

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9303933

**Gender-based differences in high school employment: Is there
differential socialization for work?**

Clifford, Dean Major, Ph.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

GENDER-BASED DIFFERENCES IN HIGH SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:
IS THERE DIFFERENTIAL SOCIALIZATION FOR WORK?

by

Dean M. Clifford

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fullfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1992

Approved by


Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following
committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The
University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Sarah M. Shoffner

Committee Members Carol E. MacKinnin
Rebecca M. Smith
Grace E. Kissling

November 4, 1991
Date of Acceptance by Committee

November 4, 1991
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to my committee chair, Dr. Sarah Shoffner, Assistant Professor of Child Development and Family Relations, whose kindness and unflagging support went beyond the call of duty. In addition, I am grateful to my committee members, Dr. Rebecca Smith, Dr. Carol MacKinnon, and Dr. Grace Kissling for their guidance in the completion of this study.

In addition, I received valuable assistance in coding and data entry from Judi Fulbright. My fellow students, Kyunghye Ok, Bob Shackelford, Patricia Vedder, and Cheryl Lindsey, gave practical assistance and continuing encouragement.

Such a study could not have been conducted without the cooperation of the principals, staff, and students of the participating schools. For their helpfulness, I am grateful.

Through the years, my close friends in a Tuesday morning group and my colleagues at Old Town Elementary School have cheered me on to complete this project. Their support was vital.

Finally, my family has been unceasingly supportive. I wish to thank my husband, Fred, and our children, Hope, Roy, Jay, and Cary for their encouragement of my work and their acceptance of the costs involved. Their love provides a living definition of what family relationships should be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSiii
LIST OF TABLESvii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION1
Theoretical Framework5
Occupational Socialization5
Gender Theory	10
Gaps in the Literature	11
Purpose of the Study	14
Limitations of the Study	16
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
Impact of High School Employment	20
Gender Differences in Employment	21
Adult Work Experience	22
Sex Role Conceptions	24
Adolescent Employment Experiences	25
Impact of Work by Gender	27
Family Factors	27
Aspirations	29
Work-related Attitudes	32
Rural Adolescents	33
Summary	34
III. Methods	36
Research Design	36
Sample Selection	37
Sampling Procedure	37
Subjects	39
Data Collection	44
Instruments	44
Demographic Data	44
High School Employment Experience	44
Educational Information	45
Money Issues	45
Friends and Family	45

	Page
Future Plans	45
Student Attitudes and Opinions	45
Independent Variables	46
Gender	46
Work Status	46
Amount of Time Student Works	46
Covariates	47
Race	47
GPA	47
Family Income	47
Mother's Occupation	47
Dependent Variables	48
School Year of Employment	48
Hourly Earnings	48
Parental Support of Employment	48
Nature of Current Job	48
Reasons for Working	49
Reasons for Not Working	49
Occupational Aspirations	50
Work-related Attitudes	50
Factor Analysis of Work-related Attitudes	51
Ethics and Work	53
Self-reliance	55
Extrinsic Rewards of Life	55
Responsibility	57
Intrinsic Rewards of Life	60
Social Acceptance	60
Data Analysis	62
Hypotheses	62
Statistical Analysis	65
IV. RESULTS	67
Descriptive Information	68
Hypothesis Testing	74
Employment Experiences	75
Employment Status	75
Employment by Grade Level	75
Hours Worked Weekly	75
Hourly Pay	79
Perceived Parental Support for Employment	79
Present Job	79
Occupational Aspirations	84
Reasons for Getting Job	84
Reasons for Not Working	87
Work-related Attitudes and Gender	87

	Page
Ethics and Work	87
Self-reliance	89
Extrinsic Rewards of Work	89
Responsibility	93
Intrinsic Rewards of Work	93
Social Acceptance	96
Work-related Attitudes and Employment	96
Ethics and Work	96
Self-reliance	99
Extrinsic Rewards of Work	99
Responsibility	99
Intrinsic Rewards of Work	103
Social Acceptance	103
Work-related Attitudes and Hours of Employment	106
Summary of Results	106
V. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	109
Discussion of Results	110
Recommendations	119
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY	125
VII. APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE	133
VIII. APPENDIX B. WORK-RELATED ATTITUDE SCALES.	156
IX. APPENDIX C. WORK-RELATED ATTITUDES AND HOURS OF WORK	167
X. APPENDIX D. SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT AND GENDER	174

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample40
2. High School Employment43
3. Factor Analysis of Ethics and Work54
4. Factor Analysis of Self-reliance56
5. Factor Analysis of Extrinsic Rewards of Work.58
6. Factor Analysis of Responsibility59
7. Factor Analysis of Intrinsic Rewards of Work.61
8. Factor Analysis of Social Acceptance Scale.63
9. Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Responses to Work-Related Attitude Scales64
10. High School Employment by Gender71
11. Employment by Gender76
12. Employment by Grade Level77
13. Hours Worked Weekly by Gender78
14. Analysis of Covariance of Average Hourly Pay by Gender.80
15. Mother's Feelings About Adolescent's Employment81
16. Father's Feelings About Adolescent's Employment82
17. Present Job by Gender83
18. Occupational Aspirations by Gender85
19. Reasons for Working by Gender86
20. Reasons for Not Working by Gender88
21. Analysis of Covariance of Ethics and Work by Gender90

Table	Page
22. Analysis of Covariance of Self-Reliance by Gender91
23. Analysis of Covariance of Extrinsic Rewards of Work by Gender92
24. Analysis of Covariance of Responsibility by Gender94
25. Analysis of Covariance of Intrinsic Rewards of Work by Gender95
26. Analysis of Covariance of Social Acceptance by Gender97
27. Analysis of Covariance of Ethics and Work by Employment98
28. Analysis of Covariance of Self-Reliance by Employment	100
29. Analysis of Covariance of Extrinsic Rewards of Work by Employment	101
30. Analysis of Covariance of Responsibility by Employment	102
31. Analysis of Covariance of Intrinsic Rewards of Work by Employment	104
32. Analysis of Covariance of Social Acceptance by Employment	105
B-1. Individual Items That Comprised Initial Work Related Attitude Scales	157
B-2. Goslen's Factor Analysis of Intrinsic Value of Work (Subscale of Initial Cynicism Scale)	161
C-1. Analysis of Covariance of Ethics and Work by Hours of Work Weekly	168
C-2. Analysis of Covariance of Self-Reliance by Hours of Work Weekly	169

Table	Page
C-3. Analysis of Covariance of Extrinsic Rewards of Work by Hours of Work Weekly	170
C-4. Analysis of Covariance of Responsibility by Hours of Work Weekly	171
C-5. Analysis of Covariance of Intrinsic Rewards of Work by Hours of Work Weekly	172
C-6. Analysis of Covariance of Social Acceptance by Hours of Work Weekly	173
D-1. School Involvement by Gender	175

CLIFFORD, DEAN M. Ph.D. Gender-based Differences in High School Employment: Is There Differential Socialization for Work? (1992) Directed by Dr. Sarah M. Shoffner. 177 pp.

This study explored the gender-based differences in high school employment experiences and possible contributors to those differences, such as parental support for employment, reasons for working or not working, aspirations, and six work-related attitudes. It was expected that there would be differences by gender in employment status, time of beginning employment, weekly hours worked, average pay, parental support for employment, current job, reasons for working or not working, occupational aspirations, and work-related attitudes. Differences in the work-related attitudes were also anticipated between those who had worked and those who had not, as well as between those who worked under 20 hours weekly and those who worked 20 or more hours a week.

The sample included 1481 high school students from three geographical regions of North Carolina: the Coastal Plains, the Piedmont, and the Mountains. The students all lived in rural areas. Independent variables included gender on the first two hypotheses, employment status on the third hypothesis, and hours worked weekly on the fourth hypothesis. Dependent variables were employment status, years in which employment occurred, hourly earnings, parental support for employment, current job, reasons for working and not working, occupational aspirations, and these six work-related attitudes: ethics and work, self-reliance, extrinsic rewards

of work, responsibility, intrinsic rewards of work, and social acceptance.

In exploring the employment experiences, the Chi-square statistic was used in analyses. In examining the work-related attitudes and the average pay, analyses of covariance were completed. Race, GPA, mother's occupation, parental income (and gender on the last two hypotheses) were selected as covariates.

Gender and occupational socialization theories were used to explain the findings that males are more likely to be employed, have different work experiences and aspirations than females, and are more likely to work for extrinsic rewards. For both males and females, employment status was significantly related to only two work-related attitudes: the intrinsic rewards of work and social acceptance. There were no significant relationships between hours worked weekly and any of the work-related attitudes.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

While there are many variations in definitions of education and philosophical approaches to the educational process, most would agree that the academic process should be relevant to real life; that is, that a student emerging from the educational system should be adequately prepared to become a productive and contributing citizen. Exactly how that goal is best accomplished, however, remains a matter of debate. One particular aspect of this controversy centers on the best means of preparing the adolescent for the adult role of worker. Adolescent employment has been a primary avenue for occupational socialization.

The work ethic is one of the foundation stones of American values. Since colonial days, there has been strong admiration for those who shoulder responsibility, strive to improve their lot, and fill their working hours with conscientious, disciplined effort. America has been viewed as an open society, where one's opportunities are limited only by one's vision and effort, rather than by artificial barriers of birth into a particular class or group. Horatio Alger and Abraham Lincoln are among the many American folk heroes who rise from humble beginnings to the pinnacle of success through hard work. In such an environment, "getting

ahead" is viewed as one of life's primary tasks.

This emphasis on the value of hard work is not confined to adult life. In the process of socialization in America, both parents and the education system are expected to train children to be hardworking, productive citizens. Patricia Voydanoff (1984) writes that "families are expected to ... socialize children to become competent workers (and are)...partially responsible for its members entering the labor force with the skills and motivation needed to operate within an industrial and commercial environment" (pp.2-3).

Although child labor laws were established to shield children from premature, dangerous, or developmentally inappropriate participation in the world of work, there has been a pervasive conviction that adolescents should experience the reality of work. In fact, encouragement of adolescent employment has been part of national policy. Historically, in this century there has been a variety of federally sponsored youth employment efforts, from the Civilian Conservation Corps of the New Deal to the more recent Job Corps and the Comprehensive Education Training Act. These programs have consistently sought to combine educational objectives and employment experience (Sherraden, 1980). In 1974 the President's Science Advisory Committee, Panel on Youth, called for practical measures such as an increase in the minimum wage and more cooperative education

programs to encourage adolescents to work. This panel regarded an integration of formal education and work experience as the optimum approach to preparing adolescents for adult life.

Likewise, many parents have supported this view. Phillips and Sandstrom (1990) found that parents clearly approved of adolescent employment in general, and of their own teens' work in particular. Alwin (1984, 1988) discovered that parental values in recent years have increasingly shifted toward autonomy and independence in children, accompanied by a steady increase in the encouragement of working hard. Paid employment for youth has been viewed as an introduction to the "real world," an avenue to learning skills, responsibility, work habits, and the value of a dollar.

Adolescent employment is not merely a matter of philosophical conjecture; it is an increasing fact of life for American teenagers. Adolescents are working in record numbers and for significant amounts of time. There have been dramatic changes in the extent of adolescent employment in the United States. In 1940, only 4% of males and 1% of females attending high school worked for pay during the school year. By 1970, 27% of 16-year old males and 16% of the females were employed. Likewise, the amount of time students worked increased, with the percentage of those

working over 14 hours a week rising between 1960 and 1970 from 44% to 56% among males and 34% to 46% among females. In 1983 Bachman found three fourths of high school seniors held a parttime job during the school year, with over one fourth of these working more than 20 hours a week; 50% of juniors and 30% of ninth and tenth graders were employed while being enrolled in school (Greenberger, Steinberg, Vaux, & McAuliffe, 1980).

Because these employment patterns are widespread among American teenagers, it is important to note variations between groups of adolescents. Youth employment is a middle-class phenomenon, with fewer employed students among both lower and higher SES groups; whites have higher rates of employment than do minorities; urban students are more likely to be employed than are rural students. In addition, working adolescents are concentrated in lower level jobs: in food service, sales, and outdoor work; as operatives, service and sales workers, and laborers. These students are earning an average of \$50 or more a week, most of which is discretionary money (Bachman, 1983; Charner & Fraser, 1987).

Given the potential importance of employment experience in the occupational process, it is important to study both the impact of such employment on adolescents in general and the variation in such experiences for males and females, for urban and rural youth, and for differing ethnic groups. In

addition, this generation of high school students has grown up in an era of increasing maternal employment and amidst a continued expansion of feminism, in particular, and civil rights for all minority groups, in general. It may be, therefore, that this generation has experienced both adolescence and vocational development in very different ways from that of students of earlier decades.

Theoretical Framework

Interwoven through this research are strands from two theoretical approaches: occupational socialization theory and gender theory. Both are important in examining the gender-based variations in adolescent employment.

Occupational Socialization

Mortimer and London (1984) point out that "the family socializes each new generation of workers, instilling the most basic attitudes and values concerning the meaning of work, which influence vocational preferences and eventual occupational destinations" (p. 22). A crucial part of the socialization process is the task of preparing a young person for adult economic responsibilities, and employment experience is perceived as significantly impacting the occupational development of adolescents.

Occupational choice has been conceptualized as a developmental process that proceeds through stages highlighted by increasing realism in occupational orientation as youth mature. (Lee, 1985, p. 28)

According to Super (1980),

the more adequately, in self-perception and in that of others, the adolescent plays preoccupational roles, especially those of student and part-time worker, the more likely are success and satisfaction in occupational roles. (p. 286)

The occupational socialization of American youth today occurs in at least four contexts: school, home, the workplace, and among peers. From an ecological perspective, it is important not only to study their experiences in each area, but the interaction between these facets of their existence. In her commentary attached to the Charner and Fraser (1987) report, Sue Berryman acknowledges the complex and bidirectional relationships between the fact of adolescent employment and other aspects of contemporary American life. First, some changes in the American family may encourage teen employment. As two-career and single parent families increase, there are fewer family members at home during the day. Parents may be relieved to have adolescents employed and thus safely accounted for when no adults are at home. Second, materialism is so widely emphasized in American society that it is hardly surprising to find the typical adolescent interested in acquiring money and becoming a conspicuous consumer. Third, there are several features of the typical high school program that may

contribute to a teenager's decision to work. Most schools concentrate heavily on verbal and mathematical skills in an academic curriculum that may lose students who are talented in the arts or more technical skills. The typical American high school program leaves many adolescents a great deal of free time, being far less demanding than those in some countries, such as Japan.

According to some, schools provide a limited range of experience for adolescents: the tasks are academic, adults are in control, and the work is individually oriented, rather than an interdependent group effort; on the other hand, an effective work program may expose youth to opportunities for cooperation and decision making, improve skills, expose youth to authoritative leaders that are good teachers and have warm relationships with employees, and insert relevance to academic progress (Hamilton & Stewart, 1980). Young (1983) recommends an ecological approach to career development, with interventions in the microsystem (parent-child interaction or school, for example), mesosystems, the exosystem (in the media or national policy), and, finally, the macrosystem, by reexamination of gender roles, the purpose of education, and the work ethic.

There are two schools of thought within the occupational socialization framework. In the first, the occupational competence model, work is perceived as an important

contributor to the educational, developmental, and socialization processes, preparing youth for adulthood. Supporters of this model argue that work experience enables students to acquire values, habits, skills, knowledge, and attitudes that make them more competent, realistic, and employable. Adolescent work experience is lauded as providing these benefits: (1) the formation of beneficial work habits and attitudes; (2) exposure to varying careers; (3) encouragement of maturity, dependability, and responsibility; (4) motivation for academic success; (5) exposure to adult models beyond the family sphere; and (6) socialization for adulthood (Hamilton & Crouter, 1980). Further, work experience may reduce the age segregation that has contributed to the strength of the youth culture and generational conflict (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1981; President's Science Advisory Committee, Panel on Youth, 1974).

Other researchers question this overwhelming endorsement of adolescents' entrance into the labor force and suggest a second school of thought, the occupational deviance model. In this school, it is argued that the menial employment available to students is alienating and dehumanizing, contributing to lower educational achievement, a negative attitude toward work and deviant behaviors (Behn, Carnoy, Carter, Crain, & Levin, 1974; Greenberger & Steinberg, 1981).

The kinds of jobs available to teens are often vastly different from what they will do in the future, unchallenging in nature, and as age-segregated as schools. "Under these conditions...involvement in a job may not advance the transition to adulthood so much as prolong youngsters' attachment to the peer culture" (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1987, p. 30).

Further, there are questions as to whether involvement in paid employment interferes with or facilitates the primary developmental task of adolescence as described by Erikson: that is, identity formation (Thomas, 1985). The teen years are transitional, acting as a bridge between childhood and the assumption of adult responsibilities. During this time, youngsters are involved in search and discovery: Who am I? What are my talents and abilities? What does it mean to be female or male? How can I successfully interact with others? The exploration of these and other questions takes both time and energy, especially in today's world, in which a nearly infinite variety of choices and options are available. Greenberger and Steinberg (1987) fear that "extensive commitment to a job may interfere with the work of growing up" (p.30) and suggest that adolescent workers may

...spend too much time and energy in a role that is too constraining and involves tasks that are too simple, unchallenging, and irrelevant to their future to promote development (p. 30).

These authors conclude that working students "may be bypassing the equally rigorous but unpaid work of growing up-- work that requires exploration, experimentation, and introspection" (p. 31). Others argue that parttime work enhances adolescent development, offering opportunities to explore the world of work and to develop in maturity and responsibility.

Gender Theory

In addition to the universal processes of occupational socialization and psychosocial stages, any consideration of gender differences necessitates examining gender-specific aspects of these processes. During the twentieth century traditional socialization processes have guided males toward an adult role as economic provider, prepared to fill primarily instrumental functions within the family. On the other hand, females were generally encouraged toward a nurturing, caretaker role, with predominantly expressive family responsibilities (Bernard, 1984). In spite of the increasing numbers of American women entering the work force, the socialization processes and attitudes toward work among Americans may still be guided by these earlier principles.

Feminist theorists have shifted from an emphasis on purely sex role theory toward a more complex "theoretical standpoint that defines gender as a lifelong process of situated behavior that both reflects and reproduces a

structure of differentiation and control" (Ferree, 1990, p. 870), a process of categorization and stratification by gender. In both the family and the larger society, Ferree (1990) argues that gender is constructed through "the symbolic and structural dimensions of labor, both paid and unpaid, and through the control over income within the family" (p. 866). From this perspective, the patterns of employment seen among adolescents are both evidence of the gendering process and clues as to whether stratification by sex is waxing or waning. The assignment of household chores, the types of early adolescent employment, parental support for achievement academically and occupationally, differential rewards received for such achievements: these components are all part of a socialization process which may be liberating or confining to individuals.

Gaps in the Literature

Not only is there controversy in theory, but in findings as to the practical impact of adolescent employment. Some studies continue to find positive effects of parttime work for high school students, such as increased knowledge of the world of work, improved self-concept, and higher levels of responsibility and maturity (D'Amico, 1984; Phillips & Sandstrom, 1990; Steinberg, Greenberger, Jacobi, & Garduque, 1981; Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, Ruggiero, 1981; Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, & Vaux, 1982);

some found that employed students had higher Grade Point Averages than those not employed (Schill, McCartin, & Meyer, 1985); and others reported no negative impact of work on school achievement, attendance, or activities (D'Amico, 1984; Gade & Peterson, 1980; Hay & Lindsay, 1969; Hotchkiss, 1986). On the other hand, some researchers have concluded that work has deleterious effects on adolescent achievement and well-being, finding that such employment undermined educational achievement, appeared to promote delinquent behavior, contributed to cynicism regarding work, and produced stress that leads to increased substance abuse (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1987).

Further exploration in the area has pointed to more complex considerations. First, it may not be work per se, but an excess quantity of work that results in adverse effects (D'Amico, 1984; Schill et al, 1985; Steinberg, 1982; Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, & McAuliffe, 1982). Others have emphasized that not only the quantity, but the quality or nature of adolescent work must be examined. The work environment is multidimensional, with some settings being more advantageous than others. Jobs vary in the opportunities which they provide for learning, for autonomy and initiative, and for social interaction (Greenberger, Steinberg, & Ruggiero, 1982). Thus, the research results remain cloudy as to the effects of adolescent employment.

Furthermore, the work experience may not be the same for males and females. There is some evidence that girls begin work at a later date than boys, work fewer hours at jobs that differ in nature than those of boys, and receive lower pay (Gade & Peterson, 1980; Gottfredson, 1985; Greenberger & Steinberg, 1983). Further differences have appeared between the genders as to the impact of adolescent employment and their occupational aspirations (D'Amico, 1984; Gottfredson, 1985; Lee, 1985; Ruggerio, Greenberger, & Steinberg, 1982; Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux & Ruggerio, 1981; Yamoor & Mortimer, 1990). With a continuing emphasis on an egalitarian society, the literature on adolescent employment raises vital questions: Are the precursors to future occupational segregation already unfolding in adolescence? Are males and females being socialized differently in occupational development? Do adolescent males and females already ascribe to differing attitudes about work that may radically alter their occupational choices and achievements?

The majority of research studies on adolescent employment have utilized urban samples; geographically, such work has virtually excluded the rural southeast from consideration. However, rural industrialization has offered increasing options for employment to rural youth (Lee, 1985). Even though it is widely believed that the rural population is more conservative than those in urban areas, there is also

evidence that rural families assign chores to youngsters along less stereotypical lines than do city dwellers (White & Brinkerhoff, 1981). The question thus remains: Is the employment experience of rural youth similar to that of the urban adolescent? In addition, in the wake of the farm crisis of the 1980's, it is important to assess the impact of rural economic conditions on adolescents' views about work and plans for the future.

Finally, the landmark studies in the area of adolescent employment were conducted by Laurence Steinberg, Ellen Greenberger, and their associates in California almost a decade ago. During this interlude, increasing numbers of women have entered the work force. Has a decade of greater maternal employment changed the occupational socialization experienced by male and female adolescents? Further exploration is needed, not only for clarification of an extremely complex and murky picture, but to bring earlier conclusions up to date. It is important to acknowledge that this is an emotionally charged issue with serious ramifications in educational decisions, employment policy, and family life.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine gender-based differences in the employment experiences of rural adolescents, particularly in terms of the occupational

socialization processes that may be operating. Given the widespread acceptance of the notion that work experience fosters the development of the attitudes necessary to future employment success, it seemed particularly important to further explore similarities and differences in these attitudes among working and non-working males and females.

The research hypotheses under study include the following:

1. There is a significant difference in the high school work experience of males and females, as to employment status, grades in which employment occurs, hours worked weekly, hourly earnings, current job, parental support of employment, reasons for working or not working, and occupational aspirations. It is expected that more boys will work than do girls; that employment will be initiated earlier in adolescence among boys than girls; and that boys will work longer hours and for higher rates of pay than will girls. In addition, a stronger measure of parental support is expected for the employment of sons than of daughters.

2. There is a significant difference in the work-related attitudes of male and female students, controlling for ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parental income. It is anticipated that females will demonstrate higher scores on emphasizing ethics in work, self-reliance, and intrinsic motivation for work,

and that males will emphasize extrinsic motivation for work more than females do. There are no directional expectations by gender on responsibility or social acceptance.

3. Working while attending high school is significantly related to the attitudes of adolescents, controlling for gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income. The direction of these differences is expected to be as follows: self-reliance, extrinsic rewards of work, responsibility, and social acceptance will increase with employment; however, emphasis on ethical practices in the workplace and intrinsic rewards for work will decrease with employment.

4. The amount of time a student works will have a statistically significant relationship to the work-related attitudes of high school students, controlling for gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parent's income. An increasing weekly involvement in work will be accompanied by an increase in self-reliance, extrinsic motivation, responsibility, and social acceptance, but a decrease in emphasizing ethics and work and intrinsic rewards for work.

Limitations of the Study

This study is based on responses to a questionnaire administered in 1990 to rural high school students in the three geographical regions of North Carolina; therefore, it is limited first by the cross-sectional nature of the data.

Without longitudinal data collected from these subjects over a period of time, it is difficult to infer causality. In addition, while the questionnaires provided some open-ended options, the data are largely quantitative. Qualitative follow-up through interviews, offering opportunities for further exploration, would add depth to the conclusions. Since the students sampled reside in the rural southeast, findings should not be generalized nationally or across groups. North Carolina does not have the widely diverse ethnic groups that might be found in other areas of the United States; therefore, ethnic minorities are under represented in this sample. Fourth, the items on the survey are self-reported, without confirmation from other sources. Finally, this study focuses on paid employment during the school year and does not explore the impact of unpaid, volunteer, or summer employment. This approach, however, is similar to the bulk of the literature, since summer or volunteer employment do not present the same stress or conflict with academic requirements as would an on-going commitment to paid employment. Nonetheless, it is important to recognize that other types of work involvement are part of the occupational socialization process. In spite of these limitations, the information drawn from this large sample offers a variety of information important in understanding and evaluating the phenomenon of adolescent employment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

It has frequently been noted that the modern Western world, particularly the United States, has created an artificially elongated adolescence: a kind of no-man's land between childhood and adulthood. During this period, young people remain financially dependent and are encouraged to focus primarily on an increasingly extended education in preparation for adulthood in a sophisticated, technological world. Prior to this century, children were expected to bear their share of the work on the family farm. However, with urbanization, industrialization, the separation of home and work into distinct domains, and the codification of child labor laws, the work of children became primarily that of education.

In the second half of this century, however, the picture has dramatically changed. When the Bureau of the Census first reported figures for working teenagers in 1940, only 4% of 16-year old males and 1% of such females worked while attending school (Greenberger, Steinberg, Vaux, & McAuliffe, 1980). Those figures have risen steadily, with recent estimates being as high as 75% of all high school seniors working an average of 16.4 hours a week (Gordon, 1985). A profile of working students indicates that older students are

more likely to work than younger, males than females, whites than minorities, urban than rural, and middle-class than upper or lower; however, no group is exempt from the employment phenomenon. Most cite financial reasons for working--that is, money for purchasing items they want or need--but few work out of necessity to help support the family.

Adolescent workers are concentrated in unskilled jobs in retail trade, food service, and outdoor work (Charner & Fraser, 1987). Even though the majority of adolescent work opportunities are menial in nature, such work is multidimensional and varies in opportunities for the development of skill; the exercise of responsibility, self-direction and leadership; and in interaction with others (Greenberger, Steinberg, & Ruggiero, 1982). Hamilton and Crouter (1980) emphasize that "the individual, the nature of the work, and the setting in which work is done must all be taken into account in order to understand the impact of that work on the person's development" (p. 332). There is a need for careful planning of adolescent employment that can encourage maturity through opportunities for decision-making and cooperative effort, the use of higher skills, an adequate fit with educational and career interests, and effective adult leadership (Hamilton & Stewart, 1980). Greenberger and Steinberg (1981) wrote, "if the workplace is to become a

truly vital context for adolescent socialization, it needs to be designed more deliberately with such aims in mind" (p. 186).

Impact of High School Employment

Before focusing on variations by gender, it seems helpful to summarize findings as to the general impact of adolescent work experience. Following the foundational work of Greenberger & Steinberg in the early 1980's, there was a flurry of research activity in the field, yet these research findings present a confused picture. Some studies found positive effects of adolescent employment, such as increased knowledge of the world of work, improved self-concept and self-reliance, more advanced social understanding and communication, and higher levels of responsibility and maturity, as well as expanded practical knowledge and skills (D'Amico, 1984; Phillips & Sandstrom, 1990; Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, & Vaux, 1982; Steinberg, Greenberger, Jacobi, & Garduque, 1981; Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981; Steinberg, 1982). Adolescent workers also demonstrated increased task perseverance and higher levels of understanding in consumer and money matters (Greenberger, 1983). Schill et al. (1985) found that employed students in their sample had higher GPA's than those not employed. Other studies found no negative impact of work on school achievement, attendance, or

activities (D'Amico, 1984; Gade & Peterson, 1980; Hay & Lindsay, 1969; Hotchkiss, 1986), with Hotchkiss (1986) concluding that he found "no deleterious side-effects of working during high school" (p. 111).

Further exploration in the field led Greenberger, Steinberg, and others to express strong reservations about adolescent work. Greenberger (1983) warned that the benefits of adolescent employment, such as increased responsibility, must be balanced by the costs, such as decreased school involvement. A work involvement in excess of 20 hours a week increases the possibility of adverse effects, including lower grades, increased absences, less enjoyment of school, less time on studying and extra-curricular activities, less closeness with family, increased substance abuse, more cynicism regarding work, and increased acceptance of unethical business practices (Steinberg, 1982). Greenberger (1983) pointed out that the benefits of parttime work can be realized with minimal levels of work involvement, while the costs increase with hours working per week, and stated emphatically: "Our youngsters deserve a well-balanced transition from childhood to adulthood" (p. 109).

Gender Differences in Employment

Given the emphasis on adolescent employment as an avenue to occupational socialization, as well as the national policy of encouraging egalitarianism in the adult workplace, it

seems crucial to examine adolescent employment through the lens of gender. Are boys and girls still being socialized differently toward work, or are egalitarian experiences in employment and attitudes toward work appearing among adolescents?

Adult Work Experience

In the adult work force, even in the wake of the feminist movement, women earn less than their male counterparts in similar jobs, have less upward mobility, are concentrated in lower occupational categories, and work fewer hours and in lower proportionate numbers. Women actually start working at higher status occupations than men, but experience some downward mobility; whereas, men go up nine points on the Socio-economic Index relative to their career beginnings (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1983; Marini, 1989; Treiman, 1985).

Currently, women's overall wages are about 70% of those earned by men. This difference in earnings has changed little in the 20th century, in spite of increased employment of women. With some slight increases in women's wages since 1980, their position relative to men is a little higher than the 1920 level. This wage difference is higher among whites than blacks and Hispanics. Interestingly, women's earnings, in relationship to men's, are not consistent over the life span, but decline with age. In 1983, women aged 25-34 earned

75% as much as men; those 45-54, only 56% as much. Job segregation and labor discontinuity provide much, but not all, of the support for a sex gap in earnings (Marini, 1989; Treiman, 1985).

While there has been a steady increase of women in the labor force, with over 60% of women (including married women with children) now working, occupational segregation is still a fact of life. Historically, occupational segregation can be attributed to both economic forces aimed at keeping men's wages high, and psychological norms, such as those that frowned upon competition between men and women (Pleck, 1984). Gross (1968) observed that "expansion in female employment has been accomplished through the expansion of occupations that were already heavily female, through the emergence of wholly new occupations, ...and through females taking over previously male occupations" and concluded that "sexual segregation in occupations is considerably more severe than racial segregation" (p. 202). Traditionally, male occupations are particularly resistant to incursion by females; however, there has been less resistance to male entry into supposedly female occupations. Until the late 1960's, women evidenced a double-peak employment pattern, working before marriage or childbirth, exiting for childrearing, and returning as children became somewhat independent. However, since the 1960's, increasing numbers

of women are not leaving work for childrearing. With continuous work force participation by women, some of the above-described differences may decline (Treiman, 1985).

Sex Role Conceptions

With the industrial revolution, differing roles for men and women crystallized. The male was to be "the good provider" for his family, his worth being measured primarily by the yardstick of economic success. As the workplace became segregated, males experienced less time for personal interaction with the family and moved into an increasingly instrumental, rather than expressive role and mode of behavior. With a more narrowly defined role in the home and less direct contributions to family income, women were placed in a vulnerable position that created both psychological and economic dependence (Bernard, 1974). The movement of women into the labor force necessitated reshaping these roles and ways of interacting between the sexes. However, the paid employment of women outside the home is not sufficient in itself to produce an egalitarian society. Such a society can emerge only when the socialization processes lead to gender-free decisions as to vocation and equally-distributed rewards and supports for employment.

There is evidence that young people are adopting more egalitarian attitudes; however, research indicates that males are still more sexist than females; that socio-economic

factors influence sex-role attitudes, with increasing education and income correlating with increased egalitarianism; and that maternal employment increases adolescent acceptance of egalitarian gender roles (Angrist, Mickelsen, & Penna, 1977; King, McIntyre, & Axelson, 1968; Winters & Frankel, 1984). For many, a woman's employment is still viewed as supplementary to the income her husband makes (Molm, 1978). Among the potent predictors of women with young children being employed, Morgan and Hock (1984) found a strong career orientation to be important; that is, if a young woman expects to pursue a career (not just a job), the chances of labor discontinuity are reduced. Farmer (1983) found that girls, even more than boys, expressed the centrality of their career role to their future adult role, and that the males expected to share parenting and career responsibilities equally with their spouses in the future.

Adolescent Employment Experiences

While both male and female students are working in record numbers, gender-based differences remain in their employment experiences. While some researchers found boys and girls to be equally involved in work (Manning, 1990; White & Brinkerhoff, 1981; Yamoor & Mortimer, 1990), most found that boys were employed in higher numbers proportionately than were their female peers, began employment at an earlier age, worked more hours, and received

higher pay (Gade & Peterson, 1980; Gottfredson, 1985; Greenberger & Steinberg, 1983). As in the adult world, the kind of work varied by gender, beginning with the chores assigned at home. While farm families were more egalitarian in chore assignments, most families increasingly differentiated by gender in task expectations as children grew older (White & Brickerhoff, 1981). As they began work for the first time, boys were employed more often in formal settings and girls in informal ones (Yamoor & Mortimer, 1990); and as adolescents, boys worked more often as manual or skilled laborers, with girls concentrated in child care or clerical and retail sales positions. In the food services, males are more likely to work with things, while females are more involved with people (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1983). Mortimer, Finch, Owens and Shanahan (1990) described adolescent males as reporting less opportunities for the development of useful skills, less variety in job tasks, and less opportunity for innovative thinking than girls, and concluded that "girls may have the more developmentally beneficial work experiences" (p. 215).

Similarly, the gap in earnings appeared at the adolescent level, with males earning more than females (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1983; Mortimer, Finch, Owens, & Shanahan, 1990). Greenberger and Steinberg (1983) described these gender differences in early labor force experience as a

"harbinger of things to come" (p. 467). There is also evidence that boys and men control a greater proportion of family income than do the females of the household (Ferree, 1990).

Impact of Work by Gender

Even the possible impact of high school employment reveals gender-related differences. D'Amico (1984) found employment improving class rank for white males, but not for females; Gade and Peterson (1980) found that boys had a higher percentage of above average grades when employed, but no significant difference between working and nonworking girls. Some have reported that employment may increase delinquent behavior more among boys than among girls (Gottfredson, 1985; Ruggiero, Greenberger, & Steinberg, 1982; Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). Interestingly, while teachers perceived boys to have more behavioral problems than girls, working boys were viewed as less difficult than unemployed males. Work was more positively related to boys' general satisfaction than girls' (Yamoor & Mortimer, 1990). It may be that a continued societal emphasis on the male provider role creates more beneficial social effects for employed boys than for working girls.

Family Factors

A review of the literature indicated widespread parental approval of adolescent employment. Supporting this stance,

parents increasingly valued autonomy and independent thinking in their children, with desire for obedience to authority declining over time (Alwin, 1984, 1988; Wright & Wright, 1976). Phillips and Sandstrom (1990) found parents supporting teen employment as early as age 13. These parents attributed several positive consequences to their children's work experience, including independence, higher self-esteem, more responsibility, improved work habits and time management, and better family communication. These parents did not differentiate by gender.

However, there are indications that many parents may still distinguish between the importance they attach to male versus female employment. In examining youth unemployment, Peters (1987) found that parents were more tolerant of daughters' unemployment than that of sons. In a study of family decision-making regarding the careers of youth, families favored the career goals of adolescent males over females, and fathers preferred homemaking careers for their daughters more than daughters selected this goal for themselves (Peterson, Rollins, Thomas, & Heaps, 1982). More boys than girls perceived parental encouragement to go to college and more boys graduated from college (Banducci, 1967). Finally, work had a positive impact on males' family relationships, and a negative impact on girls' closeness to family (Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, & Vaux,

1982).

Aspirations

Both Farmer (1983) and Shapiro and Crowley (1982) found that female adolescents held higher occupational aspirations than did males; however, occupational choices remained strongly sex stereotyped. In some cases, educational aspirations have been found similar for boys and girls (Farmer, 1983); in others, boys demonstrated higher educational aspirations than did girls (Marini, 1978; Marini & Greenberger, 1978).

The factors affecting aspirations, however, may be complex. For boys, a positive relationship has been found between socio-economic status and both educational and occupational aspirations; among girls, there was a positive relationship between SES and educational aspirations, but a weaker positive relationship between SES and occupational plans (Banducci, 1967). SES, academic ability, the number of siblings, parental encouragement, and academic performance were more strongly related to boys' educational aspirations and expectations than to girls'. Girls tended to make better grades than boys in school, but grades and test achievement had greater impact on the educational aspirations of boys than girls (Marini & Greenberger, 1978).

Some change is occurring. Farmer (1983) found that female students expected careers would be central to their

adult roles, while males expected to share in parental responsibilities. According to Shapiro and Crowley (1982) only one-fourth of female students expected to be homemakers. Although there are still marked differences in occupational plans along stereotypical lines, these differences are declining. In 1976, about one half of either gender would have had to change to non-traditional plans for an equitable distribution; by 1980, that figure dropped to one-third. In terms of work settings, women preferred schools, social service organizations, and small business, rather than self-employment or partnerships. Occupational values also varied by gender, with women emphasizing interpersonal and altruistic concerns, while males focused on status, income, and potential for advancement. Women have been less interested in power and decision-making; more concerned about self-actualization and nonmaterial gratification (Herzog, 1982). These findings indicate that a different occupational developmental process may be in operation in women, and one that places them at a disadvantage in a competitive labor market.

Not surprisingly, Card, Steel, and Abeles (1980) reported that, although females showed greater potential at age 14, particularly on test scores and grades, by age 29, males had achieved more and had significantly more education and annual earnings. While high potential females were still

ahead of their male counterparts five years out of high school, by 11 years after graduation, the males had significantly surpassed the females.

Between the ages 23 and 29, high potential men 'took off,' as far as career-related achievement was concerned. High potential women stood still or lost ground... Females of all socioeconomic groups failed to realize their potential to the extent that males did; the magnitude of that failure was not significantly different for poor versus rich females. (Card, Steel, & Abeles, 1980, pp. 12-15)

Schulenberg, Goldstein, and Vondracek (1991) pointed out that existing gender differences in adolescents' career aspirations appeared to be complex. Main effect variations fell along stereotypical lines, with males preferring science and technology; females, the arts and service sectors. However, these were modified by educational aspirations and career certainty, with gender differences greatest among those who expressed high career certainty and low educational aspirations.

Some have speculated that the process of career development might be more complex for females than for males. Super (1980) described a life-span, life-space approach to career development that included overlapping roles (child, student, leisurite, citizen, worker, spouse, homemaker, parent, and pensioner) and at least four theaters of operation: home, community, school, and workplace. Given

the still evolving nature of society's definition of sex roles and the oft-perceived conflict between family and work responsibilities, many young women may develop one set of aspirations and quite another of actual expectations and achievements. Looking at identity formation, Archer (1985) found no gender differences among adolescents as to identity statuses (diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement), but significant differences in societal orientation, with males more likely to be traditional and females transitional or liberated. Females expressed more concern about conflicts in career-family priorities. Archer concluded that "females may have a more complex identity to develop...attempting to define themselves in more domains at this point in their lives" (p. 302).

Work-Related Attitudes

Against the theoretical backdrop of occupational socialization, it is important to examine the work-related attitudes emerging among young people, since such attitudes capture their approach to the world of work. While most researchers have focused on academic achievement and the actual nature of the work adolescents performed, Steinberg, Greenberger, and their associates have examined this dimension of the adolescent vocational processes (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). One scale, measuring materialism, cynicism about work, and acceptance of unethical

business practices was developed by Ruggiero (Ruggiero et al., 1982); to these, the California studies on adolescent work added subscales on work orientation, self-reliance, and social commitment from scales developed to measure psychological maturity (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1975). The results of these studies indicated that work is associated with greater responsibility, including dependability, self-reliance, and work orientation, but is not related to social responsibility. Workers expressed more negative attitudes about work and increasing acceptance of unethical practices in the workplace. The impact of work on cynicism differed by SES. Gender differences appeared in some attitudes, as girls gained self-reliance with more time in the workplace, while boys declined; conversely, working was associated with more materialism among boys, but not girls (Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, & Vaux, 1982). The relationship of employment to acceptance of unethical business practices varied by sex and SES (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981).

Rural Adolescents

As indicated earlier, most studies on adolescent employment have involved urban/suburban samples. Popular thinking holds that the rural population in the United States is more conservative than the urban. Lee (1985) noted that

"place of residence is positively related to the occupational choice process" and that "sociocultural and environmental factors inherent in rural communities often limit the occupational achievements and perceptions of women" (p. 34). In the past, transportation limitations and fewer employment opportunities limited parttime work among rural students; however, rural industrialization may be increasing the options of these youth. Sundberg, Tyler, and Poole (1984) found that between 1967 and 1979, rural adolescents increasingly emphasized autonomy and that girls listed more atypical occupational aspirations in the late 70's, and concluded that "female views of life possibilities are becoming less stereotyped, but male views are not" (p. 52). Likewise, Lee (1985) found that rural females, regardless of ethnic origin, had the same or higher aspirations and expectations than did young men, but that female expectations declined from aspirations more than did those of males. Finally, farm families, faced with the practical necessities of heavy farm work, did not seem to differentiate between work assigned to boys and girls to the extent that urban families did (White & Brinkerhoff, 1981).

Summary

In spite of increasing egalitarian attitudes in the culture, careful examination of the literature on adolescent employment yields evidence that males continue to be

socialized for and rewarded for work far more than females are. However, there is not sufficient information on the actual nature of the work experiences, family attitudes, and work-related attitudes to understand exactly how this socialization is occurring. The perspectives of occupational socialization theory and gender theory would predict continuing differences in the work experiences and work-related attitudes of males and females. Egalitarianism may still not be internalized fully; nor is it fully implemented in the work place. Therefore, it is anticipated that male adolescents will work more and that this reality will be supported both by parental outlook and the work-related attitudes of the adolescents.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This study will examine the employment patterns of rural male and female adolescents and the possible relationship of such employment to important work-related attitudes. The exploration of similarities and differences in the experiences of males and females may provide possible clues as to the occupational socialization process encountered by each gender. This dissertation is only a selected portion of the data set of a larger project (Shoffner, 1988) on which the author was a research assistant.

Research Design

This research is cross-sectional ex post facto in design. After initial refinements of the instruments utilized by the Greenberger-Steinberg team in California, a pilot study was conducted in a high school in the western Piedmont section of North Carolina, allowing for final development of both the instrument and data collection procedures. The four-member research team, under the direction of Dr. Sarah Shoffner of the School of Human Environmental Sciences at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and the Agricultural Research Service, then administered questionnaires to students across North Carolina. The data utilized in this study are drawn from

these questionnaires.

For the first and second hypotheses, the independent variable was gender; for the other two hypotheses, independent variables were work status and hours worked weekly, respectively. In the first hypothesis, dependent variables included employment status, hours worked weekly, school year employment occurred, hourly earnings, parental support for employment, nature of current job, reasons for working and not working, and occupational aspirations. For the remaining three hypotheses, the dependent variables were the six work-related attitudes described later in this chapter. Covariates for the second, third and fourth hypotheses included race, GPA, family income, and mother's occupation, all of which have been linked to outcomes in the area of adolescent employment.

Sample Selection

Sampling Procedure

Three geographical areas exist in North Carolina: the Mountains, Piedmont, and Coastal plains. Using a geographical resource source (Lonsdale, 1967), the boundaries for these areas were determined. With census information (The North Carolina State Government Statistical Abstracts, 1984), the predominantly rural counties in these areas were identified. The counties were arranged according to their percentage of rurality. A random number between one and five

was drawn; the number was five. Therefore, every fifth county was noted and labeled as A, B, C, or D, successively. The A-series counties for each region were selected. This cluster sampling yielded four predominately rural counties.

All high schools in these counties were identified; and all schools that appeared to have over 50% rural students were selected. All of these schools had between 500 and 1500 students.

After identifying the eligible high schools in the selected counties, letters were sent to principals and county superintendents explaining the project, the school selection process, and the nature of the instrument. An invitation was extended for the school to participate in the research project. After follow-up calls to the principals, five schools were chosen in which to conduct the survey. Preliminary data sheets were administered to all students present on the survey date, providing the name, grade, gender, work status, hours worked per week, and the grades during which the student was employed. These sheets were subsequently divided into 16 cells by class (4), gender (2), and work status (2). A statistical formula determined the number of students to be drawn from each cell, as follows: for any cell with under twenty students, all were included; if a cell had over twenty, the square root of the number in the cell was taken and multiplied by four, yielding the

number of students to be drawn.

Subjects

There were 1481 high school students who completed the survey (see Table 1). Of these, 316 were from the Mountain region, 517 from the Piedmont region, and 647 from the Coastal region. Among the students, 44.3% listed their residence as rural nonfarm, 10.4% as rural farm; and 45.3% as small town (less than 2500). Subjects were 48.1% female and 51.9% male; racial composition was 86.9% white and 11.2% black, with traces of Native American, Hispanic, Asian, and other ethnic groups. As the demographic table indicates, the sample was relatively evenly distributed across grade levels, parental education, and family income. Of the students, 71% were from intact homes, and 25% from separated or divorced families. At the time of data collection, somewhat less than half were working, with 44.2% of the students employed and 55.8% not employed; however, only 29% of the subjects had never been employed (see Table 2). Of those who had never worked, 87.4% indicated they would like a job and 53.4% were actively looking for work. Even though the sample seemed representative of rural students in the southeast, caution should be exercised in generalizing these results to other geographical areas or urban populations.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic	n	%
<u>Region</u>		
Mountain	316	21.3
Piedmont	517	34.9
Coastal	648	43.8
Residential area		
Rural nonfarm	650	44.3
Rural farm	152	10.4
Small town	664	45.3
Missing	15	
Gender		
Female	712	48.1
Male	769	51.9
Ethnic group		
White	1286	86.9
Black	166	11.2
Native American	6	.4
Hispanic	10	.7
Asian	6	.4
Other	7	.4
Class		
Freshman	303	20.4
Sophomore	385	26.0
Junior	400	27.0
Senior	393	26.6

(Table 1 continues)

Characteristic	n	%
Father's education		
Less than 7th	27	1.8
Junior high	60	4.1
Some high school	228	15.4
HS grad	520	35.1
Some college	316	21.3
Assoc degree	37	2.5
College grad	145	9.8
Grad degree	90	6.1
No response	58	3.9
Mother's education		
Less than 7th	12	.8
Junior high	40	2.7
Some high school	202	13.6
HS grad	607	41.0
Some college	332	22.4
Assoc degree	53	3.6
College grad	108	7.3
Grad degree	91	6.1
No response	36	2.4
Parent's marital status		
Married	1037	70.8
Father deceased	37	2.5
Mother deceased	16	1.1
Separated	65	4.4
Divorced	292	19.7
Other	18	1.2
No response	14	.9

(Table 1 continues)

Characteristic	n	%
GPA		
A	222	15.0
B+	232	15.7
B	387	26.1
C+	278	18.8
C	250	16.9
D	73	4.9
F	13	.9
No response	26	1.8
Parent income		
Uncertain	32	2.2
Less than 10,000	86	5.8
10,000-19,999	187	12.6
20,000-29,999	212	14.3
30,000-39,999	232	15.7
40,000-49,999	190	12.8
50,000-59,999	130	8.8
60,000-69,999	84	5.7
70,000-79,999	43	2.9
80,000 or over	60	4.1
No response	225	15.2

Table 2

High School Employment

Employment Facts	n	%
Ever employed		
Yes	1052	71.0
No	429	29.0
Currently employed		
Yes	654	44.2
No	826	55.8
Time worked weekly		
1-14 hours	191	25.4
15-19 hours	114	15.2
20 and above	447	59.4
Average pay per hour		
\$3.95 or less	276	41.3
\$4.00 - \$5.00	328	49.0
Over \$5.00	65	9.7
School year		
Freshman	305	20.6
Sophomore	444	37.7
Junior	456	57.6
Senior	254	64.8

Data Collection Principles

Questionnaires were administered by trained researchers to groups of selected students in their classrooms or other school areas, such as media centers. Students completed the survey during one 50-minute class period. Data were collected during the spring and fall of 1990 from the five schools.

Instruments

The questionnaire includes scales utilized by Greenberger, Steinberg, and their associates in earlier studies with urban California youth (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). The entire questionnaire was pilot tested by the research team in another rural high school and refined before its use in this study. Using student input and observations from the pilot study, some directions and questions were modified for clarification, and some items were added. The complete instrument, which is reproduced as Appendix A, including seven sections as described below.

Demographic data

This portion included questions on age; date of birth; sex; ethnic group; class in school; marital status; parents' marital status, education, occupation, and income; and area of residence (rural farm, rural non-farm, and small town).

High school employment experience:

These questions examined current employment status; school years employed; reasons for working or not working;

hours and pay while employed; students' and students' perceptions of parents' feelings about the student working; job characteristics; ethical actions at work; and both the problems and benefits associated with working.

Educational information

Here, students supplied self-reported GPA, school attendance, extra-curricular involvement, and any changes in these areas since working.

Money issues

In this section of the questionnaire, students supplied information on spending patterns, savings habits, allowance, and other money matters.

Friends and family

Students responded to items briefly assessing the perceived impact of work on relationships with friends and family.

Future plans

Subjects were asked to respond to open-ended and rank order questions regarding occupational aspirations and expectations; job attributes considered important to them; and preferred qualities of character.

Student attitudes and opinions

The final section of the questionnaire consisted of 60 items measuring a variety of work-related attitudes and values. An in depth description of the items and factor

analysis procedures is included in a later section.

Independent Variables

Gender

Students indicated whether they were female (coded 1) or male (2).

Work status

Students responded to the question: Have you ever been employed for pay during any school year while in high school? Choices included (1) Never (2) Only in summer (3) 12th grade (4) 11th grade (5) 10th grade (6) 9th grade. Only those students employed during at least one school year were considered workers. The response to this question was also checked for face validity against questions about current employment and other employment experiences. (On the first hypothesis, this item was treated as a dependent variable; on the third one, it was an independent variable.)

Amount of time student works

Students were asked: How many hours do you usually work each week? Since the literature indicates that the impact of work changes at about 20 hours per week, responses were grouped into 1-19 hours or 20 and above hours per week. (On the first hypothesis, this variable was a dependent variable; on the fourth hypothesis, it was an independent variable.)

Covariates

Race

Respondents circled their ethnic group as follows: White (1), Black (2), Native American (3), Hispanic (4), Asian (5), Other (6). Given the fact that Native American, Hispanic, Asian, and Other groups represented less than 1% each of the sample, these 29 cases were not used in the analyses; only White (1) and Black (2) responses were included.

GPA

Grades were self-reported in response to the question: "What is your grade point average in school this year?" Choices included: About an A average (1), B+ average (2), B (3), C+ (4), C (5), D (6), and F (7).

Family Income

Students indicated the income range that applied to their parents' combined average yearly income before taxes. Ranges began with 1=less than \$10,000 and proceeded in \$10,000 increments, up to \$80,000 and above.

Mother's Occupation

An open-ended question "What is your mother's usual occupation?" yielded responses coded in 9 categories: professional (1); farm ownership (2); management/self-employment (3); clerical and sales (4); skilled trades/military (5); operatives (6); service jobs

(7); homemaker/retired/student/other (subdivided with the category and coded 8); laborer (9).

Dependent Variables

School Year During Which Employment Occurred

Students indicated whether they had been employed during the school year in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12.

Hourly Earnings

Respondents were asked: "What is the average amount of your pay at your job? _____ per hour or _____ per week". They filled in the dollar amount. The actual amount given was used in analysis.

Parental Support of Employment

The question stated: How did your mother (and next question, father) feel about your working or not working during the school year? Please describe briefly. Open-ended responses were coded in the following categories (Codes for responses are shown in parentheses): supportive (1); opposed (2); didn't care (3); conditional support (if your grades stay up, your hours are limited, etc.) (4); preferred not, but would allow (5); allow only in summer or on weekends (6); wait until later (7); glad the student wasn't working (8); other (9); don't know (10); made me work (11).

Nature of current job

Students were asked: "Where do you work? Give the name or title of your present job. Describe what you actually do

on this job." Examination of these responses produced these job groupings, coded as shown: food service (1), grocery--stock, bag (2); cashier (3); farm labor (4); sales (5); clerical (6); child care (7); yardwork (8); repair (9); miscellaneous (10); construction (11); cleaning (12); mechanic (13); recreation (14); and laborer (15).

Reasons for working

The question was: "What was your main reason for getting a job?" Eight choices were given in the questionnaire, coded as shown in parentheses: I wanted job experience for the future (1); I got a job in order to meet new friends (2); I really didn't have to work, but I wanted to have money for "extras" (3); I got a job in order to earn money for things I really need (4); I got a job to meet financial obligations (e.g. a car payment) (5); I thought working would be interesting (6); my parents put pressure on me to get a job (7); I had a lot of extra time on my hands and wanted something to do (8). Although a follow-up question provided the opportunity to order these reasons in importance to the student, this analysis will examine only the main (first) reason given.

Reasons for not working

The students were asked: "What is the main reason you didn't work during the school year?" Response choices included: did not need to (1); job not available (2);

couldn't find a job (3); parents would not allow (4); I was not interested (5); it would take too much of my free time (6); it would take time away from studying (7); no transportation (8); sports participation (9). Again, only that item ranked most important, rather than those selected second, third, and so forth will be analyzed in this study.

Occupational Aspirations

Students were asked: What occupation would you most like to have when you finish your education? Responses were coded by categories, as found in census data: Professional (1); Farmer (2); Management (3); Clerical (4); Craftsman/foreman/military (5); Operatives (6); Service occupations (7); Student/retired/uncertain (8); Laborer (9).

Work-related Attitudes

As described earlier, six work-related attitudes were examined by Greenberger, Steinberg, and their associates (1981): social commitment, cynicism about work; work orientation, reliance on self; materialism; acceptance of unethical business practices. Subjects responded to a 60-item scale with four response choices, including "Strongly agree" (coded 1), "Slightly agree" (2), "Slightly disagree" (3) and "Strongly disagree" (4). (See Appendix A). After factor analysis of these items, scales measured the following attitudes were used in this study: ethics and work; self-reliance; extrinsic rewards of work; responsibility;

intrinsic rewards of work; and social acceptance.

Factor Analysis of Work-Related Attitudes

In the California studies on adolescent employment, using high school students, the questionnaire included a 60-item section, measuring work-related attitudes. These researchers sub-divided the items into six scales: (a) social commitment, (b) cynicism about work, (c) self-reliance, (d) work orientation, (e) materialism, and (f) acceptance of unethical business practices (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). In 1989, Goslen used the work-related attitude items with college students. Her factor analysis, however, yielded somewhat different factors, using 29 of the 60 attitude items in scales designated as (a) social commitment, (b) work orientation, (c) reliance on self, (d) intrinsic value of work (e) extrinsic value of work, and (f) cynicism. Given the discrepant results in these two studies, the passage of time since the original study, and the varying nature of the three samples--one, an urban high school group; the second, an urban college sample; and the present, rural high school students--it seemed important to this researcher to probe further. To explore these differences and to establish construct validity for these attitudinal dimensions, a factor analysis was computed on the data from these high school students in rural North Carolina.

In the present study the subjects responded to the 60 items, with four response choices, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." On the majority of items, a high score indicated disagreement with the statement; a few items were reverse scored, with a high score indicating agreement. See Appendix A Section VII for the entire scale; Appendices B and C include tables of the original factor analysis and those used in the Goslen study.

A factor analysis of the 60 items yielded six scales, utilizing 32 of the original items. The six scales emerging in this study were labeled as follows: (a) ethics and work; (b) self-reliance; (c) extrinsic rewards of work; (d) responsibility; (e) intrinsic rewards of work; and (f) social acceptance. The factors were examined for conceptual cohesion. Those items retained had a factor loading of .45 or better and reliabilities of no less than .5. In testing for skewness, all scales had scores of between -1 and +1.

The factors that emerged in this study are somewhat more similar in composition to the initial scales used by the California group with their urban high school samples than to those used by Goslen with a sample of college students. This is not surprising, since college students are both a more mature and more select group than are those in a high school sample. However, some variations unique to this sample appeared, which may reflect characteristics of a rural

Southern sample. In some cases, it seemed advisable to rename a scale, to more accurately reflect the current analysis. In one case, an entirely new factor surfaced as important to this group (Social acceptance). After the factor analysis was complete, six scales were used as dependent variables in the statistical analysis. The work-related attitudes are described in the sections that follow.

Ethics and Work

The first work-related attitude factor, comprised almost entirely of items on the initial "acceptance of unethical business practices," was renamed "ethics and work," since mean scores for these students indicated a lack of acceptance of unethical practices in the workplace. Several items (60, 40, and 2) used in the original scale were dropped, because their factor loadings were below .45, and they did not reappear in the other factors used in this study. Six of the seven items retained focus on the acceptance of bending the rules for personal gain; the remaining item reflects a narrow definition of personal responsibility (see Table 3). Factor loadings ranged from .45 to .64; communalities were .47 to .76; the total percent of variability retained by the factor was 19.6, and the reliability coefficient was .74 (Table 3). The eigenvalue was 11.76.

Table 3

Factor Analysis of Ethics and Work Items

Items	Factor Loading	Communality
7. In my opinion, it's alright for workers who are paid a low salary to take little things from their jobs to make up for it.	.64	.74
17. Its acceptable to me if a teenage worker cheats a little to make a profit.	.54	.76
1. Workers are entitled to call in sick when they don't feel like working.	.53	.47
24. People who break a few laws to make a profit aren't doing anything I wouldn't do in their position.	.51	.73
8. When a job turns out to be much harder than I was told it would be, I don't feel I have to do it perfectly.	.48	.66
6. A person is responsible only for the happiness of his family, relatives and close friends.	.45	.54
14. Even if it's illegal to hire teenagers to do certain jobs, it's okay for an employer to do it to help a kid out.	.45	.52
Eigenvalue	11.76	
Percent of variance retained by factor	19.6	
Cronbach's alpha	.74	

Self-reliance

The self-reliance scale, originally part of a psychological maturity measure, (Greenberger et al., 1975) was used as part of the larger attitude scale in the California studies (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). Three items from the original scale (12, 9, and 5) did not have loadings sufficiently high to be used on this or any other factor and were dropped from consideration. The first five items retained in this study (22, 30, 58, 16, and 45) reflect the influence of others on one's decisions or actions; the sixth item, #53, which states "Luck decides most things that happen to me" also has to do with one's personal control over the events of life. Factor loadings ranged from .45 to .56 on the six items; communalities varied from .30 to .45. Eigenvalue was 2.84; and the factor retained 4.7 percent of variance, with a reliability coefficient of .67 (Refer to Table 4).

Extrinsic Rewards of Work

In 1984 Ruggiero developed a scale of materialism, which was included in the initial attitudes scale. In Goslen's 1989 study, this split into two factors, including one which was then renamed "the extrinsic value of work." In the present study, two of the original materialism (later extrinsic) items, measuring monetary rewards of work, were retained, joined by a third item found in the social

Table 4

Factor Analysis of Self-Reliance

Items	Factor Loading	Communality
22. I feel very uneasy if I disagree with what my friends think.	.56	.31
30. It is best to agree with others rather than say what you really think, if it will keep the peace.	.52	.37
58. In a group I prefer to let other people make the decisions.	.51	.30
16. When things go well for me, it is usually not because of anything I myself have done.	.50	.41
45. You can't be expected to make a success of yourself if you had a bad childhood.	.46	.41
53. Luck decides most things that happen to me.	.45	.45
Eigenvalue	2.84	
Percent of variance retained by factor	4.7	
Cronbach's alpha	.67	

commitment scales of the earlier studies, but emphasizing personal advancement, rather than the good of the group. Together, these items comprise the third factor in this study, "extrinsic rewards of work." Factor loadings on these items varied from .47 to .68, and communalities from .42 to .58. The eigenvalue was 1.94; the percent of variance retained, 3.2; and the coefficient of reliability, .5 (Refer to Table 5).

Responsibility

The fourth scale is composed of six items found in the work orientation scales of both the Greenberger and Goslen studies (31, 52, 41, 46, 27, and 4), as well as one item originally included in the materialism scale (43). On close examination, these items seem to be measuring an attitude of perseverance, as opposed to impulsivity, or a responsible attitude toward work and money. Six items relate to task perseverance, that is, finishing work begun; the other item refers to impulsivity in spending (43). Taken together, these items measure responsible behavior (see Table 6). Factor loadings vary from .51 to .60, and communalities run from .25 to .54. The factor eigenvalue is 1.86; the percent of variance retained by the factor is 3.1; and the reliability coefficient is .75.

Table 5

Factor Analysis of Extrinsic Rewards of Work

Items	Factor Loading	Communality
28. My goal in life is to make a lot of money and buy a lot of things.	.68	.54
15. It's more important for a job to pay well than for a job to be very interesting.	.54	.58
59. I would rather use my time at work for my own advancement than for the advancement of the work group.	.47	.42
Eigenvalue	1.94	
Percent of variance retained by factor	3.2	
Cronbach's alpha	.52	

Table 6

Factor Analysis of Responsibility

Items	Factor Loading	Communality
43. Money burns a hole in my pocket; if I have it, I spend it.	.60	.25
31. I often don't finish work I start.	.57	.47
52. I tend to go from one thing to another before finishing any of them.	.57	.54
41. I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.	.54	.47
46. I hate to admit it but I give up on my work when things go wrong.	.52	.44
27. I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.	.51	.34
4. Very often I forget work I am supposed to do.	.51	.32
Eigenvalue	1.86	
Percent of variance retained by factor	3.1	
Cronbach's alpha	.75	

Intrinsic Rewards of Work

Ruggiero's 1984 scale included both measurements of cynicism and materialism. Goslen relabelled four items spinning off from the cynicism scale as "intrinsic value of work." These four items, plus one from the original materialism scale, comprise the current "intrinsic value of work" factor (See Table 7). Four of these items (49, 38, 25, and 47) refer to some of the psychosocial rewards of work. The fifth item (39) states that "adults who have honestly acquired a lot of wealth really have my respect and admiration." A focus on the words "honesty," "respect," and "admiration" would seem to naturally group this response with those measuring the less tangible satisfactions of work. All five items are reverse scored; mean scores thus indicate slight to strong agreement by these students with the five statements. A range of .48 to .68 is exhibited on factor loadings, with communalities varying from .30 to .76. The eigenvalue was 1.48; the percent of variance retained was 2.5; and the reliability of the factor was .66.

Social Acceptance

The sixth factor emerging from the responses given by these subjects was not included in either of the earlier studies cited; in fact, these four items were not included in the analyses of the previous studies. All four items measure an attitude of acceptance toward persons of differing ethnic

Table 7

Factor Analysis of Intrinsic Rewards of Work

Items	Factor Loading	Communality
49. Work gives a person a feeling of self-respect.	.68	.76
38. A job provides a worker with a lot more good things than just a paycheck.	.61	.48
39. Adults who have honestly acquired a lot of wealth really have my respect and admiration.	.56	.38
25. Work provides people with the chance to really make something special out of their lives.	.56	.41
47. Work is lots more than a necessity of life that people have to learn to put up with.	.48	.30
Eigenvalue	1.48	
Percent of variance retained by factor	2.5	
Cronbach's alpha	.66	

or social background from the respondent. One item (34) is reverse scored, with a higher score indicated agreement with the statement "I would not mind working closely on a job with a person whose skin color is different than mine." Factor loadings extended from .49 to .66; communalities varied from .36 to .55. Percent of the variance retained by the factor was 2.3; the reliability was .61; and the eigenvalue was 1.39 (See Table 8).

An examination of Table 9 reveals the means, standard deviations, and ranges of responses for each of the work-related attitude scales.

Data Analysis

Hypotheses

1. There is a significant difference in the work experience of high school males and females, as to employment status, hours worked weekly, grades employed, hourly earnings, current job, perceived parental support of employment, reasons for working/not working, and occupational aspirations. It is expected that proportionately more boys will work than do girls; that employment will be initiated earlier in adolescence among boys than girls; and that boys will work longer hours and for higher rates of pay than will girls. In addition, a stronger measure of perceived parental support is expected for the employment of sons than of daughters.

Table 8

Factor Analysis of Social Acceptance Scale

Items Loading	Factor	Communality
3. I would rather not work in an environment where there are people of different races or skin color.	.66	.54
20. I wouldn't like to go on a weekend trip with people who have a different ethnic background from me.	.64	.55
34. I would not mind working closely on a job with a person whose skin color is different from mine.	.57	.36
18. I would not want to work closely with a person who had very different social skills from me.	.49	.43
Eigenvalue	1.39	
Percent of variance retained by factor	2.3	
Cronbach's alpha	.61	

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of Responses to Work
Related Attitude Scales

Dependent Variables	\bar{n}	\bar{X}	sd	Min.	Max.
(Scoring 1=Low, 4=High)					
Ethics and work	1392	22.1	4.2	7	28
Self reliance	1347	18.1	4.7	6	24
Responsibility	1340	20.4	4.2	7	28
Intrinsic rewards	1384	16.7	2.7	5	20
Social acceptance	1387	12.6	2.6	4	16
(Scoring 1=High , 4=Low)					
Extrinsic rewards					
of work	1369	7.7	2.1	3	12

2. There is a significant difference in the work-related attitudes of high school males and females, controlling for ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income. It is anticipated that females will demonstrate higher scores on ethics and work, self-reliance, and intrinsic motivation for work; and that males will emphasize extrinsic rewards for work more than females will.

3. Working while attending high school is significantly related to the work-related attitudes of high school students, controlling for gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income. Self-reliance, extrinsic motivation, responsibility, and social acceptance will increase with employment; scores on ethics and work and intrinsic rewards of work will decrease with employment.

4. The amount of time worked weekly will have a significant relationship to the work-related attitudes of high school students, controlling for gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income. An increasing weekly involvement in work will be accompanied by an increase in self-reliance, extrinsic rewards of work, responsibility, and social acceptance, but a decrease in emphasizing ethics and work and intrinsic rewards for work.

Statistical Analysis

For the first hypothesis, a series of Chi-square tests were carried out on all questions involving a dependent

variable which was categorical. The contribution of each cell to the significance of the Chi-square statistic was also examined. In the case of the continuous variables (hourly earnings), analysis of covariance was utilized. For the remaining three hypotheses, analysis of covariance was the statistical procedure chosen, since the scores on work-related attitudes are continuous, ranging from 1 to 4.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore gender-based differences in the employment experiences of rural adolescents and variations in the work-related attitudes held by these students. The general question driving this study was this: Are males and females experiencing differential occupational socialization? Four hypotheses were presented.

A significant difference was expected in the work experience of high school males and females, with more males working than females, males working at an earlier age, males receiving higher hourly pay, males and females holding different types of jobs, perceived parental support being more favorable toward sons' employment, and differing occupational aspirations by gender. This hypothesis was supported.

A significant difference was anticipated in the work-related attitudes of males and females, controlling for ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income. Expectations are that females will demonstrate higher scores on ethics and work, self-reliance, and intrinsic rewards of work; and males will express more extrinsic rewards of work. This hypothesis was supported.

Working while attending high school was expected to be related to the attitudes of adolescents, controlling for gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income, with self-reliance, extrinsic rewards of work, responsibility, and social acceptance increasing with employment and ethics and work and intrinsic rewards for work decreasing with employment. This hypothesis was only partially supported.

The amount of time a student works was expected to be related to the work-related attitudes of high school students, controlling for gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income. In fact, an increasing involvement in work was expected to be accompanied by an increase in self-reliance, extrinsic rewards of work, responsibility, and social acceptance, but a decrease in ethics and work and intrinsic rewards of work. There was no support for this hypothesis.

Descriptive Information

The survey was completed by 1481 students across North Carolina. Of these, 21.3% were from the Mountains, 34.9% from the Piedmont, and 43.8% from the Coastal Plains (see Table 1). Although these students lived in predominately rural areas, 10.4% lived on farms, 43.9% selected rural nonfarm as their residence, and 45.3% lived in small towns (under 2500). The sample was 86.9% white and 11.2% Black,

with less than 1% each from Native American, Asian, Hispanic, and other groups; therefore, only data from White and Black students were analyzed in testing the hypotheses.

Approximately 71% of the students came from intact families, 25% from separated or divorced families, and the remainder from widowed or other family circumstances. Parental education included 17% (mother's) and 21% (father's) who did not finish high school; 41% (mother's) and 35.1% (father's) who completed high school; 26% (mother's) and 23.8% (father's) who had some college or associate degrees; and 13.4% (mother's) and 14.9% (father's) who finished college and/or graduate school. Parental income ranged from 18.4% under \$20,000; 42.8% between \$20,000 and \$50,000; and 21.5% over \$50,000.

Only 29% of these students had never worked. At the time of testing, 44.2% held a job and 55.8% were not working. Of those not working, 54.1% were looking for work. Among working girls, 61.1% worked less than 20 hours a week and 38.9% worked 20 or more hours weekly. However, 51.8% of the boys reported working under 20 hours a week, and 48.2% worked 20 or more hours a week. Average pay was reported by 41.3% of the workers as \$3.95 or less an hour; \$4-\$5 an hour was earned by 49%; and 9.7% of the students reported making over \$5 an hour. Looking ahead, 49.9% of the students hoped to enter the professions; .7% to farm; 4.8% to work in business

management; 10.3% in clerical areas; 14.5% as skilled craftsmen or in the military; 1.1% as operatives; 8.5% in service positions; 1.5% as laborers; and 8.6% were undecided (See Table 10).

Among these working students, there were interesting comments about school and work. The table in Appendix D indicates the relationship between school involvement and work. Workers had varying reactions to school, with 7.2% never enjoying school, 30% liking it "once in a while"; 43.8% expressing enjoyment of school "lots of the time"; and 18.9% reported "almost always" enjoying school. Among these workers, 21.4% expressed a desire to spend more time at work, 59.2% liked their current balance of work and school, and 19.4% wanted to reduce time at work. When work and school conflicted, 90.8% of the girls and 78.1% of the boys chose to attend school; 8.5% of the girls and 21.4% of the boys put work first; and a few had experienced no conflict.

These working students recognized both problems and benefits associated with work. Their responses to open-ended questions were categorized. Most (63.8%) cited money as the primary benefit; 7.5% reported experience; and 7.4% noted increased responsibility as recognized benefits of working, with a variety of other benefits received mentioned by the remaining 21.3% of the students. Similarly, many reported problems incurred by working while attending school:

Table 10

High School Employment by Gender

Employment Facts	Female		Male	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Employment status				
Never employed	225	35.8	174	22.6
Some employment	447	64.2	595	77.4
Nonworkers currently looking for job				
Yes	129	51.2	96	57.1
No	123	48.8	72	42.9
Employed in				
Grade 12	133	63.1*	121	66.1*
Grade 11	217	54.6	239	60.5
Grade 10	178	31.1	266	43.9
Grade 9	92	12.9	213	27.8
*Percent of that gender employed in that grade				
Hours per week				
Less than 20	198	61.1	221	51.8
20 and more	126	38.9	206	48.2
Average pay per hour				
Less than 3.95	175	59.1	101	27.1
3.95-4.99	99	33.4	160	42.9
5.00 and above	22	7.4	112	30.0

Table 10 (continues)

Employment Facts	Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%
Present job				
Food service	103	39.5	99	26.5
Grocery (stock/bag)	4	1.5	73	19.5
Cashier	79	30.3	8	2.1
Farm labor	0	0	27	7.2
Sales	22	8.4	26	7.0
Clerical	14	5.4	3	.8
Child care	16	6.1	3	.8
Yard work	1	.4	34	9.1
Painting/repair	2	.8	9	2.4
Construction	0	0.0	16	4.3
Cleaning	4	1.5	15	4.0
Mechanic	0	0.0	16	4.3
Laborer	4	1.5	9	2.4
Other	12	4.6	36	9.6
Mothers feeling about student working				
Support	232	34.4	317	45.6
Oppose	136	20.2	82	11.8
Neutral	77	11.4	127	18.3
Conditional support	122	18.1	109	15.7
Other	107	15.9	60	8.6
Father's feeling about student working				
Support	208	33.7	283	43.4
Oppose	106	17.2	59	9.0
Neutral	105	17.0	144	22.1
Conditional support	97	15.7	95	14.6
Other	102	16.5	71	10.9
Receive allowance				
Yes	299	42.3	263	35.2
No	408	57.7	484	64.8

Table 10 (continues)

Employment Facts	Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%
Future occupational aspirations				
Professional	408	58.8	292	41.1
Farming	1	.1	9	1.3
Management	20	2.9	47	6.7
Clerical	103	15.1	39	5.6
Craftsman/foreman	34	5.0	166	23.8
Operator	1	.1	15	2.2
Service workers	74	10.9	41	5.9
Laborers	1	.1	20	2.9
Don't know	26	3.8	60	8.5
Other	20	2.9	15	2.1
Reasons for getting job				
Job experience	35	10.5	40	9.1
To meet new friend	2	.6	2	.5
Money for extras	144	43.2	146	33.3
Money for needs	68	20.4	124	28.2
Financial obligation	65	19.5	100	22.8
Work interesting	4	1.2	3	.7
Parent's pressure	8	2.4	13	3.0
Time on hands	7	2.1	11	2.5
Reasons for not working				
Did not need to	12	3.6	18	6.3
Job not available	7	2.1	14	4.9
Couldn't find job	22	6.5	37	12.9
Parent's wouldn't allow	53	15.7	25	8.7
Not interested	21	6.2	13	4.5
Too much time from studies	105	31.2	58	20.3
Too much time from extra activities	14	4.2	16	5.6
No transportation	38	11.3	41	14.3
Sports	37	11.0	46	16.1
Other	28	8.3	18	6.3

interference with academic work (29.1%); exhaustion (27.5%); less time for extra-curricular activities (15.6%); and 17.9% had no problems. Some students (14.5%) felt their grades had improved since they began working; the majority (56.7%) reported that grades had not been affected by work; and 28.8% thought their grades had dropped since they were employed.

Hypothesis Testing

In the first hypothesis, associations between gender and employment status, year of employment, weekly hours, perceived parental support of employment, jobs currently held, occupational aspirations, and reasons for working or not working were tested using Chi-square tests for independence. Gender differences in average pay per hour were tested, using analysis of covariance, with ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income as covariates.

The remaining hypotheses were examined using analysis of covariance. In the second hypothesis, differences between males and females on work-related attitudes were tested, with ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income as covariates. In the third hypothesis, differences in work-related attitudes by employment status were tested, with gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' incomes as covariates. Finally, in the fourth hypothesis, variation in work-related attitudes by hours worked weekly was tested, with gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's

occupation, and parents' income as covariates. For the second, third, and fourth hypotheses, the dependent variables were the work-related attitudes: ethics and work, self-reliance, extrinsic rewards of work, responsibility, intrinsic rewards of work, and social acceptance. The first two hypotheses were supported; however, the third and fourth hypotheses were not confirmed.

Employment Experiences

Employment Status

A significantly higher proportion of boys had experienced some employment than had girls [$X^2 (1)=31.25, p<.001$]. Only 22.6% of the boys had never been employed; however, 35.8% of the girls had never worked, as shown in Table 11.

Employment by Grade Level

Significantly more boys proportionately had started work in the ninth or tenth grades than had girls. In the ninth grade, 27.8% of the boys and only 12.9% of the girls were employed [$X^2 (1)=49.92, p<.001$]. Likewise, in the tenth grade, 43.9% of the boys were employed, as compared to 31.1% of the girls [$X^2 (1)=20.66, p<.001$]. While more boys than girls proportionately were employed in both the grades eleven and twelve, these differences were not significant (see Table 12).

Hours Worked Weekly

As illustrated in Table 13, relatively more males worked 20 or more hours a week than did females [$X^2 (2)=7.53, p=.02$].

Table 11

Frequency Table of Employment by Gender (N=1481)

Employment Status	Female		Male		Chi-square value	p value
	n	%	n	%		
Never employed	255	35.8	174	22.6	31.25	<.001
Employed	457	64.2	595	77.4		

Note: DF = 1.

Table 12

Frequency Table of Employment by Grade Level

Employment Status	Female		Male		Chi-square value	p value
	n	%	n	%		
Freshman (N=1478)						
Employed	92	12.9	213	27.8	49.92	<.001
Not employed	620	87.1	246	72.2		
Sophomore (N=1177)						
Employed	178	31.1	266	43.9	20.66	<.001
Not employed	394	68.9	339	56.1		
Junior (N=792)						
Employed	217	54.6	239	60.5	2.77	.10
Not employed	180	45.4	156	39.5		
Senior (N=392)						
Employed	133	63.1	121	66.1	.26	.61
Not employed	76	36.9	62	33.9		

Note: DF= 1.

Table 13

Frequency Table of Hours Worked Weekly by Gender

Hours	Female		Male		Chi-square value	p value
	n	%	n	%		
Less than 20	142	45.1	150	36.0	7.53	<.001
20 or more	173	54.9	267	64.0		

Note: DF= 2.

of the employed males, 64% worked 20 hours a week or more, while 54.7% of the employed females committed that amount of time to work.

Hourly Pay

Male students earned significantly more than did their female counterparts [$F(1,537)=41.8$, $p<.001$] (see Table 14). The mean hourly wage for males was \$4.55 (s.e.m.=\$.08); for females, it was \$3.89 (s.e.m.=\$.06). Of the covariates, only parents' income was also significantly related to hourly wages [$F(1)=5.12$, $p=.02$], as neither ethnic group, GPA, or mother's occupation contributed significantly to the prediction of hourly pay.

Perceived Parental Support for Employment

Significant differences were found in the feelings of both mothers and fathers toward the employment of sons and daughters [mothers: $X^2(8)=55.48$, $p<.001$; fathers: $X^2(8)=34.84$, $p<.001$] (see Tables 15 and 16). Further examination of the analyses revealed significantly more mothers and fathers proportionately were supportive or neutral toward sons' employment, and a significantly higher percentage were opposed to daughters' working.

Present Job

Significant differences [$X^2(14)=434.89$, $p<.001$] were found in the current jobs held by boys and girls (see Table 17). In further examination of the contribution of each cell

Table 14

Analysis of Covariance of Average Hourly Pay by Gender

(N=538)

Source	DF	F	Significance	Mean	
				Female	Male
Gender	1	41.8	<.001	\$3.89 (\$.06) *	\$4.55 (\$.08)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Ethnic group	1	.01	.92		
GPA	1	1.98	.16		
Mother's occup	1	.92	.34		
Parent's income	1	5.12	.02		
Error	537				
R ² = .086					

*Standard error of mean.

Table 15

Frequency Table of Mother's Feelings About Adolescent's
Employment (N=1341)

Feeling	Female		Male		Chi-square	
	n	%	n	%	value	P-Value
Supportive	224	33.9	309	45.4	55.48	<.001
Opposed	134	20.3	81	11.9		
Neutral	76	11.5	123	18.1		
Conditional						
support	120	18.2	109	16.0		
Prefer not	8	1.2	7	1.0		
Only in summer,						
or weekends	29	4.4	12	1.8		
Wait	14	2.1	4	.6		
Glad not working	39	5.9	22	3.2		
Other	16	2.4	14	2.1		

Note: DF= 8.

Table 16

Frequency Table of Father's Feelings About Adolescent's
Employment (N=1242)

Feeling	Female		Male		Chi-square	
	n	%	n	%	value	P-Value
Supportive	201	33.3	275	43.1	34.84	<.001
Opposed	103	17.1	59	9.2		
Neutral	103	17.1	140	21.9		
Conditional						
support	96	15.9	95	14.9		
Prefer not	12	2.0	6	.9		
Only in summer,						
or weekends	18	3.0	11	1.7		
Wait	11	1.8	8	1.3		
Glad not working	31	5.1	22	3.4		
Other	29	4.8	22	3.4		

Note: DF= 8.

Table 17

Frequency Table of Present Job by Gender (N=619)

Job	Female		Male		Chi-square	
	n	%	n	%	value	P-Value
Food Service	100	39.4	96	26.3	434.89	<.001
Bag boy	4	1.6	72	19.7		
Cashier	78	30.7	8	2.2		
Farm	0	0.0	27	7.4		
Sales	21	8.3	26	7.1		
Clerical	14	5.5	3	.8		
Child care	15	5.9	3	.8		
Yardwork	1	.4	33	9.0		
Painting/repair	2	.8	9	2.5		
Construction	0	0.0	14	3.8		
Cleaning	3	1.2	15	4.1		
Mechanic	0	0.0	15	4.1		
Recreation	4	1.6	6	1.6		
Laborer	4	1.6	9	2.5		
Other	8	3.1	29	7.9		

Note: DF= 14.

predominated in positions such as bag boy, farm labor, yardwork, painting/repair, construction, cleaning, mechanic, and laborer. Girls dominated the areas of cashier, clerical work, and child care. The two genders participated in similar proportions in the food services, sales, and recreation.

Occupational Aspirations

Again, significant differences [$X^2 (9)=208.21, p<.001$] existed for boys and girls in their future occupational plans (see Table 18). These differences occurred primarily as follows: proportionately more females planned to enter the professional, clerical, the arts, and service areas; relatively more males aimed to work in business, skilled labor, the military, and as operatives and laborers. Examination of specific positions revealed that proportionately more females than males planned to be doctors, lawyers, accountants, and veterinarians, and nearly the same percentage of males and females planned to be scientists. These were the exceptions to otherwise stereotypical patterns.

Reasons for Getting Job

The analysis did not reveal significant differences between boys and girls in the overall reasons given for getting a job [$X^2 (7)=12.00, p>.10$] (see Table 19). Both males and females cited primarily financial reasons for

Table 18

Frequency Table of Occupational Aspiration by Gender

(N = 1377)

Occupation	Female		Male		Chi-square	
	n	%	n	%	value	P-Value
Professional	400	58.8	285	40.9	208.21	<.001
Farmers	1	.1	9	1.3		
Management	20	2.9	47	6.7		
Clerical	103	15.1	39	5.6		
Craftsmen/ foremen	34	5.0	166	23.8		
Operatives	1	.1	15	2.2		
Service workers	74	10.9	41	5.9		
Laborers	1	.1	20	2.9		
Unemployed	20	2.9	15	2.2		
Don't know	26	3.8	60	8.6		

Note: DF= 9.

Table 19

Reasons for Working by Gender (N = 772)

Reasons	Female		Male		Chi-square	
	n	%	n	%	value	P-Value
Experience	35	10.5	40	9.1	12.00	>.10
Meet friend	2	.6	2	.3		
Money for extras	144	43.2	146	33.3		
Money for needs	68	20.4	129	28.2		
Money for obligations	65	19.5	100	22.8		
Interesting	4	1.2	3	.7		
Parental pressure	8	2.4	13	3.0		
Extra time	7	2.1	11	2.5		

Note: DF= 7.

working: money for extras, money for needs, and financial obligations. However, it is interesting to note that boys were significantly more likely to cite financial needs as their motivations for working; whereas girls were more likely to select money for extras as their reason for seeking employment.

Reasons for Not Working

Males and females gave significantly different reasons for not working [$X^2(9)=32.27, p<.001$] (see Table 20). Examination of the cells indicates that boys were significantly more likely to give "couldn't find a job" as a reason; a significantly higher percentage of girls cited "parents would not allow me to work" or "it would take too much time away from studying" as reasons for not having worked.

Work-Related Attitudes and Gender

Significant differences were found by gender on all six attitude scales, thus confirming the second hypothesis. Covariates on all six analyses included ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income.

Ethics and Work

On ethics and work, the mean score for females was 23.6 (s.e.m.=.15) and for males, 20.8 (s.e.m.=.19). (A higher score indicates disagreement with unethical practices.) As

Table 20

Reasons for Not Working by Gender (N=623)

Reasons	Female		Male		Chi-square	
	n	%	n	%	value	P-Value
No need	12	3.6	18	6.3	32.27	<.001
Job not available	7	2.1	14	4.9		
Couldn't find job	22	6.5	37	12.9		
Parents said no	53	15.7	25	8.7		
Not interested	21	6.2	13	4.5		
Too much time from studies	105	31.2	58	20.3		
Too much time from extra activities	14	4.2	16	5.6		
No transportation	38	11.3	41	14.3		
Sports	37	11.0	46	16.1		
Other	28	8.3	18	6.3		

Note: DF= 9

shown in Table 21, the main effect of gender was significant [F (1,1095)=131.92, $p < .001$]. Only the covariate GPA also added significantly to the prediction of the ethics and work score [F (1,1095)=28.89, $p < .001$]. The equation explained 13% of the variance.

Self-reliance

After covariate adjustments, females were significantly more self-reliant than were males [F (1,1058)=53.98, $p < .001$], as seen in Table 22. The mean score for the girls was 19.0 (s.e.m.=.12), and for the boys, 17.4 (s.e.m.=.14), with a higher score being associated with greater self-reliance. Again, only ethnic group [F (1,1058)=5.52, $p = .02$] and GPA [F (1,1058)=19.70, $p < .001$] among the covariates added significantly to the prediction of self-reliance scores (see Table 22). This equation explained 9.4% of the variance.

Extrinsic Rewards of Work

Following adjustments for covariates, male students were significantly more interested in the extrinsic rewards of work than were females [F (1,1072)=41.04, $p < .001$] (see Table 23). On this scale, a lower score indicates increased extrinsic motivation: males had a mean score of 7.3 (s.e.m.=.08); females, 8.1 (s.e.m.=.08). GPA alone among the covariates added significantly to the variation in scores [F (1,1072)=15.62, $p < .001$]. However, it is also important to note that this equation explained only 5.3% of the variance

Table 21

Analysis of Covariance of Ethics and Work by Gender (N=1096)

Source	DF	F	P-Value	Mean	
				Female	Male
Gender	1	131.93	<.001	23.6 (.12)*	20.8 (.17)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Ethnic group	1	.25	.61		
GPA	1	28.89	<.001		
Mother's occupation	1	.26	.61		
Parent's income	1	1.88	.17		
Error	1095				
R ² = .130					

* (Standard error of mean).

Table 22

Analysis of Covariance of Self-reliance by Gender (N=1059)

Source	DF	F	P-Value	Means	
				Female	Male
Gender	1	53.98	<.001	19.0 (.12)*	17.4 (.14)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Ethnic group	1	5.52	.02		
GPA	1	19.70	<.001		
Mother's occupation	1	.665	.41		
Parent's income	1	.12	.72		
Error	1058				
R ² = .07					

*(Standard error of mean)

Table 23

Analysis of Covariance of Extrinsic Rewards of Work by Gender

(N = 1073)

Source	DF	F	P-Value	Means	
				Female	Male
Gender	1	41.04	<.001	8.1 (.08)*	7.3 (.08)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Ethnic group	1	1.61	.20		
GPA	1	15.62	<.001		
Mother's occupation	1	1.55	.46		
Parent's income	1	2.60	.10		
Error	1072				
R ² = .053					

*(Standard error of mean).

in this attitude.

Responsibility

On this factor, a higher score indicates increased levels of responsibility (more perseverance, less impulsivity). After covariate adjustments, females in this sample had a mean score of 21.0 (s.e.m.=.16); males scored a mean of 19.9 (s.e.m.=.16). This was a significant difference [F (1,564)=12.17, $p<.001$], as shown in Table 24. Among the covariates, ethnic group contributed somewhat [F (1,564)=4.77, $p=.03$] and GPA quite significantly [F (1,564)=19.91, $p<.001$]. However, gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income only explained 3.4% of the variance in predicting responsibility among these adolescents.

Intrinsic Rewards of Work

A higher score indicates increasing emphasis on intrinsic rewards. Females had a mean score of 17.4 (s.e.m.=.09); the mean for males was 16.2 (s.e.m.=.11). This difference was significant [F (1,1085)=42.17, $p<.001$], as displayed in Table 25. Among the covariates, GPA was also significant [F (1,1085)=33.69, $p<.001$]. The combined effect of gender and the four covariates explained 6.7% of the variance on this scale.

Table 24

Analysis of Covariance of Responsibility by Gender (N = 1057)

Source	DF	F	P-Value	Means	
				Female	Male
Gender	1	12.17	<.001	21.0 (.16)*	19.9 (.16)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Ethnic group	1	4.77	.03		
GPA	1	19.91	<.001		
Mother's occupation	1	.23	.63		
Parent's income	1	.21	.65		
Error	1056				
R ² = .034					

*(Standard error of mean)

Table 25

Analysis of Covariance of Intrinsic Rewards of Work by Gender
(N=1086)

Source	DF	F	P-Value	Mean	
				Female	Male
Gender	1	42.17	<.001	17.4 (.09)*	16.2 (.11)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Ethnic group	1	.03	.87		
GPA	1	33.69	<.001		
Mother's occupation	1	1.25	.26		
Parents income	1	.07	.79		
Error	1085				
R ² = .067					

* (Standard error of mean)

Note: Items are reverse scored

Social acceptance

On this scale, females generally indicated more willingness to work with people of differing ethnic or social backgrounds (Mean = 13.3, s.e.m.=.09) than did males (Mean=12.00, s.e.m.=.10). This difference was significant [F (1,1090)=56.67, $p<.001$]. Three of the covariates also affected this attitude significantly: ethnic group [F (1,1090)=9.97, $p=.002$]; GPA [F (1,1090)=17.11, $p<.001$]; and mother's occupation [F (1,1090)=5.61, $p=.02$]. The variance in social acceptance explained by this equation was 7.7%. Results are shown in Table 26.

Work-Related Attitudes and Employment

For the most part, the third hypothesis was not supported, since only two of the six work-related attitudes showed a significant relationship to employment status (working or not working). Covariates on these analyses included gender, ethnic group, GPA, mother's occupation, and parents' income.

Ethics and Work

After adjustments for the covariates, being employed parttime while attending high school was not significantly related to an emphasis on ethical work practices [F (1,1095)=.15, $p=.69$] (see Table 27). Among the covariates, both gender [F (1,1095)=131.83, $p<.001$] and GPA [F (1,1095)=11.72, $p<.001$] were highly related to this

Table 26

Analysis of Covariance of Social Acceptance by Gender

(N=1091)

Source	DF	F	P-Value	Mean	
				Female	Male
Gender	1	56.67	<.001	13.3 (.09)*	12.0 (.10)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Ethnic group	1	9.97	.002		
GPA	1	17.11	<.001		
Mother's occupation	1	5.61	.02		
Parent's income	1	1.11	.29		
Error	1090				
R ² = .077					

* (Standard error of mean)

Table 27

Analysis of Covariance of Ethics and Work by Employment

(N=1096)

Source	DF	F	P-Value
Employment	1	.15	.69
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	131.83	<.001
Ethnic group	1	.01	.90
GPA	1	11.72	<.001
Mother's occup.	1	.06	.81
Parent's income	1	.19	.66
Error	1095		
R ² = .13			

attitude. There was an explained variance of 13%, using this equation.

Self-reliance

Table 28 shows that employment only weakly impacted self-reliance among this group of students [$F(1,1058)=2.9$, $p=.10$]. Again, gender [$F(1,1058)=54.07$, $p<.001$], ethnic group [$F(1,1058)=3.95$, $p=.05$], and GPA [$F(1,1058)=10.49$, $p=.004$] were significantly related to scores on self-reliance, with 7.0% of the variance in this attitude explained by employment and the covariates.

Extrinsic Rewards of Work

Interest in the extrinsic rewards of work was not significantly related to employment [$F(1,1072)=.40$, $p=.52$]. Gender [$F(1,1072)=41.02$, $p<.001$] and GPA [$F(1,1072)=8.64$, $p=.003$] were related to emphasizing extrinsic rewards of work, but only 5.4% of the variance in this attitude was explained by this equation, as indicated in Table 29.

Responsibility

The responsible attitudes of perseverance and restraint were not significantly affected by employment experience [$F(1, 1056)=.01$, $p=.91$] (see Table 30); however, three of the covariates showed a significant relationship to responsibility: gender [$F(1,1056)=12.16$, $p<.001$], ethnic group [$F(1,1056)=4.22$, $p=.04$], and GPA [$F(1,1056)=14.84$, $p<.001$]. These results should be viewed very cautiously, as

Table 28

Analysis of Covariance of Self-reliance by Employment

(N=1059)

Source	DF	F	P-Value
Employment	1	2.91	.10
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	54.07	<.001
Ethnic group	1	3.95	.05
GPA	1	10.49	<.001
Mother's occupation	1	.43	.51
Parent's income	1	.50	.48
Error	1058		
R ² = .096			

Table 29

Analysis of Covariance of Extrinsic Rewards of Work by
Employment (N=1073)

Source	DF	F	P-Value
Employment	1	.40	.52
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	41.02	<.001
Ethnic group	1	2.41	.12
GPA	1	8.64	.003
Mother's occupation	1	3.81	.54
Parent's income	1	.49	.48
Error	1072		
R ² = .054			

Table 30

Analysis of Covariance of Responsibility by Employment

(N=1057)

Source	DF	F	P-Value
Employment	1	.01	.91
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	12.16	<.001
Ethnic group	1	4.22	.04
GPA	1	14.84	<.001
Mother's occupation	1	.15	.70
Parent's income	1	.002	.96
Error	1056		
R ² = .034			

only 3.4% of the variance in responsibility was explained by employment and these covariates.

Intrinsic Rewards of Work

A weakly significant relationship was established between employment and intrinsic rewards of work [F (1,1085)=3.80, $p=.05$], as displayed in Table 31. After adjusting for covariates, those who had never been employed had higher scores on intrinsic motivations for work (Mean = 17.16, s.e.m.=.13) than did those with employment experience (Mean = 16.66, s.e.m.=.09). In addition, the covariates gender [F (1, 1085)=42.28, $p<.001$] and GPA [F (1,1085)=22.96, $p<.001$] were significantly related to this scale. This equation explained 7% of the variance on this attitude.

Social Acceptance

Among these adolescents, employment was significantly related to acceptance in the workplace of those from different backgrounds [F (1,1090)=9.60, $p=.002$]. These results appear in Table 32. Lack of employment was associated with increased acceptance (Mean = 13.12, s.e.m.=.13); employment seemed to result in less acceptance (Mean = 12.40, s.e.m.=.09). In addition, gender [F (1,1090)=57.12, $p<.001$]; ethnic group [F (1,1090)=8.28, $p=.004$]; GPA [F (1,1090)=8.50, $p=.004$]; and mother's occupation [F (1,1090)=4.70, $p=.03$] obtained significance in the equation, with 8.5% of the variance being explained.

Table 31

Analysis of Covariance of Intrinsic Rewards of Work by
Employment (N=1086)

Source	DF	F	P-Value	Mean	
				Never Employed	Employed
Employment	1	3.80	.05	17.16 (.13)*	16.66 (.09)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Gender	1	42.28	<.001		
Ethnic group	1	.17	.68		
GPA	1	22.96	<.001		
Mother's occup.	1	.92	.34		
Parent's income	1	.47	.49		
Error	1085				
R ² = .070					

* (Standard error of mean)

Table 32

Analysis of Covariance of Social Acceptance by Employment

(N=1091)

Source	DF	F	P-value	Mean	
				Never Employed	Employed
Employment	1	9.60	<.01	13.12 (.13)*	12.40 (.09)
<u>Covariates</u>					
Gender	1	57.12	<.001		
Ethnic group	1	8.28	.004		
GPA	1	8.50	.004		
Mother's occup.	1	4.70	.03		
Parent's income	1	.01	.93		
Error	1090				
R ² = .085					

*(Standard error of mean)

Work-Related Attitudes and Hours of Employment

The fourth hypothesis received no support in this study, as no significant relationships were found between number of hours worked weekly and the six work-related attitudes. In every case, however, gender and GPA were significantly associated with the six attitude scales (see Appendix C).

Summary of Results

The results of this study clearly indicated differing experiences with the world of work by gender. Male adolescents were more likely to work, began parttime employment earlier in their educational experience, received higher pay, and were more likely to work in excess of 20 hours than were females. In addition, parents were perceived as more supportive of their sons' employment and more likely to oppose or restrict daughters' employment. While there were not significant variations in the reasons given for seeking employment, there was a suggestion that proportionately more boys worked because of financial needs or obligations; whereas, relatively more girls worked for extra money.

Significant and stereotypical differences were found in the jobs held by male and female adolescents, as well as significant differences in their aspirations for the future. However, it is important to note that some stereotypes were crumbling. First, no girls indicated a career choice of

homemaker on the question "What occupation would you most like to have when you finish your education?" While the phrasing of the question may have encouraged females not to put homemaker as a response, on a second level question, "What kind of job do you actually think you will hold when you have finished your education?", only one female responded "I'll probably get married and have children." These young women expected to be employed. Secondly, in further examination of specific occupational expectations (before grouping these into broader categories), a higher percentage of girls than boys expected to be accountants, doctors, veterinarians, and lawyers, and nearly equivalent proportions expressed a desire to be scientists. These were atypical results. However, beyond these exceptions, the remaining aspirations fell along gender-typed lines: females chose nurse, paralegal, teacher, social worker, the arts, secretary, and cosmetology; males selected architecture, engineer, pilot, professional sports, farmer, business, skilled trades, military, police, and labor positions.

The work-related attitudes held by these adolescents are clearly associated with gender. On average, females were more supportive of ethical business practices, more self-reliant, more responsible, more interested in intrinsic rewards for work, and more accepting of those of differing backgrounds. Males, on the other hand, generally expressed more extrinsic motivation for work.

Employment during high school was significantly associated with only two of the work-related attitudes: intrinsic rewards of work and social acceptance. In both cases, the relationship was negative; that is, employment was associated with lower scores on intrinsic rewards and social acceptance.

The number of hours of employment weekly showed no significant relationships with the six work-related attitudes. Predominantly, gender and GPA were the covariates showing significant relationships to these attitudes.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The workplace has joined the home, school, and peer culture as a crucial domain of adolescent development. As in earlier studies, this study found a majority of teenagers surveyed having employment experience, with those percentages increasing each year in high school (Steinberg & Greenberger, 1980; Meyer, 1981). It is noteworthy that such employment is largely unrelated to any educational program or societal planning; adolescents are seeking employment on their own with little direction or guidance from the adult world.

This study examined the gender-based differences in the employment experiences of rural adolescents and the work-related attitudes held by these adolescents. Given the steady increase in maternal employment in recent years, it seemed particularly pertinent to re-examine the employment experiences and work-related attitudes of current adolescents as significantly different occupational socialization may have occurred since the research of the early 1980's. The intent of the research was to both examine the surface differences and to explore possible variations in the occupational socialization process as experienced by male and female teenagers; that is, what is leading to the differences?

Discussion of Results

The results offer clear evidence that the world of work is experienced differently by these male and female adolescents. These findings confirm those reported earlier by Gottfredson (1985), Greenberger and Steinberg (1983), and Yamoor and Mortimer (1990), who found that adolescent males began working earlier, worked in greater numbers, received higher pay, and worked in different types of jobs than did their females peers. Likewise, among these a rural adolescents, males were significantly more likely to have worked, began working at greater numbers during their first two years of high school, and received significantly higher pay. Boys also tended to work longer hours than girls, but not significantly so.

Earlier researchers in the field of adolescent employment have emphasized the fact that the adolescent workplace is not unidimensional, and that different work environments produce varying effects among the youthful employees (Hamilton & Crouter, 1980). It is important to recognize, therefore, that boys and girls hold very different jobs during high school. Greenberger and Steinberg (1983) pointed out that male adolescents tended to work more with things, females with people and that trend appeared among this sample as well. Outside the sales and food service industries, where both male and female teens worked in large

numbers, the remaining adolescent jobs tended to be highly sex stereotyped: girls worked as cashiers and child care givers; boys were employed as bag boys, mechanics, and in farm labor, yardwork, repair work, construction, cleaning, and factory labor. It is interesting to note the greater variety in jobs procured by young men, and the greater level of vocational skill generally required by these jobs. If, as occupational socialization theory predicts, adolescent employment should prepare the worker for future adult roles, adolescent males seem in this group may have had the more beneficial employment experiences. These findings would seem to contradict a conclusion reached by Mortimer et al. (1990) that the employment of adolescent males offered less opportunity for skill development and less variety in tasks than that of females, with girls having the "more beneficial work experience" (p. 215). It has been suggested that, for maximum benefit, adolescent employment should be linked to long-term career interests. It appears that the parttime jobs held by boys may offer more possibilities for vocational exploration than those held by girls.

This study also found significant differences in the future occupational plans of males and females. As in the studies by Farmer (1983), Lee (1985), and Shapiro and Crowley (1982), these female adolescents held higher occupational aspirations than did the males, with a majority of them

selecting professional careers. Herzog's 1982 study found that occupational plans differed by sex, but that differences were declining. Here, too, some stereotypes were collapsing: these young women did not expect to be fulltime homemakers; more females than males expected to be accountants, lawyers, veterinarians, and doctors; and an equivalent number anticipated becoming scientists. However, as Gross (1968) and Sundberg (1984) commented, the movement away from stereotypes is caused by females entering predominantly male occupations, not by movement in the other direction. However, Herzog (1982) noted that women were more inclined toward schools and social service organizations; those trends continued here. Nursing, social work, teaching, the arts, clerical positions, cosmetology, and child care continued to be predominantly female selections. Engineering, architecture, the military, and both skilled and unskilled labor remained bastions of male domination. Some of these young women reflected in their open-ended comments the belief that their income would be supplementary to that of their future husbands, a continuation of Molm's (1978) finding that the employment of married women increased as their husband's income declined. Nonetheless, given the finding of Morgan and Hock (1984) that a career orientation is predictive of employment among women with children, it is significant that these female adolescents expected to have careers.

Perhaps of more interest than the facts of differing experiences and plans, however, are the possible contributors to such variations. Why should adolescent males and females have such different vocational experiences and expectations? Is the socialization of the two genders indeed so different? This study offers some tantalizing clues as to differential socialization. In response to the questions "How did your parents feel about your working or not working during the school year?" males and females gave significantly different responses. Boys reported that both their mothers and fathers were supportive or neutral about their decision to work, while more girls indicated that their mothers and fathers either opposed their employment, were glad they were not working, made support conditional on other factors (such as maintaining good grades or limiting hours), or asked that they work only during summer or on weekends. Likewise, on other questions, more boys indicated they felt parental pressure to work, while more girls reported that parents would not allow them to work. These results seem to confirm those of Peters (1987) and Peterson et al. (1982) that parents seem more supportive of male employment. Further, more girls reported receiving allowances than did boys. It could be that parents continue to perceive females as more dependent than males and have not yet made the transition to seeing both male and female future employment as equally

necessary, likely, or desirable.

In questions regarding their motivations for working, both males and females cite primarily financial reasons for working; however, more boys emphasize financial needs or obligations, while proportionately more girls report wanting money for extras. The adult pattern of regarding female income as supplementary and male as essential seems to be foreshadowed among these adolescents.

One important aspect of occupational socialization is the formation of attitudes that are related to occupational achievement, such as ethics, self-reliance, extrinsic or intrinsic motivations for work, responsibility, and the social acceptance that promotes interpersonal cooperation on the job. In fact, one of the primary claims made by proponents of adolescent employment is that work would contribute to the development of beneficial attitudes and habits for future occupational success (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1981; Hamilton & Crouter, 1980). Earlier studies have linked variations in these attitudes to employment experience and have noted some differences by gender (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). Therefore, attitudinal scores were also explored in this study. This research does not support the validity of adolescent employment experience as a significant contributor to work-related attitudes. Rather, this study underscores the

variation in such attitudes by gender and confirms the findings of Herzog (1982) that women are more interested in such occupational values as self-actualization, non-material gratification, altruism, and interpersonal relationships, and men place more emphasis on status, income, power, and potential for advancement. Similarly, Steinberg et al. (1981) found adolescent males more interested in making money, having authority, and job security, while females placed more emphasis on a pleasant work environment and the value of helping others.

In this study as well, females placed more emphasis on ethics in the workplace, social acceptance of a variety of co-workers, and the intrinsic rewards of work, with males stressing the extrinsic rewards of work. It could be that, if females are still being socialized toward a perspective of their work as supplementary, not central, that this allows them the luxury of emphasizing more intangible rewards. Perhaps the male, still driven by the notion of being a good provider for his family, still measuring his worth by occupational achievements, is convinced of the importance of "success at any cost," even if that means some flexibility in ethical behavior. Likewise, the male adolescent recognizes that rewards such as high pay and personal advancement are a more important yardstick of success than are intrinsic rewards. In addition, a competitive attitude may preclude an

easy acceptance of those of other backgrounds.

In addition, if females continue to be socialized as caretakers and nurturers, this might be reflected in their higher scores on social acceptance. It is even possible that the feminist movement has raised the consciousness of these female adolescents to their status as "a minority," creating some sense of identification with others of differing backgrounds.

It is particularly intriguing that these adolescent females scored higher on self-reliance and responsibility than did the males. Perhaps these results and the high scores on self-reliance and responsibility are reflecting earlier maturation rates among females than males. Perhaps, as gender theory postulates, socialization toward a nurturing, caretaking role introduces a high degree of responsibility at an early age. For example, babysitting, generally experienced more by females, may offer extremely low pay, but requires great maturity and responsibility, since human life is involved. On the other hand, yardwork, more typically performed by boys, is far less demanding, in the sense that mistakes are more easily tolerated. It could also be that the frequently expressed view that "boys will be boys" and its accompanying tolerance of, indeed expectation for, male mischievousness discourages early development of personal responsibility in males. It is important to

recognize, however, that the benefits of responsible attitudes are multiple. To cite one example, these young women report higher academic achievement than do the males and are more likely to give as a reason for not working "to save time for studying."

Of equal interest is the higher level of self-reliance among the females. Paradoxically, it could be that both training in nurturance and the more recent emergence of feminism have contributed to independence in these young women. The rewards of parenting and homemaking, for example, are intrinsic in nature; preparation for these roles may require the development of self-reliance and self-direction. It is also important to note that these adolescent females reported proportionately higher grades and experienced somewhat less uncertainty about career plans than did the boys. Perhaps these results are reflecting earlier maturation among adolescent females than males. Again, perhaps the feminist movement has sensitized young women in the late twentieth century to their need for self-determination and independence. The questions forming the self-reliance scale measure a quality of regarding the self, rather than a group, luck, or outside forces as being the primary determinant of one's success. Perhaps the "good provider role" forces males into a competitive position that makes them more reactive to the opinions of the group and

more aware of outside circumstances and one's life.

This study provides no support for beneficial contributions of employment experience in the development of positive work-related attitudes, nor does it strongly concur with the negative influence found on some such attitudes in earlier studies (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1981 and 1987; Steinberg & Greenberger, 1980). According to occupational deviance theory, increasing adolescent employment leads to less desirable attitudes toward work; however, in this study, there was no significant relationship found between weekly hours of employment and work attitudes. As Greenberger observed in 1983, teenagers can realize the benefits of employment without increasing their hours of employment. Likewise, for the most part, there were not significant relationships between work and the attitudinal scales. In the two exceptions, however, employment did have a negative relationship to the intrinsic rewards of work and to social acceptance of those from different backgrounds. Perhaps teenagers not working for pay are better able to recognize the intangible rewards for a job well done, such as school or volunteer accomplishments; whereas, those locked into a paycheck have their eyes fixed on extrinsic rewards.

These results may reflect several factors. First, much adolescent employment is menial and unrelated to either academic achievement or future occupational plans. Hamilton

and Stewart (1980) emphasized that effective work environments should provide opportunities for cooperation and decision-making, should require the use of high-level skills, and should be related to future career goals. Second, the premature affluence cited by Bachman (1983), in which teenage salaries are largely used for discretionary expenditures, may discourage intrinsic motivations for work and underscore materialism. Finally, perhaps as Behn, et al. (1974) and Kohn (1978) conclude, socialization is largely determined by socio-economic factors; perhaps these attitudes are in place before the adolescent begins working. In 1981, Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, and Ruggiero concluded that "early work experience has virtually no effects on the young person's work attitudes, values, habits, and plans" (p. 407). This research substantiates that observation.

Recommendations

This study is part of a larger study on adolescent employment. With the existing questionnaire, much more can be done to explore this topic of gender-related differences in employment experiences and occupational socialization. For example, more extensive examination of differences within categories is essential. What similarities exist for boys and girls holding similar jobs at the present time, or those with similar occupational aspirations, or those having the same GPA's? Given the acknowledged multi-dimensional nature

of the adolescent workplace, careful study should be done of variations between jobs. What differences exist within each gender, and which variables seem to be linked to these differences? Further exploration needs to be made regarding the differential impact of employment on school achievement and involvement, since there are indications in this data that academic achievement among boys may be more adversely affected by employment than among girls.

Other available indices of socialization should be examined. For example, information on spending patterns and money issues has not been examined. These variables might provide more insight to socialization toward being a central provider or a supplementary contributor to family income in the future.

Likewise, there are additional questions about deviant behaviors practiced by the employee, their current job characteristics, and desirable work environments. These would enrich our understanding of the work-related philosophies and practices of these young people.

Researchers should explore what adolescents are learning in the work experience. What benefits and problems do the teens perceive from their work experience? There seems to be a need for more a more extensive scale to measure work-related attitudes, that might include additional factors, such as punctuality, independent thinking, respect

for authority figures, and other areas. A survey of employers regarding desirable employee characteristics, habits and attitudes might lead to a more complete scale on attitudes beneficial in occupational socialization.

This study is limited by the self-report nature of the questionnaire. For example, the crucial aspect of parental feelings about adolescent employment is drawn from the teens' perception of their parents' reactions. To conduct interviews with both the adolescents and their parents would greatly enhance our ability to understand the lifelong socialization process. How were boys and girls first introduced to the world of work in early childhood? What were their household responsibilities? What are the parents' hopes and dreams for their children? How do the adolescents expect to blend future occupational and family responsibilities? How have the occupations of the parents impacted on the plans of the adolescents? How if family income controlled and distributed, considering the earnings of the adolescent?

Furthermore, in the process of collecting the data used in this study, the researchers encountered a number of teachers and school staff members eager to comment on aspects of the study. Interviews with educators would provide further information about the relationship of high school employment to the academic environment. Some aspects of this

impact of high school work may be subtle. Are teachers reducing their expectations of students, because of the adolescents' outside work responsibilities; or are more teens working because the school is not demanding enough of them? Is the expansion of teen employment contributing to the continuing decline in national high school achievement scores?

This field of research has profound implications for policy and educational practice. Given the strong support for adolescent employment, what can be done to make such employment truly beneficial? Behn et al. (1974) asserted that work is "alienating, dehumanizing, and violent to the spirit, as well as the body" (p. 53) and insisted that we should "humanize and democratize the workplace and the institutions which prepare people for work" (pp. 66-67).

Adolescent employment is an area in which we know much more than we have implemented. In 1980 Hamilton and Crouter wrote that "a good (work) experience is one that involves a manageable confrontation with novel responsibility...(and offers) a dramatic departure from the activities, roles, and relationships that make up their daily lives" (p. 335). We know that having an effective mentoring relationship with a supervisor is important, yet few adolescent jobs seem to offer such supervision. As Greenberger and Steinberg (1981) have said, "If the workplace is to become a truly vital context for adolescent socialization, it needs to be designed

more deliberately with such aims in mind" (p. 186).

It seems crucial to more fully integrate and coordinate the academic and vocational experiences, since both could contribute to the full actualization of a productive citizenry. Berryman (1987) pointed out four areas in which the current contrasts between education and the workplace could be integrated: (1) individual versus shared performance; (2) pure mental activity versus the manipulation of tools; (3) symbol-based learning, as opposed to learning more closely tied to events, things, and situations; and (4) generalized learning, as contrasted to situation-specific competencies. These are not either-or areas of growth; rather, a more complete educational experience would integrate these outlooks. Coordination between the school staff employers could include such adaptations as cooperative learning approaches; businessmen lecturing in classrooms; school credits for employment experiences; academic use of business and industrial equipment; internships or other mentoring experiences; communication between school and employer regarding student performances that might result in adjusted work or academic schedules; and classroom units based on real-world situations. Such an approach to education and work would facilitate the preparation of a more flexible, more fully prepared work force.

By the high school years, many adolescent have at least partially discovered their areas of talent, skill, and

interest. Why not carefully construct, as a complementary adjunct to educational experience, employment opportunities that enhance these talents, skills, and interests, with able and interested adult supervision? Hours of employment could be limited to prevent stress; academic expectations could be maintained at appropriate levels; school and work experiences could be integrated.

It seems likely that both adolescent employment and the employment of adult women are here to stay. That being the case, thoughtful consideration should be given to ways in which both parents and teens could be counselled regarding the implications of various socialization practices and decision-making processes. It is essential that females are encouraged in the development of occupational attitudes, skills, and preparation; it is equally vital that males are encouraged in social and emotional development. Both genders need support in exploring a full range of career options and in analyzing the costs and benefits of various career decisions.

It is not likely that there will be a decrease in adolescent employment in the near future. Much remains to be done to encourage gender free, beneficial occupational socialization experiences across the span of childhood and adolescence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alwin, Duane F. (1984). Trends in parental socialization values: Detroit, 1958-1983. American Journal of Sociology, 90, 359-380.
- Alwin, Duane F. (1988). From obedience to authority: Changes in traits desired in children, 1924-1978. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52, 33-52.
- Angrist, Shirley S., Mickelsen, R. & Penna, A. N. (1977). Sex differences in sex-role conceptions and family orientation of high school students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 6, 179-186.
- Archer, S. L. (1985). Career and/or family: the identity process for adolescent girls. Youth & Society, 16, 289-314.
- Bachman, J. G. (1983). Premature affluence: Do high schools students earn too much? Economic Outlook USA, 10, 64-67.
- Bachman, J. G., Bare, D. E., & Frankie, E. I. (1986). Correlates of employment among high school seniors (Monitoring the Future Occasional Paper 20). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 145).
- Bachman, J. G., Johnston, L. D., & O'Malley, P. M. (1987). Monitoring the future: Questionnaire responses from the nation's high school seniors, 1986. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 143)
- Banducci, R. (1967). The effect of mother's employment on the achievement, aspirations, and expectations of the child. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 46, 263-267.
- Behn, W. H., Carnoy, M., Carter, M. A., Crain, J. C., & Levin, H. M. (1974). School is bad; work is worse. School Review, 83, 49-68.
- Bernard, Jessie (1984). The good provider role: its rise and fall. In Patricia Voydanoff (Ed.), Work and Family, 43-60. Palo Alto, California: Maryfield Publishing Company.

- Berryman, Sue. (1987). A commentary. In Ivan Charner & Bryan S. Fraser, Youth & Work. National Institute for Work and Learning.
- Bills, David B. (1983). Social reproduction and the Bowles-Gintis thesis of a correspondence between school and work settings. In A. Kerckhoff (Ed.), Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, 4, (pp. 185-210), JAI Press, Inc.
- Bridges, W. P. (1982). The sexual segregation of occupations: Theories of labor stratification in industry. American Journal of Sociology, 88, 270-295.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: research perspectives. Developmental Psychology, 22, 723-742.
- Burlin, Frances-Dee. (1976). Locus of control and female occupational aspiration. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 126-129.
- Card, J. J., Steel, L., & Abeles, R. P. (1980). Sex differences in realization of individual potential for achievement. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17, 1-21.
- Charner, Ivan, & Fraser, Bryan S. (1987). Youth & Work. National Institute for Work and Learning.
- Crowley, J. E. & Shapiro, D. (1982). Aspirations and expectations of youth in the United States. Youth and Society, 13, 391-422.
- D'Amico, R. (1984). Does employment during high school impair academic progress? Sociology of Education, 57, 152-164.
- Farmer, Helen S. (1983). Career and homemaking plans for high school youth. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 40-45.
- Farmer, H. S. & Bohn, M. J., Jr. (1970). Home-career conflict reduction and the level of career interest in women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 228-232.
- Ferree, Myra M. (1990). Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 866-884.

- Fitzgerald, L. F. & Crites, J. O. (1980). Toward a career psychology of women: What do we know? What do we need to know? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 44-62.
- Gade, E. & Peterson, L. (1980). A comparison of working and nonworking high school students on school performance, socio economic status, and self-esteem. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 29, 65-69.
- Galotti, K. M. & Kozberg, S. F. (1987). Older adolescents' thinking about academic/vocational and interpersonal commitments. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16, 313-318.
- Gordon, R. (1985). Part-time work experience of high school seniors: Education and employment. Research for the practitioner (Research Brief No. 4). Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 254)
- Goslen, Mary Anne (1989). High school employment and work related attitudes of college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 3754-A.
- Gottfredson, Denise C. (1985). Youth employment, crime, and schooling: A longitudinal study of a national sample. Developmental Psychology, 21, 419-432.
- Greenberger, Ellen (1983). A researcher in the policy arena: the case of child labor. American Psychologist, 38, 104-111.
- Greenberger, E.; Josselson, R.; Knerr, C.; & Knerr, B. (1975). The measurement and structure of psychosocial maturity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 127-143.
- Greenberger, Ellen & Steinberg, L. (1981). The workplace as a context for the socialization of youth. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 185-210.
- Greenberger, Ellen & Steinberg, Lawrence D. (1983). Differences in early labor force experience: Harbinger of things to come. Social Forces, 62, 467-486.
- Greenberger, E., & Steinberg, L. (1986). When teenagers work: The psychological and social costs of adolescent employment. New York: Basic Books.
- Greenberger, E., & Steinberg, L. (1987). Teen job holders and the unpaid work of growing up. The Education Digest, 53, 29-31.

- Greenberger, E.; Steinberg, L.; Ruggiero, M. (1982). A job is a job is a job...or is it? Work and Occupations, 9, 79-96.
- Greenberger, E.; Steinberg, L. D.; Vaux, A.; & McAuliffe, S. (1980). Adolescents who work: effects of part-time employment on family and peer relations. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, 189-202.
- Gross, Edward. (1968). Plus ca change...? The sexual structure of occupations over time. Social Problems, 16, 198-208.
- Hamilton, S. F. & Crouter, A. C. (1980). Work and growth: a review of research on the impact of work experience on adolescent development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, 323-338.
- Hamilton, S. F. & Stewart, S. K. (1980). A multi-method approach to research on youth employment programs: A case study of the Youth Conservation Corps. Children and Youth Services Review, 2, 185-208.
- Hay, J. F., & Lindsay, C. A. (1969). The working student--How does he achieve? Journal of College Student Personnel, 10(2), 109-114.
- Herzog, A. R. (1982). High School seniors occupation plans and values: Trends in sex differences 1976 through 1980. Sociology of Education, 55, 1-13.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1975). Four factor index of social status. Department of Sociology, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Hotchkiss, Lawrence. (1986). Work and schools--complements or competitors? In K. Borman & J. Reisman (Eds.), Becoming a Worker, (pp. 90-114). Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.
- King, K., McIntyre, J., & Axelson, L. J. (1968). Adolescents' views of maternal employment as a threat to the marital relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 633-637.
- Kohn, M. L. & Schooler, C. (1978). The reciprocal effects of the substantive complexity of work and intellectual flexibility: A longitudinal assessment. American Journal of Sociology, 84, 24-52.

- Lee, C. C. (1985). An ethnic group-gender comparison of occupational choice among rural adolescents. Journal of Non-White Concerns, , 28-36.
- Lewis, M. V., Gardner, J. A., & Seitz, P. (1983). High school work experience and its effects (Contract No. 300-78-0032). Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 227 310)
- Manning, Wendy. (1990). Parenting employed teenagers. Youth and Society, 22, 184-200.
- Marini, M. M. (1978). Sex differences in the determination of adolescent aspirations: A review of research. Sex Roles, 4, 723-753.
- Marini, M. M. (1989). Sex differences in earnings in the United States. American Review of Sociology, 15, 343-80.
- Marini, M. M. & Greenberger, E. (1978). Sex differences in education, aspirations, and expectations. American Educational Research Journal, 15, 67-79.
- Meyer, K. A. (1987). The work commitment of adolescents: Progressive attachment to the work force. Career Development Quarterly, 36, 140-147.
- Molm, L. D. (1978). Sex role attitudes and the employment of married women: The direction of causality. The Sociological Quarterly, 19, 522-533.
- Morgan, K. C. & Hock, E. (1984). A longitudinal study of psychosocial variables affecting the career patterns of women with young children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 383-390.
- Mortimer, Jeylan T. & Finch, Michael D. (1986). The effects of part-time work on adolescent self-concept and achievement. In K. Borman and J. Reisman (Eds.), Becoming a Worker, (pp. 66-89). Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.
- Mortimer, Jeylan T., Finch, Michael D., Owens, Timothy J. & Shanahan, Michael. (1990). Gender and work in adolescence. Youth and Society, 22, 201-224.

- Mortimer, Jeylan T. & London, J. (1984). The varying linkages of work and family. In Patricia Voydanoff (Ed.), Work and Family, 20-35. Palo Alto, Calif: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- The North Carolina State Government Abstracts. (1984). Urban and rural distribution of the Population of North Carolina Counties (Years 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980). Raleigh, N. C.: Office of State Budget and Management, Research and Planning Services, pp. 15-17 (Table 8).
- Otto, L. B. (1988). America's youth: a changing profile. Family Relations, 37, 385-391.
- Peters, John F. (1987). Youth, family, and employment. Adolescence, 22, 465-473.
- Peterson, G. W.; Rollins, B. C.; Thomas, D. L.; & Heaps, L. K. (1982). Social placement of adolescents: sex-role influences on family decisions regarding the careers of youth. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 647-659.
- Phillips, Sarah & Sandstrom, Kent L. (1990). Parental attitudes toward youth work. Youth & Society, 22, 160-183.
- Pleck, J. H. (1984). The work-family role system. In Patricia Voydanoff (Ed.), Work and Family, 8-19. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- President's Science Advisory Committee, Panel on Youth. (1974). Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ruggiero, M.; Greenberger, E.; & Steinberg, L. D. (1982). Occupational deviance among adolescent workers. Youth and Society, 13, 423-4438.
- Ruggiero, M. & Steinberg, L. D. (1981). The empirical study of teenage work: A behavioral code for the assessment of adolescent job environments. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 19, 163-174.
- Schill, W. J., McCartin, R., & Meyer, K. (1985). Youth employment: Its relationship to academic and family variables. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26, 155-163.

- Schulenberg, J., Goldstein, A. E., & Vondracek, F. W. (1991). Gender differences in adolescents' career interests: Beyond main effects. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1, 37-61.
- Shapiro, David & Crowley, Joan E. (1982). Aspirations and expectations of youth in the United States (Part 2, Employment Activity). Youth and Society, 14, 33-58.
- Sherraden, M. W. (1980). Youth employment and education: Federal programs from the new deal through the 1970's. Children and Youth Services Review, 2, 17-39.
- Shoffner, S.M. (1988). Rural adolescent employment, academic achievement, psychological maturity, and occupational aspirations. North Carolina Agricultural Research Services Project 16076. Raleigh: North Carolina State University, Project Outline.
- Silverberg, S. B. & Steinberg, L. (1990). Psychological well-being of parents with early adolescent children. Developmental Psychology, 26, 658-666.
- Steinberg, L. D. (1982). Jumping off the work experience bandwagon. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11, 183-205.
- Steinberg, L. D. (1987). Recent research on the family at adolescence: the extent and nature of sex differences. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16, 191-197.
- Steinberg, L. D. & Greenberg, E. (1980). The part-time employment of high school students: a research agenda. Children and Youth Services Review, 2, 159-183.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L., & McAuliffe, S. (1982). High school students in the labor force. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4, 363-372.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L., Ruggiero, M., & Vaux, A. (1982). Effects of working on adolescent development. Developmental Psychology, 18, 385-395.
- Steinberg, L. D.; Greenberger, E.; Jacobi, M.; & Garduque, L. (1981). Early work experience: A partial antidote for adolescent egocentrism. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 141-157.

- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Vaux, A., & Ruggiero, M. (1981). Early work experience: Effects on adolescent occupational socialization. Youth and Society, 12, 403-422.
- Sundberg, N. D., Tyler, L. E., & Poole, M. E. (1984). Decade difference in rural adolescents' views of life possibilities. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13, 45-55.
- Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 282-298.
- Thomas, R. Murray. (1987). Comparing Theories of Child Development. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Treiman, D. J. (1985). The work histories of women and men: What we know and what we need to find out. In A. S. Rossi (Ed.), Gender and the Life Course, (pp. 213-231). New York: Academic.
- Voydanoff, Patricia. (1984). Work and Family. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- White, Lynn K. & Brinkerhoff, David B. (1981). The sexual division of labor: Evidence from childhood. Social Forces, 60, 170-181.
- Winters, A. S. & Frankel, J. (1984). Women's work role as perceived by lower status white and black female adolescents. Adolescence, 19, 403-414.
- Wright, J. D. & Wright, S. R. (1976). Social class and parental values for children: A partial replication and extension of the Kohn thesis. American Sociological Review, 4, 527-537.
- Yamoor, Catherine M. & Mortimer, Jeylan T. (1990). Age and gender differences in the effects of employment on adolescent achievement and well-being. Youth and Society, 22, 225-240.
- Young, R. A. (1983). Career development of adolescents: An ecological perspective. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12, 401-416.

APPENDIX A
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

**134-155
157-166**

University Microfilms International

APPENDIX B
INITIAL WORK RELATED ATTITUDE SCALES:
ITEMS AND FACTOR ANALYSES

APPENDIX C
WORK-RELATED ATTITUDES
AND HOURS OF WORK

Table C-1

Analysis of Covariance of Ethics and Work by Hours of Work
Weekly (N=566)

Source	DF	F	P-value
Hours/week	1	.22	.63
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	56.01	<.001
Ethnic group	1	3.16	.08
GPA	1	9.82	.002
Mother's occup.	1	.07	.79
Parent's income	1	.06	.81
Error	565		
R ² = .127			

Table C-2

Analysis of Covariance of Self-reliance by Hours of Work
Weekly (N=543)

Source	DF	F	P-value
Hours/week	1	.14	.71
<u>Covariates</u>			
Sex	1	34.49	<.001
Ethnic group	1	.05	.83
GPA	1	7.65	<.01
Mother's occup.	1	1.1	.29
Parent's income	1	.05	.83
Error	542		
R ² = .09			

Table C-3

Analysis of Covariance of Extrinsic Rewards of Work by Hours
of Work Weekly (N=555)

Source	DF	F	P-value
Hours/week	1	.89	.35
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	21.96	<.001
Ethnic group	1	3.85	.05
GPA	1	3.98	.05
Mother's occup.	1	.90	.34
Parent's income	1	1.34	.25
Error	554		
R ² = .064			

Table C-4

Analysis of Covariance of Responsibility by Hours of Work
Weekly (N=544)

Source	DF	F	P-value
Hours/week	1	.68	.41
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	9.71	.002
Ethnic group	1	.22	.64
GPA	1	5.63	.02
Mother's occup.	1	.13	.72
Parent's income	1	.538	.47
Error	543		
R ² = .037			

Table C-5

Analysis of Covariance of Intrinsic Rewards of Work by Hours
of Work Weekly (N=565)

Source	DF	F	P-value
Hours/week	1	.10	.75
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	13.40	<.001
Ethnic group	1	.080	.78
GPA	1	17.01	<.001
Mother's occup.	1	.21	.65
Parent's income	1	1.11	.29
Error	564		
R ² = .066			

Table C-6

Analysis of Covariance of Social Acceptance By Hours of Work
Weekly (N=564)

Source	DF	F	P-value
Hours/week	1	1.65	.20
<u>Covariates</u>			
Gender	1	40.87	<.001
Ethnic group	1	.54	.46
GPA	1	7.08	.008
Mother's occup.	1	.88	.35
Parent's Income	1	3.98	.05
Error	563		
R ² = .103			

APPENDIX D
SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT
AND GENDER

Table D-1

School Involvement by Gender

School Information	Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%
Grades (GPA)				
A	141	19.9	81	10.8
B+	108	15.3	124	16.6
B	210	29.7	177	23.7
C+	125	17.7	153	20.5
C	98	13.8	152	20.3
D	23	3.2	50	6.7
D	3	.4	10	1.3

Table D-1 (continues)

GPA by hours worked per week

	Do not work		Work 1-19 hours				Work 20 or more hours					
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A	74	19.9	42	13.9	48	24.2	23	10.6	14	11.2	14	6.9
B+	47	12.6	45	14.9	36	18.2	42	19.4	25	20.0	32	15.8
B	112	30.1	76	26.1	54	27.3	54	25.0	40	32.0	43	21.2
C+	69	18.5	60	19.8	29	14.6	44	20.4	25	20.0	44	21.7
C	53	25.8	58	19.1	28	14.1	34	15.7	15	12.0	52	25.6
D	15	4.0	16	5.3	3	1.5	17	7.9	5	4.0	14	6.9
F	2	.5	3	1.0	0	0	2	.9	1	.8	4	2.0

Table D-1 (continues)

Absences and Employment

Do not work hours		Work 1-19 hours				Work 20 or more hours					
Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Almost never											
143	38.4	131	42.4	59	29.9	93	42.6	25	20.0	58	28.6
Few											
116	31.2	116	37.4	71	36.0	75	34.4	46	36.8	58	28.6
1-2/month											
91	24.5	54	17.5	49	24.9	41	18.8	40	32.0	72	35.5
1/week											
14	3.8	5	1.6	13	6.6	4	1.8	10	8.0	11	5.4
Over 1/wk											
8	2.2	3	1.0	5	2.5	5	2.3	4	3.2	4	2.0