased similarity in occupational aspirations can be explained more by females increased valuing of characteristics common in male-dominated careers (e.g., high status and prestige), decreased valuing of characteristics common in female-dominated careers (e.g., people and society oriented), and increased perceptions of ability and expectancies for success in male-dominated occupations.

This paper focuses on the possible developmental origins of the sex differences in labor market participation and on assessing whether there are likely to be changes in the magnitudes and nature of these sex differences in the next generation of adults. Gender differences in adolescent values, expectancies, perceived abilities, and occupational aspirations will be examined. In addition, the relation of these variables to occupational aspirations will be investigated.

Methods

Study Overview

The data used in the present study were collected as part of a multi-wave longitudinal examination of adolescent development which began in 1983. Approximately 2200 students from 12 school districts in southeastern Michigan were surveyed in the fall and spring of their sixth and seventh grade years. A subset of this sample were surveyed again during their tenth and twelfth grade years. Students from two high schools were surveyed for

the first time during twelfth grade data collection. Survey data collected on 1042 twelfth-grade students will be examined presently.

Subjects

The sample included 603 females and 439 males from 10 predominantly white (90%), lower-middle to middle class school districts in southeastern Michigan. Mean age of the students at the time of the survey was 17 years (SD=.52). At the time of the survey, most of the student's parents were married (70%), some were divorced (22%), and a small percentage fell into other marital categories (8%).

Measures

Four sets of values and beliefs were assessed using a 7-item, Likert-scale format. These included: 1) values regarding work, future success, relationships, and leadership (**lifestyle values**); 2) specific job characteristics adolescents may desire in their future occupational settings (**valued job characteristics**); 3) estimates of future success in different categories of occupations (**expected efficacy in jobs**); and 4) self-ratings of job relevant skills (**self perception of skills**). Each of the four sets of items were factor analyzed. Factors obtained from the analyses were further broken down based on theoretical and conceptual grounds. Scale items, alphas, means, and standard deviations are presented in the Appendix. **Occupational aspirations** were assessed using the following open-ended probe: "If you could have any job you wanted, what job would you like to have when you are 30?". Standard U.S. Occupational Classification codes were used and each code was categorized into 1 of 9 general occupational categories (see Table 1).

Results

Data Analyses

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were run on 2 sets of variables. Each set of variables was chosen based on a priori conceptualizations and examination of the relations among the variables. MANOVA reduces the probability of Type I. error (false rejection of the null hypothesis) and takes into account the relations among dependent variables (Stevens, 1992). Non-parametric statistical procedures (chi-square analyses) were run in order to determine sex differences in occupational aspirations. Finally, discriminant analyses were run separately for males and females in order to determine which values, job characteristics, skills, and efficacy expectations best discriminated between adolescents who aspired to each of nine occupational categories. The results of the discriminant analyses are presented in Table 3.

Gender Differences in Values, Expectancies, and Skills

The MANOVA results are presented in Table 1. Looking first at **lifestyle values**, it was found that males valued high status/competitiveness, risk-taking, and material wealth more than females. Females valued putting family and friends before work more than males. Both males and females held high career values, although there was a slight tendency for females to rate career values higher ($p < .01$). For **valued job characteristics**, females preferred people and society oriented jobs more than males, and males preferred machinery/manual work and math/computer work more than females. Both females and males held high values for job flexibility to meet family needs, creative/educational job experiences, and job

Table 1.
Gender Differences in Values, Expectancies, and Perceived Skills.

| Measures | Females Mean (SD) | Males Mean (SD) |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|
| Lifestyle Values | | |
| 1. High status/Competitive ^a | 4.4 (1.4) | 4.8 (1.4)*** |
| 2. Risk taking ^a | 4.7 (1.1) | 5.1 (1.0)*** |
| 3. Careerism ^a | 5.7 (1.0) | 5.5 (1.0) |
| 4. Family and friends before work ^b | 4.5 (1.0) | 4.0 (1.1)*** |
| 5. Material Wealth ^a | 4.7 (1.2) | 5.1 (1.1)*** |
| Valued Job Characteristics | | |
| 1. Flexibility to meet family obligations ^b | 5.5 (1.1) | 5.4 (1.0) |
| 2. People/society oriented ^b | 5.7 (1.0) | 5.1 (1.1)*** |
| 3. Prestige/responsibility ^a | 5.4 (1.1) | 5.6 (0.9) |
| 4. Creative/educational ^a | 5.7(1.2) | 5.8 (1.1) |
| 5. Machinery/manual work ^a | 3.0 (1.2) | 3.9 (1.6)*** |
| 6. Math/computer work ^a | 3.9 (1.5) | 4.2 (1.5)*** |
| Expected Efficacy in Jobs | | |
| 1. Health-related ^b | 4.2 (1.9) | 3.7 (1.7)*** |
| 2. Science-related ^a | 3.5 (1.6) | 4.1 (1.7)*** |
| 3. Skilled labor (male)/Protective services ^a | 2.4 (1.0) | 4.2 (1.2)*** |
| 4. Skilled labor (female)/Human services ^b | 4.5 (1.2) | 3.3 (1.2)*** |
| 5. Business and Law ^b | 4.6 (1.4) | 4.9 (1.4) |
| 6. Artist ^a | 3.5 (1.9) | 3.3 (1.7) |
| Self-Perception of Skills | | |
| 1. Working with others ^b | 5.5 (0.9) | 4.8 (1.0)*** |
| 2. Leadership ^a | 5.3 (1.1) | 5.3 (1.0) |
| 3. Independence ^a | 5.2 (1.1) | 5.3 (1.0) |
| 4. Intellectual ^a | 5.1 (1.2) | 5.3 (1.2) |
| 5. Mechanical ^a | 2.3 (1.4) | 4.2 (1.7)*** |
| 6. Computers ^a | 4.0 (1.7) | 4.2 (1.6) |

^a First MANOVA Set; ^b Second MANOVA Set

Note: Both MANOVAs were significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Reported gender differences are based on univariate tests of significance *** $p < .001$.

prestige/responsibility (although there was a trend for males to rate job prestige/responsibility higher in value; $p < .01$). With regard to expectations for efficacy in jobs, males had higher expectancies for efficacy in skilled labor/protective service (male-typed) occupations and science-related occupations. Females had higher expectancies for efficacy in health-related occupations and skilled labor/human service (female-typed) occupations. There was a slight trend for males to have higher efficacy expectations in business and law when compared to females ($p < .01$). On ratings of skills, females believed they were better at working with people and males thought they were better at mechanical tasks. No gender differences were found on ratings of leadership skills. There was a slight trend for males to rate their intellectual skills higher than females ($p < .01$).

Gender Differences Occupational Aspirations

The findings based on the chi-square analyses (see Table 2.) show that males aspired to science/math-related occupations, male-typed skilled labor occupations, and protective service jobs more than females. Females aspired to human service jobs, health professions, and female-typed skilled labor more than males. The majority of both males and females aspired to business/law occupations (31% and 30%, respectively) and an equal number of females and males aspired to writing/artistic occupations.

Occupational Aspirations: Discriminant Analyses

The results for the discriminant analyses are presented in Table 3. All of the functions except for one significantly discriminated between those females and males who chose jobs in each category and those who did not

Table 2.
Gender Differences in Occupational Aspirations.

| Occupation | Males N (Percent) | Females N (Percent) |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| Male Typed^a | | |
| Science/Math (e.g., engineer, computer science) | 94 (20) | 45 (7) |
| Skilled labor (e.g., construction, mechanic) | 61 (13) | 12 (2) |
| Protective services (e.g., military, police) | 53 (11) | 15 (2) |
| Female Typed^b | | |
| Human services (e.g., social worker, teacher) | 19 (4) | 80 (13) |
| Health para-professional/professional (e.g., dental assistant, nurse) | 6 (1) | 69 (11) |
| Health (e.g., doctor, dentist, vet) | 25 (5) | 60 (10) |
| Skilled labor (e.g., cosmetology, secretary) | 4 (1) | 52 (8) |
| Neutral | | |
| Business and law (e.g., accountant, manager, attorney) | 149 (31) | 186 (30) |
| Writer or artist (e.g., journalism, performing art) | 43 (9) | 76 (12) |

^a Males reported significantly more ($p < .01$) than females based on Chi square analyses.

^b Females reported significantly more ($p < .01$) than males based on Chi square analyses.

Note: 49 (4%) of the responses to the occupational aspiration probe could not be coded.

Table 3. Discriminant Function Analyses.

| Occupation | Males | | Females | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Discriminating Variables | Structure Coefficients | Discriminating Variables | Structure Coefficients |
| Skilled Labor: Male-typed | (N = 50 aspiring / 371 not aspiring) | | (N = 12 aspiring / 569 not aspiring) | |
| | Job Value - Machinery | .63 | Efficacy - Male-typed | .59 |
| | Efficacy - Male-typed | .60 | Job Value - Machinery | .59 |
| | Skills - Computers | -.33 | Skills - Mechanical | .44 |
| | Skills - Mechanical | .33 | Job Value - Math/Comp. | .28 |
| Skilled Labor: Female-typed | Job Value - Creative | -.32 | | |
| | Job Value - Math/Comp. | -.30 | (N = 48 aspiring / 533 not aspiring) | |
| | Skills - Intellectual | -.28 | Efficacy - Health-related | -.55 |
| | (N = 3 aspiring / 418 not aspiring) | | Efficacy - Science-related | -.52 |
| | n.s. | | Efficacy - Business/law | -.47 |
| Protective Services | (N = 46 aspiring / 375 not aspiring) | | Lifestyle Value- High Status | -.46 |
| | Efficacy - Male-typed | .49 | Job Value - Prestige | -.33 |
| | Job Value - Math/Comp. | -.36 | Skills - Leadership | -.26 |
| | Efficacy - Science-related | -.36 | Lifestyle Value - Family | .25 |
| | Efficacy - Business/Law | -.30 | (N = 11 aspiring / 570 not aspiring) | |

Table 3. cont.

| Occupation | Males | | Females | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Discriminating Variables | Structure Coefficients | Discriminating Variables | Structure Coefficients |
| Human Services | (N = 19 aspiring / 402 not aspiring) | | (N = 74 aspiring / 507 not aspiring) | |
| | Job Value - People/Society | .56 | Skills - Work with others | .48 |
| | Skills - Work with others | .42 | Job Value - People/Society | .42 |
| | Job Value - Flexibility | .31 | Job Value - Prestige | -.40 |
| | Lifestyle Value - Wealth | -.30 | Efficacy - Female-typed | .37 |
| Writer/Artist | Lifestyle Value - Family | .30 | Job Value - Machinery | -.34 |
| | (N = 39 aspiring / 382 not aspiring) | | Job Value - High Status | -.26 |
| | Efficacy - Artist | .61 | (N = 69 aspiring / 512 not aspiring) | |
| | Efficacy - Male-typed | -.31 | Efficacy - Artist | .68 |
| | Job Value - Math/Comp. | -.27 | Job Value - Math/Comp. | -.43 |
| Health Professional | Job Value - Machinery | -.26 | Job Value - Creative | .30 |
| | (N = 6 aspiring / 415 not aspiring) | | Efficacy - Health-related | -.29 |
| | Efficacy - Health-related | .49 | Efficacy - Science-related | -.28 |
| | Efficacy - Female-typed | .27 | (N = 65 aspiring / 516 not aspiring) | |
| | Skills - Computers | -.26 | Efficacy - Health-related | .72 |
| Lifestyle Val. - Risk Taking | .25 | Job Value - People/Society | .39 | |

Table 3. cont.

| Occupation | Males | | Females | |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Discriminating Variables | Structure Coefficients | Discriminating Variables | Structure Coefficients |
| Business/Law | (N = 130 aspiring / 291 not aspiring) Efficacy - Business/Law Lifestyle Value - Wealth Skills - Leadership | .60 .29 .26 | (N = 174 aspiring / 407 not aspiring) Efficacy - Health-related Efficacy - Business/Law Job Value - People/Society Job Value - Prestige Job Value - Machinery Efficacy - Science-related | -.49 .45 -.32 .30 -.29 -.26 |
| Science-Related | (N = 90 aspiring / 331 not aspiring) Efficacy - Science-related Job Value - Math/Comp. Skills - Computers Skills - Machinery Efficacy - Business/Law | .51 .51 .32 .31 -.28 | (N = 45 aspiring / 536 not aspiring) Efficacy - Science-Related Job Value - People/Society Efficacy - Male-typed Job Value - Math/Comp. | .61 -.40 .27 .27 |
| Health | (N = 20 aspiring / 401 not aspiring) Efficacy - Health-related Skills - Machinery Skills - Working with others Job Value - People/Society | .65 -.28 .26 .25 | (N = 56 aspiring / 525 not aspiring) Efficacy - Health-related Efficacy - Science-related Job Value - People/Society | .81 .56 .29 |

Note: Only coefficients correlating with the function at .25 or above are reported here

(only 3 males aspired to female-typed skilled labor, and the function was not significant). Females who aspired to **female-typed skilled labor** held low occupational expectancies in health-related, science-related, and business/law occupations and they had low perceptions of leadership skills when compared to females who aspired to other careers. In addition, they did not value high status /competitiveness or prestige on the job when compared to all other females. Finally, females who aspired to female-typed skilled labor valued putting family and friends before work more than females who did not aspire to this category.

Both males and females who aspired to **male-typed skilled labor** expected to do well in male-typed jobs, valued working with machinery/hands, and felt they possessed mechanical skills. However, males who aspired to these careers rated themselves low on computer skills and intellectual skills. In addition, they did not value job characteristics associated with creativity/education and math/computer tasks when compared to all other males. On the other hand, females who aspired to male-typed skilled labor valued math/computer job tasks more than females who did not aspire to these careers.

With regard to those who aspired to **protective service** occupations, both males and females expected to well in skilled labor/protective service (male-typed) occupations when compared to those who do not aspire to these jobs. However, males who chose these jobs did not value math/computer job characteristics as much as males who did not chose these jobs. In addition, males who aspired to protective service occupations did not expect to do well in science-related or business/law occupations when compared to all other

males. Females who aspired to protective service careers valued high status/prestige, working with machinery/hands, and risk taking more than females who did not aspire to these careers. In addition, they held lower values for putting friends and family first in comparison to all other females.

Both females and males who aspired to **human service occupations** valued jobs that were people/society oriented and rated their skills in working with others higher than those who did not aspire to these careers. In addition, males who chose human service jobs valued job flexibility to meet family needs, valued putting friends and family first before work, and de-valued wealth in comparison to those males who did not aspire to human service careers. Females aspiring to human service jobs did not value prestige, working with machinery, or high status/competitiveness when compared to all other females. In addition, they expected to do well in female-typed/human service careers.

Males and females who aspired to **writing or artistic occupations** expected to do well in artistic occupations and did not value math/computer job tasks in comparison to those who did not choose writing/artistic jobs. Males who wanted artistic jobs did not expect to do well at skilled labor/protective service (male-typed) jobs and they did not value working with machinery/hands. Females who aspired to these careers valued job creativity and did not expect to do well in health or science-related careers when compared to all other females.

For those who chose **health paraprofessional/professional occupations**, both males and females expected to do well in health-related jobs. Females who aspired to these careers also valued jobs that were people/society

oriented when compared to all other females. Males who aspired to these careers expected to do well in skilled labor/human service (female-typed) jobs, valued risk taking, and had lower perceptions of their computer skills when compared to males who did not aspire to such careers.

Expectations to do well in business/law occupations discriminated between those who chose a **business/law career** from those who did not for both males and females. In addition, males who aspired to business/law careers valued wealth and rated themselves high on leadership skills in comparison to all other males. Females who chose business/law careers valued prestige, did not expect to do well in health or science-related careers, did not value jobs that were people/society oriented, and did not value working with machinery/hands in comparison to females who aspired to other careers.

With regards to **science/math careers**, males and females who aspired to these careers expected to do well in science-related fields and valued math and computer job tasks when compared to others. Males who aspired to science-related careers also had high ratings of computer and machinery skills and low expectancies of doing well in business/law occupations. Females who chose science-related careers did not value people/society oriented job characteristics and they anticipated doing well in skilled labor (male-typed) careers when compared to all other females.

Finally, with regard to **health careers**, both females and males who aspired to these careers expected to do well in health-related occupations and they valued people/society oriented job characteristics in comparison to those who did not aspire to health careers. For females, those who chose health-related careers also expected to do well in science-related occupations. For males,

those who chose health-related careers rated their machinery skills low and their "working with others" skills high in comparison to males who did not aspire to these careers.

Discussion

As evidenced by the present study, sex differences continue to exist in the expectancies, self-perceptions, values, and occupational aspirations of high school seniors. Gender shifts in occupational attainment appear to be the result of more females aspiring to and subsequently moving into previously male-dominated careers such as business, law, and medicine. Results of the present study also suggest that the shift may be related to a broadening of efficacy, skill, and value configurations which represent less traditional female patterns. Males appear to be shifting away from health-related careers and few males are aspiring to traditionally female careers. The "feminization" of occupations has been widely recognized as the process by which female movement into an occupation tends to lower the occupation's status which, in turn, discourages males from aspiring to such careers (Eccles & Hoffman, 1984; Eccles, 1987). Thus, female movement into health related fields such as medicine may be related to the low number of males aspiring to such occupations. In addition, the low incidence of males aspiring to female-dominated professions supports the hypothesis that males are not motivated to aspire to traditionally female occupations since traditionally female occupations tend to hold less prestige than traditionally male occupations (Eccles & Hoffman, 1984).

Within aspiration categories, the discriminant analyses reveal a number of similar processes for both males and females. These similarities support the

hypothesis that gender differences in occupational aspirations are mediated to some degree by expectations, values, and beliefs in ability. In addition, both approach (i.e., I expect to do well in science, therefore I will choose a science career) and avoidance (i.e., I do not value people/society oriented job tasks, therefore I will aspire to something else) processes appear to be operating within the occupational choice system for both males and females. The importance of considering all of these factors in explaining occupational behavior has been stressed by Eccles and her colleagues (e.g., Eccles, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala, Meece, & Midgley, 1983; Eccles, 1987; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992).

In addition to the gender similarities in the discriminant functions, there are also a number of gender differences that appear. For instance, expecting to do well in science-related occupations discriminates females who chose science-related or health careers from those who do not aspire to these careers. This is not true of males where science-related expectancies only discriminate between those males who choose science careers and those who do not. With regard to the females who chose science-related or health careers, it is important to point out that the value of people/society job characteristics also discriminates between those females who aspire to health or science/math careers and those who do not. However, it discriminates in opposite directions. That is, females who aspire to health careers value people/society oriented job characteristics and females who aspire to science-related careers do not value people/society oriented aspects of jobs when compared to females who do not aspire to these careers. Considering the fact that they both expect to do well in science-related careers, it follows that one

of the critical components influencing females decisions to go into a science vs. a health related field is not necessarily science related efficacy but the values associated with people and humanistic concerns. Thus, increased emphasis on the humanistic and people oriented aspects of science-related careers, not increased emphasis on ability perceptions alone, may be important in encouraging more females to consider science-related occupations.

In conclusion, the present study supports the hypothesis that beliefs and values are important mediators of occupational outcomes. Future studies should address the socialization pressures that influence adolescent expectancies, beliefs, values, and aspirations. In addition, the influence of ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, and institutional constraints on occupational aspirations and outcomes cannot be overlooked.

References

- Eccles, J., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., & Midgley, C. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence, (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives*. San Francisco: Freeman and Co.
- Eccles, J. E., & Hoffman, L. W. (1984). Sex roles, socialization, and occupational behavior. In H. W. Stevenson & A. E. Siegel (Eds.), *Child Development Research and Social Policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Eccles, J. E. (1987). Gender roles and women's achievement-related decisions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11, 135-172.
- Herzog, A. R., & Bachman, J. G. (1982). *Sex-role attitudes among high school seniors*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Marini, M. M. (1978). Sex differences in the determination of adolescent aspirations: A review of the research. *Sex Roles*, 4, 723-751.
- Stevens, (1992). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. E. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review*, 12, 265-310.

Appendix

Scale Items, Alphas, Means and Standard Deviations

Lifestyle Values

(1 = Strongly disagree...7 = Strongly agree)

High Status/Competitive

Alpha = .76 Mean (SD) = 4.6 (1.4)

I'd like to accomplish something in life that will be well known.

I feel that winning is very important.

I'd like to be famous.

I would rather be president of a club than just a member.

When a group I belong to plans an activity, I would rather organize it myself than have someone organize it and just help out.

It is important to me to perform better than others on a task.

Risk Taking

Alpha = .64 Mean (SD) = 4.9 (1.1)

I more often attempt difficult tasks that I am not sure I can do than easier tasks I believe I can do.

I like to try things I've never done before.

I would rather do something at which I feel confident and relaxed than something which is challenging and difficult (reverse coded).

I really enjoy working in situations involving skill and competition.

Careerism

Alpha = .60 Mean (SD) = 5.6 (1.0)

Doing my very best at the tasks I take on is very important to me.

I want to do my best in my job even if this sometimes means working overtime.

I expect my work to be a very central part of my life.

Family and Friends Before Job

Alpha = .52 Mean (SD) = 4.3 (1.1)

I would turn down a promotion in my career if it meant moving away from close supportive friendships.

If a choice had to be made, I would put my spouse's career before mine.

I would readjust my work schedule or work part-time to meet the needs of my children.

If I had a great career opportunity in another location I would expect my spouse and family to move (reverse coded).

Material Wealth

Alpha = .50 Mean (SD) = 4.9 (1.2)

I would give up a secure job for a chance to make big money.

I would like a lot of expensive possessions.

Valued Job Characteristics

Different people may look for different things in their work.

Please indicate how much you would like a job with each characteristic.

(1 = Not at all...7 = A lot)

Flexibility to Meet Family Needs

Alpha = .79 Mean (SD) = 5.5 (1.1)

Has a flexible working schedule you can adjust to meet the needs of your family.

Leaves a lot of time for other things in your life.

Does not require you to be away from your family.

Allows you to be at home when your children are out of school (like teaching).

You have more than two weeks vacation.

Makes it easy to take a lot of time off for family responsibilities.

People/Society Oriented

Alpha = .77 Mean (SD) = 5.4 (1.1)

Gives you an opportunity to be directly helpful to others.

Gives you contact with a lot of people.

Involves working with children.

Gives you a chance to make friends.

Is worthwhile to society.

Prestige/Responsibility

Alpha = .73 Mean (SD) = 5.4 (1.0)

Has high status and prestige.

You get a chance to participate in decision making.

You get a chance to work on difficult and challenging problems.

You are your own boss most of the time.

Creative/Educational

Alpha = .70 Mean (SD) = 5.8 (1.1)

You have the chance to be creative.

You can learn new things and new skills.

Machinery/Manual Work

Alpha = .60 Mean (SD) = 3.4 (1.5)

Involves a lot of work with your hands.

Involves operating heavy machinery.

Math/Computer Work

Alpha = .50 Mean (SD) = 4.0 (1.5)

Uses a lot of math.

Involves the use of a computer.

Expected Efficacy in Jobs

Rate how well you think you would do in each of the following types of jobs:

(1= I would not do well at all...4 = I would do average...7= I would do very well)

Health-Related

Alpha = .87 **Mean (SD) = 4.0 (1.8)**

Health paraprofessional (like paramedic, dental hygienist, medical technician, vet's assistant).

Health professional (like registered nurse, physical therapist, pharmacist).

Health (like physician, dentist, psychiatrist, veterinarian).

Skilled Labor/Protective Services (Male-typed)

Alpha = .80 **Mean (SD) = 3.2 (1.4)**

Transportation (like taxi-cab, bus, or truck driver).

Factory (like assembly line worker, welder).

Protective or military service (like police officer, fireman, military).

Skilled worker in electronics or computer repair.

Other skilled worker (like carpenter or mechanic).

Professional athlete.

Science-Related

Alpha = .73 **Mean (SD) = 3.7 (1.9)**

Science or math related field (like engineer, architect, science teacher).

Science (like scientist with a Ph.D.).

Business and Law

Alpha = .70 **Mean (SD) = 4.7 (1.4)**

Owner of small business (like restaurant owner, shop owner).

Business manager or administrator, stock broker.

Lawyer.

Skilled Labor/Human Services (Female-typed)

Alpha = .69 **Mean (SD) = 4.0 (1.3)**

Full-time homemaker

Child care/day care

Personal service (like cosmetologist, masseuse, tailor, and chef).

Clerical or office worker (like typist, receptionist, secretary).

Human services (like librarian, social worker, counselor, teacher).

Professional and Performing Artist

Alpha = .60 **Mean (SD) = 3.4 (1.8)**

Professional artist (like designer, interior decorator).

Performing artist (like musician, actress, dancer, model).

Self-Perception of Skills

Here is a list of skills and abilities.

Compared to others, how good are you at each of the following:

(7-point Likert scale: A lot worse than others...A lot better than others)

Working With Others

Alpha = .77 **Mean (SD) = 5.2 (1.0)**

Taking care of children.

Listening to and understanding others.

Teaching and explaining to others.

Helping others solve their problems.

Patience.

Leadership

Alpha = .75 **Mean (SD) = 5.0 (1.2)**

Supervising others

Being a Leader

Independence

Alpha = .75 **Mean (SD) = 5.3 (1.1)**

Independence

Self-confidence

Decisiveness

Intellectual

Alpha = .73 **Mean (SD) = 5.1 (1.2)**

Logical, analytic thinking

Intelligence

Mechanical **Mean (SD) = 3.2 (1.8)**

Repairing mechanical equipment

Computers **Mean (SD) = 4.1 (1.7)**

Computer skills