DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 753 CE 034 266

AUTHOR Roos, Patricia A.
TITLE Sex Differences in Occupational Attainment: A Twelve-Nation Study.
SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 82
GRANT DD-06-80-003
NOTE 63p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, CA, September 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Educational Background; Employed Women; *Employment Level; *Employment Patterns; Family Characteristics; Foreign Countries; Individual Characteristics; Professional Recognition; *Sex Differences; Sex Discrimination; *Socioeconomic Status; Wages
IDENTIFIERS Prestige

ABSTRACT

Differences in the occupational attainment patterns of men and women were investigated by using data from 12 industrial societies. The sample consisted of employed persons 20 to 64 years of age working full- or part-time in the United States, Australia, Denmark, Finland, West Germany, Great Britain, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Israel, and Japan. Four determinants of occupational attainment were identified: father's occupations, age, marital status, and educational achievement. The dependent variable was the occupation of the respondent measured by the prestige and occupational wage rate scale. Use of the measure of wage rates of men's and women's jobs in regression analysis showed gender differences in the process of occupational allocation. Findings from cross-cultural analyses of occupational attainment showed that educational attainment is consistently the most important predictor of occupational positions for men and women. For men it is only one of several factors, but it is the only identified factor for women. Findings suggested that fundamental restructuring of ways in which work is organized will be required to equalize women's and men's occupational options. (YLB)

Sex Differences in Occupational Attainment: A Twelve-Nation Study*

Patricia A. Roos
SUNY-Stony Brook

July, 1982

*This paper was prepared for the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, September, 1982. The research was funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (Grant #DD-06-80-003). I wish to thank David McFarland, Michael Sobel, Donald Treiman, and Wendy Wolf for their helpful comments on an earlier draft. The data were made available by Donald Treiman and the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), University of Michigan.

Mailing address:

Department of Sociology
SUNY-Stony Brook
Stony Brook, N.Y. 11794

Sex Differences in Occupational Attainment: A Twelve-Nation Study

ABSTRACT

Employing data from 12 industrial societies, I investigate differences in the occupational attainment patterns of men and women. Early status attainment researchers found that men and women in the U.S. are employed in jobs of comparable prestige and, moreover, that the process whereby they are allocated to occupational destinations is also essentially similar. In the present paper I offer one explanation for why previous analyses failed to detect gender differences in occupational attainment. By building on the knowledge that the occupational wage hierarchy is essentially invariant across industrial societies, I use a measure of occupational achievement constructed to reflect differences in the wage rates of men's and women's jobs. Employing this measure in regression analyses, I find evidence that gender differences in the process of occupational allocation and average levels of attainment are masked when prestige is used as a measure of occupational achievement. Cross-cultural analyses of occupational attainment produce several important findings. While educational attainment is consistently the most important predictor of occupational position for both men and women, for men it is generally only one of several factors. In most of the countries, education is the only identified factor affecting women's occupational attainment. Decomposing gender differences in occupational attainment reveals that in some coun-

tries part of the occupational gap is attributable to gender differences in background factors. In most countries, however, sex differences in rates of return to background and individual characteristics remain the major determinant of women's occupational attainment.

Sex Differences in Occupational Attainment: A Twelve-Nation Study

INTRODUCTION

One undisputed characteristic of the American occupational structure is that is is highly segregated by sex (Gross; Oppenheimer, a; Blau and Hendricks). In attempting to account for this sex-segregated occupational distribution, it is useful to consider whether such occupational patterns emerge out of the historical circumstances of this country or whether they derive in part from more general structural features common to all industrial societies. The existence of similarly segregated labor forces in other industrial societies (Gaskin; Roos, a) indicates that historical, cultural, and political traditions unique to the U.S. cannot account for the gender difference in occupational outcomes observed in this country. Instead, fundamental features of the organization of work are probably responsible for men's and women's different occupational outcomes.

As a first step towards better understanding these fundamental features, the present analysis further describes the processes that produce the substantial gender differences in occupational outcomes observed in the U.S. and in other modern industrial societies. I thus apply the comparative perspective to investigate gender differences in the determinants of occupational achievement in 12 industrial societies. Such an investigation will shed additional light on explanations for occupational

segregation by sex than can be gleaned from analyses conducted solely on U.S. data.

Stratification researchers generally investigate sex differences in occupational outcomes in one of two ways. First, research on sex differences in intergenerational occupational mobility investigates the pattern of mobility from social origins to first or current occupation. In this approach, both origin and destination occupational positions are measured by a categorical classification of occupations. Recent applications of this tradition have generally used Goodman's log-linear analysis (e.g., Hauser et al.; Rosenfeld, b; Dunton and Featherman; Roos, a). Second, the structural equation (or status attainment) approach, which I employ in the present analysis, views current occupational position as a function of various ascriptive factors (e.g., father's occupation and education, mother's occupation and education, race, and sex), and achieved factors (e.g., educational attainment, on-the-job experience, and marital status). In these studies, occupation is measured by an interval-level socioeconomic or prestige scale. Unlike traditional mobility analysis, which maps social origin and destination categories, structural equation analyses investigate determinants of occupational mobility.

The aggregate occupational structure we observe is the result of a process of occupational attainment. That is, the occupational outcomes of individual men and women depend on a variety of factors, including (but not limited to) their social origins and educational achievement. Researchers in the structural equa-

tion tradition identify two possible ways that gender differences in occupational outcomes can arise. First, gender differences may reflect differing background characteristics (e.g., different social origins or levels of education). For example, most women workers in the early industrializing economies of the nineteenth century originated from working- or lower-class backgrounds. Middle-class daughters, in contrast, seldom worked outside the home (Smuts). If this were still the case in modern industrial societies (that is, if a woman's decision to work still depended on her social origins), a relatively larger proportion of all women workers would originate from working- or lower-class backgrounds, a factor that would affect women's occupational distribution relative to that of men. Second, the sex segregation of the occupational structure may be attributable not to sex differences in background or individual characteristics, but to gender differences in the process of occupational attainment (or rates of return to background characteristics). If men and women have similar background and individual characteristics, gender differences must exist in the way status (as measured by occupational position) is transferred from one generation to the next.

The earliest status attainment analyses for the U.S. (e.g., Blau and Duncan; Duncan et al.) were restricted to men, as were early comparative studies (e.g., Cummings and Naoi; Muller; Iutaka and Rock; Pontinen; Treiman and Terrell, a). Several U.S. researchers, however, have recently begun to use the approach to investigate gender differences in occupational attainment. In one of the first of these studies, all of which employed status

or prestige to measure occupational position, Treiman and Terrell (b) found that men and women are employed in equally prestigious jobs, even though the occupational structure is highly differentiated by sex and women are concentrated in jobs that pay poorly relative to the educational investment required. In addition, the authors found that the process of occupational attainment is substantially similar for the two sexes and very similar to what Duncan et al. found for men: (1) occupational achievement depends mainly on one's educational attainment and also to a minor degree on one's social origins, and (2) the occupational return to educational investment is approximately the same for males and females (and sometimes even slightly higher for women). Treiman and Terrell (b) also found that while married women are on average employed in jobs of lower prestige than never married women, there are no marital differences in the process of prestige attainment.(1) The authors viewed these findings as evidence that women like men depend essentially on their own achievements rather than social origins for job allocation and, furthermore, that women need not present higher educational qualifications to compete for equally prestigious jobs. McClendon and Featherman and Hauser for the most part replicated the basic findings of Treiman and Terrell using different data.

Several researchers have elaborated the basic status attainment analyses described above, most importantly by including a measure of the respondent's entry-level occupation (Sewell et al.; Marini; Boyd). All three studies, which employed status (or prestige) of first job, found sex differences in the average lev-

el of and process of occupational attainment. While the results of these studies differ from those of previous work, they are not inconsistent. Because previous analyses did not include first job as an intervening factor between social origins and current occupation, marital and gender differences in patterns of occupational attainment, as well as in average status, were effectively masked.(2)

As the above review notes, studies of gender differences in status attainment have generated conflicting findings. Earlier work suggested that the process of occupational attainment is nearly identical for men and women, while more recent work found sharp differences in the process of occupational attainment of men and women when status of first job is added to the analysis.

In the present analysis, I suggest a different explanation for the apparent sex similarity in the process of occupational attainment. Gender similarity in levels (and in the process) of attainment coexists with substantial sex differences in the kinds of occupations in which men and women work because of differences in the way occupation is generally measured in the two analyses. Comparisons of men's and women's occupational distributions use occupational categories (thus allowing a distinction for kind of employment), while status attainment analyses abstract a metric status or prestige dimension.

In an earlier analysis, Roos (b) documented that status and prestige do not contribute to explaining the gender gap in earnings precisely because as measures of occupational attainment they do not reflect differences in the kinds of work men and

women do (see also England; Jacobs, a, b; Boyd). In like manner, in the present analysis I suggest that the finding of gender similarity in the process of occupational attainment derives in part from the way occupation is traditionally measured in status attainment research.(3) A more useful contribution to the occupational attainment literature could be had if occupation variables were employed that more directly reflect existing differences in the kinds of work men and women do.

Taking account of the knowledge that "women's" jobs are less well-paid than "men's" jobs, I created a summary scale based on the occupation's wage rate rather than its prestige or status. Inclusion of the "occupational wage rate scale" (described below) in a model of occupational attainment permits one to address what I see as a more interesting set of questions. For example, are there gender differences in occupational wage rate returns to educational investment, even though no such differences have been found in prestige returns (unless one controls for first job). The present analysis should thus improve upon traditional attainment analyses, which seldom explicitly address the fact that the occupational structure is highly sextyped. In sum, I suggest that employing a measure of occupational attainment that reflects differences in the wage rates of men's and women's jobs should reveal gender differences in the process of occupational attainment. Unfortunately, the lack of "first job" variables precludes a replication of the Sewell et al., Marini, and Boyd work here. Others may wish to apply the proposed analysis on data sets that include first job to determine whether sharper

gender differences in attainment patterns emerge.

It should be noted that, with the exception of Boyd, all of the status attainment literature surveyed in the previous section was done by U.S. researchers on U.S. data. One primary task of the present analysis is to investigate the occupational attainment processes of men and women in other countries to determine whether they are similar to those of men and women in the U.S., and to speculate on why any observed country differences might exist. Because occupational attainment models investigating gender differences have not previously been estimated for most of the countries in the present analysis, I view the descriptive part of my task as particularly important and thus provide the basic data of the analysis more fully than might otherwise be necessary.

DATA AND METHODS

Data

The data used in the present study are a subset of a larger number of sample surveys obtained in conjunction with a comparative study of social mobility and status attainment (Treiman and Kelley, a, b). In the current analysis I selected only industrial societies to minimize the amount of noncomparability that arises from varying definitions and measurements of the "economically active" population across countries, a factor that affects the enumeration of female more so than male workers. The

12 data sets employed are national representative samples of the adult population of each country. Among the countries are societies in North America (the United States); Western Europe (Austria, Denmark, Finland, West Germany, Great Britain, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, and Sweden); and Asia (Israel and Japan). Table 1 provides additional details on the sample characteristics of the included countries.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Because of cross-cultural variability in the age cutoffs used in the samples as well as in the ages at which people generally start work, I restricted the sample to the most economically active portion of the population--employed persons 20 to 64 working full or part time.

Methods

In the present section I provide a brief review of the analytic strategy employed, hypotheses to be tested, and the measurement and justification for included variables.

I identify four determinants of occupational attainment: father's occupation (as the best available measure of occupational origins), age, marital status, and years of school completed. As described in the review, each of these factors has been found to affect an individual's occupational attainment, although there is some controversy as to whether the effects of these factors on occupation vary by gender.

Father's occupation is included in the analysis as a measure of social origins.(4) Although there is no reason to suspect that all women differ in their social origins from all men, one could make the argument that employed women differ in social origins from employed men. This might be the case if the sample of employed women does not represent all employed women in the country. Although Fligstein and Wolf suggest that such a selectivity bias does not exist in the U.S., it is not at all evident that the same would hold true in other societies, especially in those countries where few women work or where there is a large agricultural work force. Previous results using log-linear analysis found small gender differences in social origins in three of these countries (West Germany, Israel, and Northern Ireland), all of which are "early-peak" societies where few women work and those who do tend to drop out of the labor force permanently upon marriage or first birth (Roos, a). In such countries, women who work may be those who must work (e.g., never married women, female heads of household, women married to men in low-paying occupations). If this were true, one might expect a relatively larger proportion of employed women to originate from lower- and working-class backgrounds. Alternatively, it may be that women who work in societies where most women remain at home are those who stand to lose the most by not working (e.g., highly-educated women might incur an opportunity cost if they do not work). In this case, one might expect a relatively larger proportion of employed women to originate from professional and other white-collar backgrounds. One would not have the same expectations

about the male labor force, since men have traditionally been responsible for ensuring their family's financial security, regardless of their socioeconomic background. As described above, previous analyses based on U.S. data (and using prestige) found no gender differences in returns to social origins (Treiman and Terrell, b). In the present analysis, I replicate earlier prestige models for the U.S., and, in addition, estimate occupation models using the occupational wage rate scale for the U.S. and the remaining countries. The wage rate variable allows a determination of whether social origins differentially affect men's and women's access to high-paying jobs, even if they do not produce differing levels of achieved prestige.

I also identify age, measured in years, as a determinant of occupational status. Age is a particularly important variable to include in an analysis of occupational attainment since there are no experience variables in the present data sets, and women's lack of continuous labor force attachment due to marital responsibilities is considered to be an important explanation of gender differences in occupational attainment and earnings (Mincer and Polachek). Although one would assume that increasing age would result in incumbency in jobs of higher prestige and average earnings, previous research has suggested that while the occupational status of men does increase with age (due presumably to their increasing levels of experience), the occupational status of employed women remains constant over their lifetime (due presumably to their discontinuous labor force attachment) (Wolf; Wolf and Rosenfeld).

More recent research by Rosenfeld (a) suggests a different explanation for sex differences in occupational returns to age than that provided by Mincer and Polachek. Rosenfeld found that continuously-employed women do experience some status gains with age, although these gains are smaller than those men receive. Interestingly, women's status gains are not rewarded by a similar gain in earnings. Both these results and those of Marini suggest that the lack of a wage increase for women over their lifetime cannot be due solely to their intermittent labor force attachment.

Because the relationship between age and occupational attainment may be curvilinear, that is, workers may move into relatively lower- paying employment as they near retirement, I include an age-squared term (after subtracting the mean of age from age to avoid problems of multicollinearity).

Marital status is the third factor I identify as a determinant of occupational achievement. Human capital theory predicts that never married women should have an occupational advantage over married women because the latter's family responsibilities should keep them from competing on an equal footing with their male (and never married female) counterparts in the work force (e.g. Mincer and Polachek; Polachek). If this theory is correct, married women should more often be employed in jobs that are compatible with childcare and home obligations, responsibilities with which most men and single women need not contend. In the present analysis, I make the distinction between ever married women (assigned a value of 0) and never married women (assigned a

value of 1) because of the greater likelihood that previously married women, like currently married women, have childcare and other home responsibilities left over from their marriage that may affect their occupational choice and subsequent achievement.

For men, being married is likely to be to their advantage occupationally since the responsibility for time-consuming home chores and childcare generally falls upon the wife, regardless of whether or not she works outside the home (Szalai; Walker and Woods). Men should thus be relatively more free to invest in lengthy training, both prior to employment and on the job, which enhance their job prospects. Because of their traditional responsibility to ensure for the financial security of their family, married men in some sense have no choice but to maximize their income-producing activities.

The final determinant of occupational status is <u>educational achievement</u>, measured by years of school completed. It may be that sex differences in occupational outcomes are attributable to differences in achieved education, although previous work (e.g., Treiman and Terrell, b) showing that men and women complete nearly the same amount of schooling suggests that this is not the case, at least in the U.S. The work reviewed above also suggests that men and women receive similar prestige returns to their educational investments. Following the implication of Oppenheimer's (b) and Treiman and Terrell's (c) finding that jobs held by women are underpaid relative to the average educational achievement of their incumbents, it may be that (even though gender differences in prestige returns to education may not exist) educational in-

vestment does allow men easier access than women to high-paying jobs. Use of the occupational wage rate scale as the dependent variable permits an assessment of whether the data from the U.S., as well as other industrial societies, support this supposition.

The dependent variable is occupation of respondent, which is measured both by prestige (to replicate previous U.S. work) and by the occupational wage rate scale. The metric prestige scale used is the Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale (Treiman), a scale validated for use in cross-cultural comparisons and widely used in comparative research. In order to have a summary measure of men's and women's occupational attainment for convenient application in a multivariate framework, I also used an occupational wage rate scale. This variable was constructed to measure the extent to which women are concentrated in low-wage employment, relative to the occupations in which men are employed, and to study the determinants of such concentration. To create this scale, I relied on the knowledge, derived from previous research, that there is a striking consistency across countries in the income hierarchy of occupations. Using data from 11 countries, Treiman (Table 5.2) found a substantial degree of similarity in the relative wage rates of occupations. Roos provided similar evidence of a standard earnings hierarchy across industrial societies: the average intercountry correlation in occupational earnings levels for 10 countries was .90 (calculated from Roos, a:Table 3.5).

The raw data on which the occupational wage rate scale was based were the average earnings of men within each of the 14

categories of the Standard International Occupational Classification (Treiman), in the 10 countries for which earnings data were available. These average occupational earnings were then converted to a common metric, averaged across the countries, and converted to a 0 to 100 point scale. The resulting metric scale represents a cross-cultural standard earnings hierarchy of occupations, with 0 assigned to the occupation with the lowest average male earnings (low-prestige agricultural occupations) and 100 to the occupational group with the highest average male earnings (administrative and managerial occupations).

The basic strategy of the analysis is as follows: First, I describe the distribution of variables by sex for each country. Second, I estimate two models of occupational attainment separately for men and women within each country. One, replicating past work, employs prestige to measure occupation, while the second employs the occupational wage rate scale. In my discussion, I first compare the present U.S. prestige results with those from previous work and then with the findings of the occupational wage rate regressions. Using only the wage rate results, I then investigate the extent to which the findings from other countries approximate the U.S. pattern. Third, I use the regression results to decompose the male-female gap in occupational attainment into its component parts.

SEX DIFFERENCES IN OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Distribution of Variables by Sex

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the variables included in the occupation models (the correlations among included

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

variables are provided in Roos, a:Appendix 5.1). I begin my discussion by referring to the results for the United States. The means of the independent and dependent variables look much like those found in previous research. Men and women come from essentially similar social origins, regardless of which occupation scale is used. Furthermore, employed men and women are approximately the same age; are equally likely to have never married; have on average the same education (although women have a more restricted range of variation); and work in jobs of equal prestige. The only significant difference between men and women in the U.S. is that women work on average in lower-paying (although equally prestigious) jobs than their male counterparts, as evidenced by the 3.4 point male advantage on the occupational wage rate scale. In addition, the occupations in which women work have on average a more restricted range of variation than the jobs in which men are employed. Since the sexes have similar average values on the identified determinants of occupational attainment, the difference in occupational distribution reflected

in the occupational wage rate scale cannot be attributed to these variables (for example, to a lower female educational achievement or to a lower average age). These findings thus suggest that the explanation for the wage rate differential lies in differences in return to background factors and investments experienced by men and women, a topic to be investigated in a subsequent section.

Comparing the U.S. results with the findings for the remaining countries suggests that the U.S. pattern should not be taken as representative. Gender differences do exist and in some countries they are quite substantial. I describe cross-cultural differences on a variable by variable basis. In highlighting gender differentials, I refer only to those differences that are significant at the .05 level.

Social origins. Although the differences tend to be small, men and women in three of the 12 countries (Israel, Japan, and Sweden) differ significantly in social origins when the prestige scale for father's occupation is used. When the occupational wage rate scale is employed, the gender differential widens and two additional countries (Finland and Northern Ireland) exhibit gender differences in social origins.

In Japan, men come from somewhat higher-status social origins than women, while in the remaining countries the significant gender difference favors women. The anomalous Japanese result is probably due to the fact that employed Japanese women are more likely than Japanese men to originate from low-wage agricultural origins (56 percent of the employed Japanese women compared with 48 percent of the Japanese men come from agricultural

backgrounds; calculated from Roos, a:Appendix 4.2).

The results for Finland, Israel, Northern Ireland, and Sweden represent the more general finding that employed women come from slightly higher-status social origins than men, a finding that duplicates what Boyd found for Canadian workers. The sex difference in the wage rate scale ranges from 3.1 points in Finland to 5.9 points in Sweden. The finding that social origin differences more often favor women than men suggests that those women in a better competitive position in the labor market (in this case, those deriving from higher-status social origins) are more likely to be employed than women in a less competitive position. This finding is in direct contrast to what was true in the industrializing societies of nineteenth century Europe and the U.S., when the female labor force was composed almost entirely of daughters of lower- and working-class families (Smuts).

Notably, in the four countries where social origin differences favor women, larger proportions of the male labor force than of the female labor force originate from farm backgrounds. This finding does not hold true in those countries with no significant gender differences in social origins, nor is it true in Japan, where the gender difference favors men (see Roos, a:Appendix 4.2). One can speculate from these results that women from farm origins (who tend to remain in agricultural occupations themselves) are less likely to be enumerated as employed in these countries, probably because they are family farm workers.

Age. In five of the 12 countries (Denmark, Germany, Israel, the Netherlands, and Sweden), employed men and women differ sig-

nificantly in age, and in each case employed men are somewhat older than employed women. Particularly large age differences occur in Israel and the Netherlands where men are on average 4.6 and 6.6 years older than their female counterparts, respectively. These two countries are characterized by an early peak pattern of female labor force participation, suggesting that women work only until marriage or childbirth before retiring permanently from the labor force. Because most women in these two countries drop out of the labor force upon marriage or childbearing, it is not surprising that the female labor force is on average so much younger than the male work force. In over half of the countries, however, employed men and women are quite similar in age.

Marital status. According to human capital theory, because women traditionally have primary responsibility for childbearing and rearing, the employed female labor force should include proportionately greater numbers of never married women (who generally have no childcare responsibilities) than the male labor force. Surprisingly, in most of the countries, employed men and women are equally likely to have never married. In five countries (Finland, Germany, Israel, Netherlands, and Northern Ireland), the proportion never married does differ significantly by gender and in all but one (Finland) the prediction is in the expected direction--employed women are more likely to be never married than employed men. Not surprisingly, in each of these four countries, the female labor force is characterized by an early peak pattern of participation. In Germany, Israel, Netherlands, and Northern Ireland, 22, 27, 41, and 36 percent, respectively of

the female labor force has never married. The comparable figure for the U.S. is a much lower 14 percent. In Finland (the only other country exhibiting a significant marital difference), approximately seven percent more employed males than females are single. This anomalous finding is probably a reflection of the Finnish women's more continuous labor force attachment. Finland is the country where the amount and pattern of women's labor force participation most closely approximates that of men. In a country where a working wife is the norm rather than the exception, marriage and childcare responsibilities are less likely to be a deterrent to labor force participation.

Educational attainment. The education results are mixed. In half the countries (Denmark, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United States), men and women complete a nearly equivalent amount of schooling. In the remaining half of the countries, males and females differ significantly in their achieved education. Interestingly, significant sex differences are not always in the same direction. In Austria, Germany, and Japan, men complete .8, .8, and 1.0 years more schooling than women, respectively, while in Finland Israel, and Northern Ireland, women are significantly more educated than men, by .5, 1.2, and .4 years, respectively. The findings of higher female educational achievement may be due in part to the fact that in the three countries exhibiting this finding, employed women also come from slightly higher social origins than employed men. In the three countries where males achieve the higher education, women come from social origins similar to those of men or, in the

case of Japan, from significantly lower origins than men.

Respondent's occupation. In half the countries (Denmark, Finland, Great Britain, Northern Ireland, Sweden, and the U.S.), there are no differences in the average prestige of men's and women's jobs. In the other half (Austria, Germany, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, and Norway), men's and women's average prestige differs significantly, ranging from a gender difference of 2.3 prestige points in Israel to 5.6 points in Japan. Notably, where significant differences in average prestige exist, in each country except Israel the prestige advantage favors men. When the occupational wage rate variable is employed, the results are similar, with two exceptions: (1) a sex difference in prestige, but not in the wage rate scale, exists in Norway, and (2) a sex difference in occupational attainment emerges in the U.S. only when the wage rate scale is employed. Employing the occupational wage rate scale generally widens the observed sex difference in occupational attainment. Only in Israel are women employed in significantly higher-paying (and higher-prestige) occupations than men. This does not mean that women in Israel earn more than their male counterparts in the work force, but only that they are employed on average in higher-paying jobs than men (more specifically, given the construction of the wage rate scale, in jobs that pay men higher salaries). The higher-prestige and monetary advantage of women's employment in Israel may be due either to their higher-status social origins or to their significantly higher educational attainment (or to some combination of these factors), possibilities I investige in a subsequent

section.

Sex Differences in Attainment: Results from the U.S.

Table 3 presents the coefficients for the prestige and wage rate models, separately for men and women in the U.S. The prestige results are

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

substantially similar to those found previously for men and women in the U.S. The process of prestige attainment is nearly identical for men and women: educational investment is the most important determinant of occupational prestige for both sexes, and the prestige return to each year of schooling is also very similar, with women receiving a slightly higher return (2.6 points) than men (2.4 points). Father's occupation is also a significant, but less powerful, predictor of occupational attainment for both sexes, in the expected positive direction. The occupational return to father's prestige is the same for both sexes. Small gender differences in returns to other determinants of occupational attainment occur and all are in the predicted directions. Males return almost twice the prestige to age that women do, a finding that reflects both sex differences in the total amount of time spent working and in returns to experience. The [albeit quite small] significant effect of age on the prestige of women is worth noting, however, in light of previous findings (Wolf; Wolf and Rosenfeld) suggesting that women's occupational status re-

mains constant over their lifetime (although see Rosenfeld, a). Additionally, the significant coefficient for the age-squared variable for men (although not for women) suggests that as they near retirement, their rate of occupational return to age begins to decrease. Finally, the coefficients for marital status show that while as predicted married men have a 2.3 point prestige advantage over never married men, married women are not disadvantaged relative to never married women (contrary to human capital theory). In sum, the prestige results for the U.S. presented in Tables 2 and 3 replicate the findings of Treiman and Terrell (b), McClendon, and Featherman and Hauser.

In comparing the wage rate and prestige results for the U.S. the overall picture is similar in kind although not in degree: both men's and women's occupational outcomes depend primarily on their own educational achievement, but also to a minor extent on several other factors. Social origins, age, and education all have expected positive effects on occupational attainment for both sexes, and being married positively affects men's (but not women's) attainment. On the other hand, several gender differences in rates of return emerge (or increase) when the wage rate scale is employed. First, men and women in the U.S. receive similar net prestige returns to social origins but quite different occupational wage rate returns. With respect to the wage rate of their occupational destinations, men receive over twice the return to social origins that women do. Thus, although men and women in the U.S. come from similar origins (as Table 2 indicates), men are able to translate their origin advantages

into higher-paying occupations more readily than women. Second, women receive 52 percent of the occupation return to age that men do when prestige is employed, and a slightly lower 48 percent when the wage rate scale is used. This result indicates that if increasing age does little for women's occupational prestige relative to men's, it does even less for their occupational wage rate. Third, gender differences in the effect of marital status also widen. Married men have significantly higher-paying jobs than never married men, but the human capital expectation that ever and never married women will differ does not emerge. Fourth, the gender gap in the rate of return to educational investment widens when the wage rate scale is used (the female return to education is 111 percent of the male return in the prestige model and 89 percent in the wage rate model).

In sum, taking account of the fact that men and women tend to work in jobs with different wage rates revealed differences in the process of occupational attainment of U.S. men and women that prestige models failed to detect. Although men and women in the U.S. attain prestige in similar ways, the process whereby they are allocated to positions in the male occupational wage hierarchy differs by gender, with men accruing greater returns than women to each occupational determinant identified.

Because the wage rate scale makes distinctions on the basis of only 14 major group categories, and since it is based on male earnings within these occupational groups, the results of this exercise should be viewed as a conservative estimate of gender differences in the process of occupational attainment. It is

well known that in addition to gender segregation at the major group level, men and women work in different detailed occupations, and within occupations, in different jobs. Additionally, males and females are segregated within occupations by industries and firms.(5) Taking account of occupational differentiation at these more detailed levels may reveal even greater differences in the occupational attainment processes of men and women.

Cross-Cultural Results

Table 4 presents the coefficients for the occupational wage rate model, separately for currently employed men and women, in each of the 12

Insert Table 4 about here.

countries. Cross-cultural differences are described on a variable by variable basis, and only for the models estimated on the basis of the occupational wage rate variable (the comparable prestige models are provided in Appendix 1 for the interested reader).

Social origins. For men, social origins have a small but significant effect on occupational destination in each country except Sweden (where education and marital status prove to be the only significant predictors). In each country the effect is positive; that is, sons with fathers who worked in high-paying jobs are more likely themselves to be employed in high-paying oc-

cupations relative to sons with fathers in low-paying jobs. For women, social origins have a significant positive effect only in Austria, Japan, and the U.S. In most of the countries, women's occupational attainment depends almost solely on their educational investments. Even in Austria and the U.S., where social origins are a significant positive predictor for females, the female occupational return is 41 and 45 percent of the male return, respectively. In Japan, the male return is 78 percent of the female return. Thus, with the exception of Japan, social origins benefit men more so than women: either father's occupation has no significant effect on daughter's attainment or the benefit accruing to women is substantially less than that men receive.

Age. Age is positively associated with the occupational attainment of men in ten of the 12 countries, although only significantly so in six (Finland, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the U.S.). For women, age has a significant effect only in Finland and the U.S., in both cases in the expected positive direction. Thus, increasing age is more likely associated with incumbency in jobs of higher average income for men than for women. Interestingly, the only countries in which age has a significant positive effect for women are Finland, where the female age pattern of participation comes closest to approaching that of men, and the U.S., which has historically been headed in the same direction (see Roos, a and Oppenheimer, a). If age were to have a significant effect on the attainment of women in any country, it would be in one such as Finland where women have relatively continuous labor force participation. While in Finland the fe-

male return is 90 percent of the male return, in the U.S. women receive only 48 percent of the male occupational return for each yearly increment in age. Finally, the age-square coefficient is significant for men in Great Britain, Israel, and the U.S., and for women only in Israel, indicating a decreasing rate of occupational return to age as they near retirement.

Marital status. Married men in each country have an occupational advantage over never married men, net of social origins, age, and education, although this advantage is significant only in Norway, Sweden, and the U.S. The marital status results for women are mixed: the coefficient is significant in only two countries (Japan and Israel) and, moreover, in seven of the 12 countries the sign is opposite that predicted by human capital theorists. Only in Japan is a significant positive coefficient obtained, indicating that never married women have the expected occupational advantage over married women. In Israel, married women have the advantage over never married women, even net of differences in social origins, age, and education. Thus, indications are that ever married and never married women do not differ significantly in most countries, at least with respect to the wage rate of the jobs in which they work.

Because no interaction terms with other independent variables are included in the attainment equations, the analyses reported here do not test for marital differences in the process of occupational attainment, but only for differences in the average occupational wage rate.

Educational attainment. For both men and women, education

is consistently the most important predictor of occupational attainment. In each country, the relationship between education and occupational wage rate is always significant, and increasing education is always associated with incumbency in jobs of higher earnings, for both sexes. For men, however, education is generally only one of several determinants of occupational attainment: social origins, age, and occasionally marital status also play a positive role in many of the countries in enhancing men's occupational outcomes. In contrast, education is the only independent variable with significant effects on women's occupational attainment in seven of the 12 included countries. These data thus suggest that while educational attainment might be the most important factor affecting men's occupational outcomes, for women, it is very often the only factor among those I have measured. Women's social origins contribute to their occupational allocation in only three countries (Austria, Japan, and the U.S.); in two countries (Finland and the U.S.), women improve their occupational position with age; and in Israel and Japan, marriage affects women's occupational achievement, in the former positively and in the latter negatively. Finally, the occupational return to education is not always greater for men than for women. In six countries (Austria, Denmark, Germany, Japan, Sweden, and the U.S.), the female return is somewhat less than the male return, averaging 88 percent that of men. As Table 2 shows, in each of these countries, males also complete slightly more years of school than women, although the difference is significant in only three (Austria, Germany, and Japan). In the remaining six coun-

tries (Finland, Great Britain, Israel, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, and Norway), the female return is either identical to or greater than the male return. These latter six countries are also the ones in which women have similar (nonsignificant differences) or greater achieved education than men. These results may indicate, as Sewell et al. speculated, that women continue to rely on formal educational qualifications for occupational placement throughout their life (hence their receiving a greater occupational return to education than men in some countries), while men advance in their careers by building upon their personal characteristics (e.g., age and social origins) and previous occupational experience.(6)

The Male-Female Gap in Occupational Attainment

To this point, I have compared the occupational attainment processes of men and women, identifying various factors as determinants of their occupational position. Such analyses can inform us as to whether hypothesized variables are important in explaining variation in attainment among women or among men, but they give no estimate of the extent to which gender differences in achieved occupation reflect gender differences in distribution on these variables. Since my discussion regarding Table 2 highlighting the existence of several gender differences (in both determinants and achieved occupation) for some of the included countries, a decomposition of the male-female occupational wage rate is in order. In the present case, Table 2 indicates that sufficiently large gender differences in occupational attainment

exist in six countries, as indicated by a significant gender difference on the wage rate variable, to warrant decomposition. In Austria, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, and the U.S., men are employed in significantly higher-paying jobs than women. In one country (Israel), women are on average employed in the higher-paying employment. In the present section, I investigate to what extent these gaps in occupational attainment can be attributed to the various identified determinants.

The extent to which the gender gap in achieved occupation reflects hypothesized factors may be assessed by the application of a regression standardization procedure (Duncan). In applying this technique, the generally higher male (or in the case of Israel, female) means on the factors included as occupational determinants were substituted into female (male) regression equations of occupation on the sequentially-ordered set of independent variables.(7) The technique, when used with the wage rate scale, provides an estimate of how much of women's relatively greater concentration in low-paying employment (i.e., in jobs that pay even men poorly), can be attributed to compositional differences on identified occupational determinants, and how much to gender differences in rates of return to compositional characteristics. In applying the technique, one is estimating how much of the gender gap in achieved occupation could be accounted for if women (or in the case of Israel, men) had the same social origins, average age, marital status, and educational achievement as men (women), but continued to receive the same occupational returns to investments as they always have.

Table 5 presents the results of the decomposition. In Panel A, the

Insert Table 5 about here

results are expressed as the "female occupational wage rate as a percentage of the male;" while in Panel B, the comparable findings are expressed as the "male occupational wage rate as a percentage of the female." In each case, the group with the greater wage rate is assumed to be 100 percent. Although my primary interest is in explaining the gender difference in occupational attainment in those countries where significant differences exist (i.e., Austria, Germany, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, and the U.S.), I include a decomposition of differences in the mean occupational wage rate for all 12 countries, since an observed non-difference could be masking offsetting effects.

The results in Panel A suggest that gender differences in educational attainment are an important explanation for women's lower average wage rate in Austria, Germany, and Japan. In these countries, sex differences in education increase women's wage rate, relative to men's, by 12, 7, and 6 percent, respectively. The observed difference is due both to the significantly higher male educational achievement and also to the smaller return to educational investment women receive. In the Netherlands, women's relative wage rate can be increased by two percent when educational differences are taken into account, a finding due more to the use of the female equation to decompose mean differences than to gender differences in composition on this variable:

the difference in male and female achieved education in the Netherlands is only a nonsignificant .1 year, and the occupational return to education for females is larger than it is for males. The combination of these two factors produce the observed two percent increase in women's relative wage rate. Finally, in the U.S., the nonsignificant gender difference in education (.1 year) and the greater male return for educational investment account for a modest 1.7 percent of the increase in the female wage rate. Of those countries with a significant gender difference in wage rate, only in Japan does any other occupational determinant besides education account for an appreciable part of the gender gap. The fact that Japanese men come from significantly higher-status social origins increases the female relative wage rate by three percent. Sex differences in social origins and education together account for nine percent of the increase in the relative wage rate of Japanese women.

There are four countries included in Panel A (Denmark, Great Britain, Norway, and Sweden) that do not show a significant gender difference in occupational wage attainment. Of these four, Denmark and Great Britain show only minimal change when the female wage rate is adjusted to take account of distributional differences in determinants of occupational attainment. In the case of the Norway gender difference in wage rate (which barely lacks significance), the greater female return to educational investment and the slightly higher male average education combine to produce a 10.7 percent increase in the relative female wage rate. The lack of a gender difference in the wage rate scale in

Sweden may be due to offsetting social origin and education effects--substituting men's lower social origins into the female equation decreases the female relative wage rate while substituting men's slightly higher education increases it.

Referring to column 8 of Panel A, women in Germany come closest to approximating men in their achieved occupational level. Once gender differences in educational attainment are taken into account, the occupational difference between men and women all but disappears (the residual is only 1.2 percent). This finding is all the more remarkable when one considers that the German sample excluded the lowest-earning, and overwhelmingly male, guest worker population, estimated in 1972 to comprise 11 percent of the German labor force (German Federal Institute for Population Research). The German result of near gender equality, however, must be viewed in the context of the relatively small number of employed German women. As indicated by their early peak age pattern of participation, those who work tend to be younger women who then drop out of the labor force permanently upon marriage or childbirth. Additionally, approximately half of the German women who work do so only on a part-time basis (Roos, a:Tables 3.1 and 3.2).

In the four remaining countries in Panel A that have a significant gender difference in occupation, large portions of the gender gap in occupational attainment are left unaccounted for by compositional differences and thus can be attributed for the most part to differences in rates of return to occupational determinants. In the U.S. case, compositional differences ac-

count for only a negligible part of the gender differential, leaving a seven percent residual. Hence, nearly the entire male-female gap can be attributed to gender differences in rates of return (e.g., women receive less of an occupational return than men for their social origins, age, and educational investment). In the Netherlands and Japan, the portions attributable to differences in rates of return are especially large, with unexplained residuals of approximately 14 percent in each country.

In Panel B, I present a breakdown of the gap between women and men in those countries where the average occupational wage rate of women is higher than that of men. I concentrate on Israel since only in that country is the wage rate significantly different. The largest portion of the Israeli gender gap is evidently attributable to differences in educational achievement--when the higher female achieved education is taken into account, men's wage rate relative to women's increases by 5.3 percent, net of father's occupation, age, and marital status. Three percent is attributable to women's higher-status social origins. When compositional differences between the sexes are taken into account, men's wage rate is 98.4 percent that of women, leaving only 1.6 percent to be attributed to differences in rates of return. The Israeli results suggest that if women have a slight occupational advantage over men (in the sense of being more likely than men on average to be in jobs that pay men well), it is because they come from slightly higher-status backgrounds and are somewhat better educated, and not because of large differences in

the rates of return that favor women over men (as is the case for men in several other countries).

Recent work by Kraus and Treiman suggested a possible explanation for the seemingly anomalous Israeli findings--choosing only employed women for inclusion in the sample may have introduced a selectivity bias that is affecting the attainment results. The immigrant nature of the population, and the division of the Jewish population into the more Westernized and advantaged European and American-origin Jews and the less advantaged Asian and African-origin Jews, makes the potential effect of such a selectivity bias particularly troublesome (see Matras and Weintraub for additional information on the importance of ethnic origins on attainment patterns in Israel).

Few women in Israel work--only 30 percent of Israeli women 18 years and older (and 37 percent of the 20-64 year old population) are employed. This figure is the lowest of any of the 12 countries. In addition, women in Israel tend to leave the labor force permanently upon marriage or childbearing (Roos, a). Kraus and Treiman's results allow a more precise description of just who these Israeli working women are. Using the same data I do, they found first that almost no Arab women work in the paid labor force [15 percent of the population of Israel is Arab (Israel Central Bureau of Statistics)]. In addition, 64 percent of women 25-64 in the civilian labor force in 1974 originated from European or American backgrounds (almost half of women from European or American-origins are employed, compared with 29 percent of Asian/African women). There is no similar distinction

among men: 92 percent of the European/American and 90 percent of the Asian/African men are employed. In comparing male and female workers in Israel, therefore, one is comparing groups with different likelihoods of success based solely on their social origins. In sum, the overrepresentation of European and American-origin Jews in the employed female population is apparently an important explanation for why women in Israel are on average employed in jobs that pay better than the jobs in which men work. As Table 5 indicates, however, even net of social origin differences, women apparently achieve higher education than men and this factor is also important in explaining gender differences in the occupational wage rate.

Although not significant, the male wage rates in Finland and Northern Ireland are also less than those of their female counterparts--the relative male wage rate is 94 percent in Finland and 97 percent in Northern Ireland. The decomposition of the mean occupational wage rates reveals that the gender difference favoring women, in both Finland and Northern Ireland, is due entirely to the fact that women in these countries come from higher-status social origins and that they have on average more education. In fact, as column 7 of Panel B indicates, if Finnish and Northern Ireland men had the higher female social origins and education, their relative wage rate would exceed that of women by seven and five percent, respectively.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Early status attainment researchers found that men and women in the U.S. are employed in jobs of comparable prestige and, moreover, that the process whereby they are allocated to occupational destinations is also essentially similar. More recent analyses suggested that the gender similarity in status attainment found by previous work may be overstated--incorporating status of first job in predicting occupational attainment revealed sharp gender differences in status attainment, in both average levels of achieved status and in the process of attainment. These findings led some researchers (e.g., Sewell et al.) to speculate that men and women are occupationally advantaged at different points in their lifetime (although see Marini for a different view). Finding gender differences in the process of occupational attainment at the individual level resolved a seeming inconsistency between the results of aggregate-level comparisons of men's and women's occupational distributions, which show substantial occupational segregation by sex, and micro-level status attainment research, which consistently found no differences in the way men and women reach their occupational destinations.

In the present study I offer a different explanation for why previous analyses failed to detect gender differences in occupational attainment, and test that explanation with data from 12 industrial societies. By building on the knowledge that the occupational wage hierarchy is essentially invariant across industrial society, and the fact that women are concentrated in

lower-paying jobs even within occupational groups, I proposed a measure of occupational achievement constructed to reflect differences in the wage rates of men's and women's jobs. The results of regression analyses for the U.S. show that gender differences in the process of occupational allocation and average levels of attainment are masked when prestige is used as a measure of occupational achievement. The process whereby men and women are allocated to positions in the occupational wage hierarchy differs, with males accruing greater returns than females to each identified occupational determinant. This finding coexists with sex similarity in the process of prestige attainment in the U.S.

Comparing the occupational attainments of men and women cross-culturally reveals some general patterns and associations that hold true across all the included societies. There are, however, several important country differences that should be noted. Overall, for each sex within each country, educational attainment is consistently the most important predictor of occupational attainment, documenting again that in industrial society one's occupational destination depends mainly on one's educational achievement. For men, however, education is generally only one of several significant factors affecting occupational position; social origins, age, and marital status all have expected positive effects on men's attainment in many of the countries. With one exception, men with fathers in high-paying jobs are more likely to work in high-paying employment themselves than are men from lower-status social origins. In half the

countries, increasing age is significantly associated with son's incumbency in jobs of higher average income. And finally, in three of the countries (Norway, Sweden, and the U.S.), married men have a significant occupational advantage over never married men.

Like men, women are allocated to occupational positions mainly on the basis of their educational achievement. However, education is very often the only factor benefiting female occupational attainment: in seven of the 12 countries, women's attainment depends solely on their educational achievement. Age is significant for women in only two countries (Finland and the U.S.) and social origins contribute to women's occupational wage rate in three countries (Austria, Japan, and the U.S.). No support exists for the human capital prediction that never married women have a significant occupational advantage over ever married women (only in Japan is the result significant and in the expected direction).

In addition to relying almost solely on educational investments for their occupational attainment, women more often than not receive lower occupational returns than men for their background characteristics. In Austria and the U.S. the female occupational return to social origins is less than half that received by men (although in Japan the male return is smaller than the female return); in Finland, and especially in the U.S., women's occupational return to age is less than the male return; and in half of the included countries women's occupational return to educational investment is somewhat less than that of men, averag-

ing 88 percent of the male return.

The results of the decomposition of the male-female occupational gap suggest that, in those countries where significant difference in achieved occupational attainment favor men, part of the explanation lies in women's generally lower levels of educational achievement. Women's lower average social origins also account for an appreciable portion of the gender difference in wage rate in Japan. However, with the exception of Germany, in each of the five countries with a significant male advantage in occupational attainment, gender differences in rates of return are an important explanation for the wage rate gap. In Israel, the only country where women's occupational wage rate is significantly greater than that of men, men's lower relative wage rate can be attributed almost entirely to gender differences in education and social origins.

In conclusion, the comparative perspective employed in the present analysis was useful in addressing several important issues. First, the cross-cultural differences found suggest that the U.S. findings regarding gender differences in socioeconomic attainment are not necessarily generalizable. While some results are more generally true across industrial societies (e.g., education is the strongest predictor of men's and women's occupational attainment in all 12 countries), others are unique to one or two countries (e.g., women's occupational wage rate increases with age only in Finland and the U.S.). Second, the supposition that men are better able than women to capitalize on personal characteristics for their occupational gain is strongly supported in

the present analysis. While men in most of the countries benefit occupationally from their background characteristics, this is much less true for women. In most countries, women depend almost entirely on their educational investments to advance occupationally. Third, while sex differences in composition (e.g., in educational attainment) are important in explaining gender differences in occupational wage rate in some countries, there is strong evidence that differences in rates of return are the more important explanation for why women are concentrated in lower-paying employment relative to men. Merely equalizing women's investments in educational training for example will not bridge the occupational gap. Taken as a whole, these findings suggest that women's concentration in lower-paying employment relative to men's is not easily rectified. Rather, the cross-cultural evidence presented here suggests that fundamental restructuring of the ways in which work is organized will be required to equalize women's and men's occupational options.

NOTES

1. Contrary to Treiman and Terrell (b), McClendon reported that married women have a significant 3.5 point status advantage over unmarried women, net of social origin, education, work status, and children variables. This difference is probably due to different operationalizations of marital status in the two studies. Treiman and Terrell distinguished between those women who had never married (and thus probably had no children) and those who were currently married, divorced, separated, and widowed. McClendon compared married women living with their spouse with unmarried women (a group that included never married, divorced, widowed, and separated women).

2. While these three studies all showed sex differences in average occupational status and in the process of occupational attainment, the findings are not always consistent across the studies. For example, Sewell et al. found that women are advantaged with respect to the status of their first job, whereas men have the advantage in status at mid-life; Marini found sex similarity in average status at entry level and a male advantage in last reported occupation; and Boyd reported a substantial female advantage at first job and sex similarity in current occupation. Some of these observed differences are probably due to sample differences among the studies: Sewell et al. used panel data for a 1957 cohort of Wisconsin high school seniors; Marini's analysis was based on data collected as part of a 15-year followup survey of Illinois high school students originally contacted in 1957-

1958; and Boyd's sample consisted of a 1973 cross-section of native-born Canadian men and women employed full time and aged 35-49.

3. Gender similarity in status derives from the way in which the SEI status scores are created. Blau and Duncan described status scores as deriving from approximately equal weightings of the average education and income of occupational categories. As Oppenheimer (b) and Treiman and Terrell (c) found, women's occupations can be characterized as high education but low-pay employment. Thus, the comparable status of women's and men's employment results in part from the high average education characteristic of "women's" jobs and not from high average levels of earned income. The prestige similarity follows from the fact that, as Treiman has shown, prestige derives in part from education and income.

4. It is unfortunate that mother's occupation is not available for inclusion, since previous analyses (Rosenfeld, b; Marini; Boyd) have suggested its relevance for women. Although perhaps less important historically (since so few married women worked outside the home), this factor is likely to increase in importance as more women engage in paid employment.

5. The literature documenting these assertions is too voluminous to report on here and several empirical and theoretical reviews are already available (e.g., Gross; Oppenheimer, a; Buckley; Fuchs; Waldman and McEaddy; Blau and Jusenius; Blau; Treiman and Hartmann; Bielby and Baron).

6. There is another possible explanation for the finding of

cross-country variation in gender differences in rates of occupational return to educational investment. It may be that the relationship between occupational wage and education is curvilinear, with larger rates of return accruing to the highest education levels. If this were true, the correct functional form would be curvilinear and could be tested by estimating a quadratic equation including education and education-squared. Certainly my finding that the countries with greater male coefficients are also those in which males have higher average education levels, and vice versa, is consistent with this possibility.

7. By sequentially ordering the independent variables I am not necessarily implying that variables included first are logically prior to those included later. Although one's social origins can be considered logically prior to age, and both of these are prior to the last two variables, it could be argued that educational attainment should precede marital status. In the present case, I place years of schooling last in the sequential ordering because I am interested in its effect net of father's occupation, age, and marital status.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bielby, William T., and James N. Baron. 1982. "A Woman's Place is with Other Women: Sex Segregation in the Workplace." Paper presented at the Workshop on Occupational Segregation by Sex, Committee on Women's Employment and Related Social Issues, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., May 24-5.

Blau, Francine D. 1977. Equal Pay in the Office. Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Blau, Francine D., and Wallace E. Hendricks. 1978. "Occupational Segregation by Sex: Trends and Prospects." Journal of Human Resources 14:197-210.

Blau, Francine D., and Carol L. Jusenius. 1976 "Economists' Approaches to Sex Segregation in the Labor Market: An Appraisal." In Martha Blaxall and Barbara Reagan (eds.), The Implications of Occupational Segregation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Blau, Peter M., and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. The American Occupational Structure. New York: Wiley.

Boyd, Monica. 1982. "Sex Differences in the Canadian Occupational Attainment Process." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 19:1-28.

Buckley, John E. 1971. "Pay Differences Between Men and Women in the Same Job." Monthly Labor Review 94(November):36-9.

Cummings, William K., and Atsushi Naoi. 1972. "Education and Mobility: An International Comparison With Special Reference to Japan and the United States." paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, August.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. 1969. "Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race." In Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.), On Understanding Poverty. New York: Basic Books.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, David L. Featherman, and Beverly Duncan. 1972. Socioeconomic Background and Achievement. New York: Seminar Press.

Dunton, Nancy E., and David L. Featherman. 1979. "Gender Differences in Intergenerational and Intragenerational Occupational Mobility." Working Paper 79-36, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

England, Paula. 1979. "Women and Occupational Prestige: A Case of Vacuous Sex Equality." Signs 5(Winter):252-65.

Featherman, David L., and Robert M. Hauser. 1976. "Sexual Inequalities and Socioeconomic Achievement in the U.S., 1962-1973." American Sociological Review 41(June):462-83.

Fligstein, Neil D., and Wendy C. Wolf. 1978. "Sex Similarities in Occupational Status Attainment: Are the Results Due to the Restriction of the Sample to Employed Women?" Social Science Research 7(June):197-212.

Fuchs, Victor R. 1971. "Differences in Hourly Earnings Between Men and Women." Monthly Labor Review 94(May):9-15.

Gaskin, Katharine A. 1979. Occupational Differentiation by Sex: An International Comparison. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

German Federal Institute for Population Research. 1974. The Population of the Federal Republic of Germany. Committee for International Coordination of National Research in Demography. CICRED series. Wiesbaden, Germany: Federal Institute for Population Research.

Gross, Edward. 1968. "Plus Ca Change . . .? The Sexual Structure of Occupations Over Time." Social Problems 16(Fall):198-208.

Hauser, Robert M., David L. Featherman, and Dennis P. Hogan. 1977. "Sex in the Structure of Occupational Mobility in the United States, 1962." In Robert M. Hauser and David L. Featherman (eds.), The process of Stratification: Trends and Analyses. New York: Academic Press.

Israel Central Bureau of Statistics. 1975. Statistical Abstract of Israel, Volume 26. Tel Aviv: Israel Ministry of Education and Culture.

Iutaka, Sugiyama, and E. Wilbur Bock. 1973. "Determinants of Occupational Status in Brazil." In Walter Müller and Karl Ulrich Mayer (eds.), Social Stratification and Career Mobility. Paris: Mouton.

Jacobs, Jerry. a:1981. "On Comparing the Socio-economic Standing of Men and Women." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society, philadelphia.

-----. b:1981. "The Prestige of Men's and Women's Occupations: A Reassessment." Unpublished paper, Harvard University.

Kraus, Vered, and Donald J. Treiman. 1980. "Sex and the Process of Status Attainment in Israel." Unpublished paper, National Academy of Sciences.

Marini, Margaret Mooney. 1980. "Sex Differences in the Process of Occupational Attainment: A Closer Look." Social Science Research 9:307-61.

Matras, Judah, and Dov Weintraub. 1976. "Ethnic and Other Primordial Differentials in Intergenerational Mobility in Israel." Paper presented at the International Sociological Association Seminar on Mobility and Social Stratification, Jerusalem, April.

McClendon, McKee J. 1976. "The Occupational Status Attainment Processes of Males and Females." American Sociological Review 41(February):52-64.

Mincer, Jacob, and Solomon Polachek. 1974. "Family Investments in Human Capital: Earnings of Women." Journal of Political Economy 82(March/April):Supplement 76-108.

Muller, Walter. 1973. "Family Background, Education, and Career Mobility." In Walter Muller and Karl Ulrich Mayer (eds.),

Social Stratification and Career Mobility. Paris: Mouton.

Oppenheimer, Valerie K. a:1970. The Female Labor Force in the United States: Demographic and Economic Factors Governing its Growth and Changing Composition. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

-----. b:1968. "The Sex-Labeling of Jobs." Industrial Relations 7(May):219-34.

Polachek, Solomon. 1975. "Discontinuous Labor Force Participation and its Effect on Women's Market Earnings." In Cynthia B. Lloyd (ed.), Sex, Discrimination, and the Division of Labor. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pontinen, Seppo. 1978. "Comparison of Social Mobility in the Scandinavian Countries." In Wlodzimierz Wesolowski, Klazimierz Slomczynski, Bogdan Mach (eds.), Social Mobility in Comparative Perspective. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences Press.

Roos, Patricia. a:1981. Occupational Segregation in Industrial Society: A Twelve-National Comparison of Gender and Marital Differences in Occupational Attainment. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

-----. b:1981. "Sex Stratification in the Workplace: Male-Female Differences in Economic Returns to Occupation." Social Science Research 10(September):195-224.

Rosenfeld, Rachel. a:1980. "Race and Sex Differences in Career

Dynamics." American Sociological Review 45(August):583-609.

-----. b:1978. "Women's Intergenerational Occupational Mobility." American Sociological Review 43(February):36-46.

Sewell, William H., Robert M. Hauser, and Wendy C. Wolf. 1980. "Sex, Schooling, and Occupational Status." American Journal of Sociology 86(November):551-83.

Smuts, Robert. 1959. Women and Work in America. New York: Columbia University Press.

Szalai, Alexander (ed.). 1972. The Use of Time: Daily Activities of Urban and Suburban Populations in Twelve Countries. The Hague: Mouton.

Treiman, Donald J. 1977. Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Treiman, Donald J., and Heidi I. Hartmann (eds.). 1981. Women, Work, and Wages: Equal Pay for Jobs of Equal Value. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Treiman, Donald J., and Jonathan Kelley. a:1974. A Comparative Study of Status Attainment. Grant Proposal submitted to the National Institute of Mental Health. August.

-----, b:1978. Extension of a Comparative Study of Status Attainment. Grant Proposal submitted to the National Institute of Mental Health. January.

Treiman, Donald J., and Kermit Terrell. a:19[illegible]. "The Process of

Status Attainment in the United States and Great Britain." American Journal of Sociology 81(November):563-83.

-----. b:1975. "Sex and the Process of Status Attainment: A Comparison of Working Women and Men." American Sociological Review 40(April):174-200.

-----. c:1975. "Women, Work, and Wages: Trends in the Female Occupational Structure Since 1940." In Kenneth Land and Seymour Spilerman (eds.), Social Indicator Models. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Waldman, Elizabeth, and Beverly McEaddy. 1974. "Where Women Work--An Analysis by Industry and Occupation." Monthly Labor Review 97(May):3-13.

Walker, Kathryn E., and Margaret E. Woods. 91976. Time Use: A Measure of Household Production of Family Goods and Services. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association, Center for the Family.

Wolf, Wendy C. 1976. "Occupational Attainments of Married Women: Do Career Contingencies Matter?" Working Paper 76-3, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Wolf, Wendy C., and Rachel A. Rosenfeld. 1978. "Sex Structure of Occupations and Job Mobility." Social Forces 56(March):823-44.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics of Survey Data

Country and survey date	Unweighted sample size total (and weighted number of employed males and females)[a]	Sample characteristics
1. Austria, 1974 (Political Action: An Eight-Nation Study)	1,585 (M=546; F=352)	National multistage probability sample of the adult population, 16 years and older
2. Denmark, 1972 (Comparative Scandinavian Welfare Survey)	1,000 (M=412; F=316)	National probability sample of the 15-64 year old population
3. Finland, 1972 (Comparative Scandinavian Welfare Survey)	994 (M=413; F=363)	National probability sample of the 15-64 year old population
4. Germany (Fed. Rep.), 1976 (West Germany ZUMABUS Survey)	2,036 (M=678; F=442)	Representative population sample based on the total number of persons aged 18 and over, with German citizenship, living in private households in the Federal Republic of Germany (including West Berlin)
5. Great Britain, 1974 (Political Action: An Eight-Nation Study)	1,787 (M=554; F=314)	National multistage probability sample of the adult population, 16 years and older
6. Israel, 1974 (Israel Labor Force Survey)	15,060 (M=8,911; F=4,437)	Representative sample of the non-institutional population of Israel, except for persons living in kibbutzim and the Bedouin population in the South; respondents are age 14 and over
7. Japan, 1967 (Japanese National Election Study)	1,973 (M=762; F=476)	Multistage stratified nationwide probability sample of adults of voting age, 20 years and above, supplementary sample of youths 15 to 19 drawn
8. Netherlands, 1974 (Political Action: An Eight-Nation Study)	1,201 (M=466; F=161)	National multistage probability sample of the adult population, 16 years and older
9. Northern Ireland, 1968 (Northern Ireland Loyalty Study)	1,291 (M=478; F=221)	Multistage stratified random sample of 1500 households, drawn from the Annual Electoral Register; respondents are age 21 and older
10. Norway, 1972 (Comparative Scandinavian Welfare Survey)	1,005 (M=452; F=199)	National probability sample of the 15-64 year old population
11. Sweden, 1972 (Comparative Scandinavian Welfare Survey)	1,005 (M=431; F=364)	National probability sample of the 15-64 year old population
12. United States, 1974-1977 (National Opinion Research Center General Social Surveys)	6,003 (M=1,975; F=1,295)	Four merged representative samples of English-speaking persons 18 years of age and over, living in non-institutional arrangements within the continental U.S.

[a]Sample was weighted so that the survey data would equal the male-female proportion in the labor force as a whole, as estimated from published data. This weighting recreated the total sample size for which data were available, but altered the proportions of men and women.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Models of Occupational Attainment for Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64 in 12 Industrialized Countries[a]

	Austria		Denmark		Finland		Germany (Fed. Rep.)		Great Britain		Israel	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Means												
Father's occupation-prestige	37.2	37.6	37.9	38.6	38.0	38.9	41.7	42.0	47.5	47.2	38.7 *	41.2
Father's occupation-wage rate scale[b]	27.6	28.7	27.0	29.1	25.0 *	28.1	32.4	32.9	--	--	38.1 *	43.0
Age	40.6	41.1	41.7 *	39.2	38.1	39.6	40.5 *	38.9	42.5	42.1	39.8 *	35.2
(Age*)2	129	130	157	153	150	154	121 *	152	165	170	167	164
Marital status (Never married=1)	.174	.196	.131	.122	.264 *	.186	.140 *	.221	.141	.170	.191 *	.273
Years of schooling	9.95 *	9.20	8.23	8.18	7.94 *	8.42	11.2 *	10.4	10.4	10.3	9.57 *	10.8
Respondent's occupation-prestige	39.4 *	35.7	40.2	38.6	38.3	38.2	44.3 *	40.5	39.3	38.5	39.9 *	42.2
Respondent's occupation-wage rate scale	33.2 *	27.2	33.5	32.8	28.9	30.6	38.5 *	35.1	35.6	33.4	35.6 *	39.3
Standard deviations												
Father's occupation-prestige	10.6	10.5	10.0	10.7	8.72	8.34	11.2	11.5	22.8	21.5	12.0	12.9
Father's occupation-wage rate scale[b]	17.7	18.3	17.9	20.2	16.8	17.3	17.1	16.4	--	--	23.2	24.8
Age	11.4	11.4	12.6	12.4	12.3	12.3	11.0	12.2	12.9	12.8	12.9	12.7
(Age*)2	135	135	138	140	151	139	133	159	148	145	155	175
Marital status (Never married=1)	.379	.398	.338	.328	.442	.390	.348	.416	.348	.376	.358	.446
Years of schooling	2.11	1.61	2.26	1.86	2.21	2.77	2.35	2.05	2.23	1.93	4.18	4.05
Respondent's occupation-prestige	12.1	11.2	11.9	10.4	11.8	11.9	12.1	11.5	13.0	12.7	13.7	13.3
Respondent's occupation-wage rate scale	21.6	16.4	21.9	17.5	20.2	19.1	19.9	16.9	24.0	19.1	23.3	20.5
N[c]	445	293	363	253	353	286	610	365	473	271	5926	2653

[a]For details on scoring see text.

Note: Age* = Age - mean of age.

[b]The father's occupational wage rate scale could not be constructed for Great Britain, due to the way father's occupation was measured.

[c]Missing cases deleted pairwise, lowest number of cases reported.

*Difference in male and female mean is significant at .05 level, 2 tailed test.

Table 2 (Cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations for Models of Occupational Attainment for Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64 in 12 Industrialized Countries[a]

	Japan		Netherlands		Northern Ireland		Norway		Sweden		United States	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
						Means						
Father's occupation-prestige	36.1	34.6	39.6	40.9	38.1	37.9	38.7	40.2	37.4	39.4	39.6	40.2
Father's occupation-wage rate scale[b]	23.3	18.6	35.3	37.0	24.2	28.2	29.6	32.2	27.2	33.1	35.8	36.8
Age	38.8	39.3	39.1	32.5	40.9	39.0	42.2	39.9	41.8	39.6	39.5	38.9
(Age*)^2	136	147	156	147	152	154	158	145	156	138	153	155
Marital status (Never married=1)	.184	.202	.180	.412	.230	.358	.126	.133	.156	.115	.149	.142
Years of schooling	11.2	10.2	10.1	10.2	10.2	10.6	9.14	8.70	8.88	8.78	12.6	12.5
Respondent's occupation-prestige	42.1	36.5	43.7	40.4	39.3	37.4	42.7	39.2	41.0	39.8	41.9	41.8
Respondent's occupation-wage rate scale	39.5	30.3	42.9	37.1	31.5	32.4	37.6	33.3	37.0	35.0	41.6	38.2
						Standard deviations						
Father's occupation-prestige	8.59	7.77	12.7	13.4	13.6	13.5	9.82	10.2	10.0	10.8	10.9	11.7
Father's occupation-wage rate scale[b]	27.1	24.7	25.5	25.7	16.7	22.0	20.4	22.2	19.0	22.4	26.6	27.5
Age	11.7	12.1	12.5	12.0	12.4	12.5	12.6	12.1	12.5	11.7	12.4	12.4
(Age*)^2	146	141	150	219	137	145	143	128	141	131	141	146
Marital status (Never married=1)	.388	.402	.384	.494	.421	.481	.332	.341	.363	.319	.356	.349
Years of schooling	3.20	2.37	2.97	2.42	1.88	2.01	2.91	2.61	2.91	2.66	3.23	2.64
Respondent's occupation-prestige	11.3	9.51	13.5	13.2	12.7	13.3	12.9	12.6	13.3	12.6	12.9	12.8
Respondent's occupation-wage rate scale	25.2	20.0	25.9	21.1	21.8	23.5	24.2	22.2	24.9	20.3	28.3	21.4
N[c]	521	366	404	132	442	201	382	147	383	289	1626	1046

Table 3

Coefficients for Two Models of Occupational Attainment, for Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64, United States (1974-1977)[a]

Independent Variables	Prestige model		Wage rate model	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	Metric coefficients			
Father's occupation	.104*	.109*	.151*	.068*
Age	.178*	.093*	.384*	.184*
(Age*)^2	-.006*	-.002	-.018*	-.002
Marital status (Never married=1)	-2.28*	1.43	-4.97*	.762
Years of schooling	2.36*	2.63*	4.34*	3.85*
Intercept	2.18	1.13	-30.2	-19.3
R^2	.384	.331	.313	.247
	Standardized coefficients			
Father's occupation	.087*	.099*	.141*	.088*
Age	.171*	.090*	.168*	.107*
(Age*)^2	-.061*	-.026	-.090*	-.013
Marital status (Never married=1)	-.063*	.039	-.063*	.012
Years of schooling	.592*	.540*	.495*	.474*

[a]Age*= Age - mean of age. Means and standard deviations for all variables are provided in Table 2 and correlations in Roos, a:Appendix 5.1. Occupational prestige is used to measure respondent's and father's occupations in the "Prestige model;" the wage rate scale is employed in the "Wage rate model."

*Metric coefficient is twice its standard error.

Table 4

Coefficients of a Model of Occupational Wage Rate Attainment, for Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64, in 12 Industrialized Countries[a]

		Father's occupation[b]	Age	(Age*)^2	Marital status	Years of schooling	Intercept
		Metric coefficients					
Austria	Men	.301*	.124	-.003	-4.39	4.91*	-27.8
	Women	.123*	-.029	.006	-2.02	4.86*	-20.3
Denmark	Men	.109*	.106	-.006	-4.92	6.05*	-22.2
	Women	.010	-.049	.001	-.200	5.04*	-7.00
Finland	Men	.216*	.287*	-.005	-4.27	4.86*	-24.2
	Women	.084	.261*	-.007	-.125	4.93*	-22.4
Germany (Fed. Rep.)	Men	.254*	.068	-.001	-3.68	4.79*	-25.2
	Women	.033	-.016	-.011	-2.76	3.48*	.587
Great Britain	Men	.103*	-.032	-.015*	-5.27	4.30*	-9.62
	Women	-.037	.074	-.004	4.51	4.30*	-12.5
Israel	Men	.102*	.214*	-.010*	-1.39	3.09*	-4.44
	Women	.014	-.017	-.009*	-3.22*	3.25*	6.78
Japan	Men	.124*	.498*	-.008	-2.07	3.00*	-14.8
	Women	.158*	.073	-.013	7.57*	2.95*	-5.32
Netherlands	Men	.214*	.315*	-.014	-6.33	3.91*	-13.3
	Women	.037	.150	.009	3.60	4.37*	-16.4
Northern Ireland	Men	.251*	.056	-.001	-4.25	5.72*	-33.9
	Women	.067	.130	-.003	-2.72	7.36*	-51.0
Norway	Men	.153*	-.003	-.002	-6.81*	5.26*	-13.7
	Women	.027	.083	.006	5.05	5.98*	-24.4
Sweden	Men	.043	.189*	-.007	-11.2*	5.48*	-17.9
	Women	.025	.034	-.002	-4.53	4.65*	-7.26
United States	Men	.151*	.384*	-.018*	-4.97*	4.34*	-30.2
	Women	.068*	.184*	-.002	.762	3.85*	-19.3

[a]Age*= Age - mean of age. Means and standard deviations for all variables are provided in Table 2 and correlations in Roos, a:Appendix 5.1.

[b]For Great Britain only, father's occupation = prestige of father's occupation; for all other countries, father's occupation = wage rate scale.

*Metric coefficient is twice its standard error.

Table 4 (Cont.)

Coefficients of a Model of Occupational Wage Rate Attainment, for Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64, in 12 Industrialized Countries[a]

		Father's occupation[b]	Age	(Age*)^2	Marital status	Years of schooling	R^2
		Standardized coefficients					
Austria	Men	.246*	.065	-.020	-.077	.480*	.390
	Women	.137*	-.020	.052	-.049	.476*	.307
Denmark	Men	.089*	.061	-.035	-.076	.624*	.458
	Women	.012	-.035	.012	-.004	.537*	.303
Finland	Men	.179*	.174*	-.035	-.093	.530*	.393
	Women	.076	.168*	-.054	-.003	.715*	.534
Germany (Fed. Rep.)	Men	.218*	.038	-.009	-.064	.567*	.461
	Women	.032	-.011	-.106	-.068	.421*	.208
Great Britain	Men	.098*	-.017	-.092*	-.076	.400*	.194
	Women	-.042	.050	-.032	.089	.436*	.201
Israel	Men	.101*	.119*	-.068*	-.021	.555*	.347
	Women	.017	-.011	-.078*	-.070*	.639*	.438
Japan	Men	.133*	.231*	-.049	-.032	.381*	.223
	Women	.196*	.044	-.090	.152*	.350*	.238
Netherlands	Men	.210*	.152*	-.080	-.094	.448*	.323
	Women	.045	.085	.088	.084	.500*	.264
Northern Ireland	Men	.192*	.032	-.007	-.082	.491*	.338
	Women	.066	.072	-.017	-.058	.658*	.449
Norway	Men	.129*	-.002	-.012	-.094*	.634*	.488
	Women	.027	.045	.032	.077	.702*	.512
Sweden	Men	.033	.095*	-.038	-.164*	.640*	.453
	Women	.028	.020	-.011	-.071	.609*	.376
United States	Men	.141*	.168*	-.090*	-.063*	.495*	.313
	Women	.088*	.107*	-.013	.012	.474*	.247

Table 5

Decomposition of Difference in Mean Occupational Wage, of Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64, in 12 Industrialized Countries[a]

Panel A	Female mean as percent of male mean (1)	Percentage due to sex differences in: Father's occupation (2)	Age (3)	Marital status (4)	Years of schooling (5)	Total difference due to composition (sum of 2-5) (6)	Adjusted female wage rate (sum of 1 and 6) (7)	Residual (100%-7) (8)
1. Austria*	82.0%	-1.0	.2	.0	11.5	10.7	92.7%	7.3%
2. Denmark	98.0%	-1.1	-1.7	.3	2.8	.3	98.3%	1.7%
3. Germany* (Fed. Rep.)	91.1%	-.3	.9	.1	7.0	7.7	98.8%	1.2%
4. Great Britain	94.0%	.0	-.3	-.4	1.5	.8	94.8%	5.2%
5. Japan*	76.9%	3.0	.3	-.2	6.0	9.1	86.0%	14.0%
6. Netherlands*	86.6%	-.8	-1.0	-.6	2.0	-.4	86.2%	13.8%
7. Norway	88.5%	-2.3	-.9	-.1	10.7	7.4	95.9%	4.1%
8. Sweden	94.4%	-5.0	-1.5	-.3	7.1	.3	94.7%	5.3%
9. United States*	91.7%	-.5	.1	.1	1.7	1.4	93.1%	6.9%

Panel B	Male mean as percent of female mean (1)	Percentage due to sex differences in: Father's occupation (2)	Age (3)	Marital status (4)	Years of schooling (5)	Total difference due to composition (sum of 2-5) (6)	Adjusted male occupational wage rate (sum of 1 and 6) (7)	Residual (100%-7) (8)
1. Finland	94.2%	4.3	1.2	1.1	6.6	13.2	107.4%	-7.4%
2. Israel*	90.7%	3.0	.0	-.6	5.3	7.7	98.4%	1.6%
3. Northern Ireland	97.2%	5.8	.6	-1.0	2.7	8.1	105.3%	-5.3%

[a]In Panel A countries, where the male occupational wage rates were greater than the female occupational wage rates, the male means were substituted into the female prediction equations. In Panel B countries, where the female occupational wage rates were greater than the male occupational wage rates, the female means were substituted into the male prediction equations. An asterisk (*) indicates that the gender difference in occupational attainment (wage rate scale) is a significant one.

Appendix 1

Coefficients of a Model of Occupational Prestige Attainment, for Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64, in 12 Industrialized Countries[a]

		Father's occupational prestige	Age	(Age*)^2	Marital status	Years of schooling	Intercept
		Metric coefficients					
Austria	Men	.179*	.045	-.000	-2.56	3.02*	1.31
	Women	.220*	-.016	.003	-1.93	2.63*	3.79
Denmark	Men	.191*	.028	.004	-3.83*	3.27*	4.79
	Women	.038	.001	.002	.688	3.22*	10.3
Finland	Men	.217*	.211*	-.003	-2.11	2.30*	4.74
	Women	.153*	.199*	-.006	.356	2.87*	1.02
Germany (Fed. Rep.)	Men	.135*	.050	-.001	-2.01	2.94*	4.16
	Women	.064	-.039	-.003	-1.67	2.40*	15.1
Great Britain	Men	.062*	-.016	-.008*	-2.96	2.73*	10.3
	Women	-.037	.050	-.002	2.74	3.38*	3.09
Israel	Men	.100*	.076*	-.006*	-.993	1.87*	16.2
	Women	.034*	-.002	-.005*	-2.08*	2.16*	19.1
Japan	Men	.114*	.343*	-.005	-.500	1.43*	9.43
	Women	.173*	.017	-.002	1.97	1.53*	14.1
Netherlands	Men	.176*	.141*	-.005	-3.00	2.40*	8.23
	Women	.013	.066	.006	1.97	2.95*	5.86
Northern Ireland	Men	.265*	.105*	-.004	-.962	2.86*	-3.39
	Women	.087	.085	-.004	.482	3.90*	-10.1
Norway	Men	.166*	.006	-.004	-.740	2.78*	11.4
	Women	.138	-.031	.003	2.67	3.12*	6.87
Sweden	Men	.085	.021	-.006	-3.96*	2.84*	13.2
	Women	-.067	.046	.000	-4.02	3.53*	9.98
United States	Men	.104*	.178*	-.006*	-2.28*	2.36*	2.18
	Women	.109*	.093*	-.002	1.43	2.63*	1.13

[a]Age* = Age - mean of age. Means and standard deviations for all variables are provided in Table 2 and correlations in Roos, a:Appendix 5.1.

*Metric coefficient is twice its standard error.

Appendix 1 (Cont.)

Coefficients of a Model of Occupational Prestige Attainment, for Currently Employed Men and Women 20-64, in 12 Industrialized Countries[a]

		Father's occupational prestige	Age	(Age*)^2	Marital status	Years of schooling	R^2
		Standardized coefficients					
Austria	Men	.156*	.043	-.003	-.080	.526*	.350
	Women	.206*	-.016	.040	-.069	.378*	.229
Denmark	Men	.161*	.030	.042	-.109*	.622*	.486
	Women	.039	.001	.031	.022	.575*	.354
Finland	Men	.160*	.219*	-.035	-.079	.430*	.272
	Women	.107*	.206*	-.067	.012	.667*	.489
Germany (Fed. Rep.)	Men	.124*	.046	-.008	-.058	.572*	.394
	Women	.064	-.042	-.040	-.060	.426*	.215
Great Britain	Men	.108*	-.016	-.087*	-.079	.469*	.256
	Women	-.063	.050	-.025	.081	.515*	.272
Israel	Men	.088*	.072*	-.066*	-.026	.572*	.364
	Women	.033*	-.002	-.072*	-.070*	.658*	.466
Japan	Men	.087*	.355*	-.070	-.017	.406*	.268
	Women	.141*	.022	-.033	.083	.381*	.214
Netherlands	Men	.166*	.131*	-.059	-.085	.530*	.357
	Women	.014	.060	.104	.073	.541*	.288
Northern Ireland	Men	.283*	.102*	-.039	-.032	.421*	.322
	Women	.089	.080	-.044	.017	.591*	.387
Norway	Men	.127*	.006	-.048	-.019	.627*	.472
	Women	.112	-.029	.036	.072	.648*	.523
Sweden	Men	.064	.020	-.058	-.108*	.621*	.437
	Women	-.058	.043	.004	-.101*	.742*	.486
United States	Men	.087*	.171*	-.061*	-.063*	.592*	.384
	Women	.099*	.090*	-.026	.039	.540*	.331