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Foreword

Where there is creation there is progress.
Where there is no creation there is no progress: know the nature of creation.
Where there is joy there is creation.
Where there is no joy there is no creation: know the nature of joy.
Where there is the Infinite there is joy.
There is no joy in the finite.

—from the Chandogya Upanishad

From the study of social forces, I have learned that the nature of society is the reality of the "finite" world. Through its processes society creates complex finite walls in which we live from day-to-day and where we are engulfed by a poverty of consciousness—a consciousness burdened by feelings of hopelessness, alienation, and despair. Unfortunately this joyless social "closet" prevents us from experiencing the excitement of creation and self-progress. It is what ancient Hopi prophets called Koyaanisqasti, life out of balance. Our own social creations seem to be heading us to self-destruction and it is from this revelation that this dissertation is written.

Twenty years ago we believed that in America everyone had an equal chance to achieve success through education and hard work. Schools were the means by which we achieved self-realization and self-actualization. However, it soon became all too clear that the poor and the working class in capitalist America were not really benefiting from the education system while the advantaged families did. Why?

When, in the late 1960's and 1970's, critics began to question education's utopian quest for the "Infinite," sociologists, among others, realized that tapping a student's potential and talent was
really a loaded question for schools. As desegregation problems mounted throughout the United States, the true character of the education system appeared. Were schools here just to serve certain groups in society and not others? Were schools designed not to "liberate" the minds of young people, but rather to provide a segregated labor force molded to meet the needs of the capitalist economy?

From a historical perspective, Sputnik was probably more important as a catalyst for American education than it was symbolic of Soviet advancement in space technology. Sputnik became the battlecry during the 1950's and early 1960's for educators, lawmakers, and the general public who demanded educational reforms in the United States in order to "catch" the Russians. To advance American education one of the changes initiated was the widespread implementation of stratified curriculum programs, or tracks. Students were segregated into so-called ability groups and taught different curricula. Ideally, this plan would offer (1) advance studies for deserving children — to put them in a learning environment unencumbered by "slower" students — and (2) offer "applied" or vocational learning for students who were judged incapable or who were undesiring of post-secondary education.

Tracking was hailed as the solution to the education problem and was widely adopted by schools throughout the country. However, tracking created a new problem for education. Tracking has become yet another fixture in society that locks people in their place. Research has shown that track assignment is highly predictable by social
background characteristics such as class (working class students into
the vocational track, middle class into the college-preparatory) and by
ethnicity (minorities into the vocational, whites into the academic).
When students graduate from these tracks, they have specialized adult
futures waiting for them: vocational students are prepared for working
class jobs and college-prep students are more likely to land
middle-class jobs.

This research, at a meta-theoretical level, is interested in the
social "fairness" of tracking. That is, does curriculum segregation
manifest the intrinsic and ameliorative functions of education? Or
does it actively work to recreate the social "finite" for those already
at the bottom of the American hierarchy?

These questions are not solely about education. They are questions
about the role of education within the political-economic organization
of a capitalist society. It is hoped that this study sheds light on
this relationship and makes us more aware of the restrictive and
undemocratic forces that impinge upon the people of our society.
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In recent years, Marxist theories have challenged the traditional, meritocratic perspective dominant in the sociology of education. The meritocracy assumes that schools, like the larger society, are based on the premise of equal opportunity; success in school is the result of hard work and good grades, which lead to good jobs and good incomes. Bowles and Gintis, among other revisionists, disagree arguing that the structure of education, sorting students into segregated, hierarchical curriculum tracks, mirrors the structure of the capitalist workplace and reproduces the existing class system such that the most advantaged persons and groups continue to fare well while the disadvantaged continue to fare poorly. This research tests some of the propositions of the Marxist-oriented correspondence principle of Bowles and Gintis. Previous research shows that the vocational track stresses such behaviors as submission to authority and dependability and does little to prepare students for college—characteristics highly suitable for manual class occupations. The academic track prepares students for higher education and emphasizes independent and symbolic learning—skills required of mental class jobs. Studies also show that minorities and working class students are over-represented in the vocational track whereas middle class students are over-represented in the academic track. Using a national sample of women seven years after high school, results of log-linear logit analysis indicate that tracking facilitates reproduction of a dichotomous categorization of class. For the manual class, reproduction is enhanced by student's
participation in the vocational education track. In the mental class, however, reproduction is largely a consequence of being in the academic program. Other variables known to affect women's occupational position also vary by track. Women in the vocational track are more likely to have children, less likely to be single, have lower self-esteem, have traditional sex role attitudes, and less likely to achieve higher education than women from the academic track. Though social mobility occurs, hypotheses drawn from the correspondence principle were supported.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: SCHOOL TRACKS, THE "HIDDEN CURRICULUM" AND THE CORRESPONDENCE PRINCIPLE

When I went to school I learned to write and how to read
History, geography, and home economy.
And typing is a skill that every girl is sure to need
to while away the extra time until it's time to breed.
And then they have the nerve to ask what would I like to be:
I said I'm gonna be an engineer.

Oh no, you only need to learn to be a lady.
The duty isn't yours to try to run the world.
An engineer could never have a baby.
Remember, dear, that you're a girl....

—Peggy Seeger: "I'm Gonna Be An Engineer"

Educational researchers have shown considerable interest in the socialization of young people and particularly the way that socialization experiences and practices get reflected in schools. Until very recently, essentially one argument has prevailed: schools, like the larger society, are based on the premise of equal opportunity. Success in school, as in the larger society, is the result of hard work. Rewards go to those who do well; good grades in school lead, eventually, to good jobs, good incomes, and so on. In the parlance of this group of writers, outcomes in both educational and occupational experiences are consequences of "meritocratic" principles: In the most individualistic way possible, one guides his/her own destiny. The "system" gives you an opportunity and you must take advantage of it. In sociological circles, this is the well-known theoretical perspective
called functionalism. It holds that the historical unfolding of a society in which social placements are fixed solely by merit is the ultimate and "just" social structure, though not necessarily an equalitarian one given that inequality is a "natural" by-product of capitalist economy (Antonio, 1981). A society rooted in meritocratic principles, then, overcomes inequalities caused by ascriptive characteristics (Parsons, 1971). This ideology assures society that the division of labor is based on individual merit rather than differential opportunity, etc.

Functionalism has been the target of increasing criticism. School analysts argue that schooling is not just individual accomplishment in a meritocratic setting. Instead, schools are seen as merely reproducing existing forms of inequality such that the most advantaged persons and groups continue to fare well while the disadvantaged persons and groups continue to fare poorly. Further, these critics contend that school curricula have manifest and latent sides and to focus only on cognitive outcomes is to miss the most important aspect of the education process—what they call the "hidden curriculum." The hidden curriculum refers to the non-scholastic, antidemocratic (Morgan, 1977; Bowles and Gintis, 1973) demands placed on pupils in the classroom. Of particular interest are such things as personality traits and behaviors which conform to (usually predefined) existing class relations. Success in school means more than academic ability, it also relies upon mastering the non-cognitive curriculum. As a student learns to adapt to school life he or she "learns to subjugate his own desires to the will of the teacher and to subdue his own
actions to the interest of the common good" (Jackson, 1968: 36). Thus, the student is rewarded not only for scholastic success, but also for conformity, dependence, and acquiescence in personal behavior.

Nowhere is the structural (versus individual) side to this clearer than in the analysis of school tracking programs. Tracking represents a relatively easy way to categorize and differentiate students: in Spring's (1976) metaphor, the school becomes a "sorting machine." Students arrive at school with varying levels of intellectual ability, differing values, priorities, etc. As Bowles and Gintis show, schools then perpetuate these early differences. In this way, schools become the handmaiden for the particular forms an economy takes.

Tracking also becomes a legitimation for inequality by providing unequal resources and teachers for tracks (Tunnell, 1978). Through differences in resources and in the hidden curriculum, tracking can be seen as "an agency for maintaining and enhancing caste and class stratification in a society" (Heathers, 1969: 566). Tracking serves to reproduce class partly through an unequal distribution of knowledge and skills. The school's system of stratification determines that special information will be made available to certain groups yet are withheld from others.

As described by Bowles and Gintis, tracking suggests a very deterministic aspect of schooling. Tracking in high school is simply an extension of "ability" grouping in earlier school years. Tracking, then, is actually begun quite early in one's schooling career and its effects continue to be seen (and felt) long afterwards. It has been shown to be related to such things as achievement, self-concept and
attitudes toward school and school-related societal things; and this influence is usually positive for academic track (economically advantaged) students, negative for vocational/general track (economically disadvantaged) students. In short, the hidden curriculum varies by school track placement to the degree that there are actually hidden curricula. Those in the academic track are taught reliance while others learn the importance of conformity and deference to authority; in fact, these latter qualities may be equated with or even made superior to cognitive performance. As a recent graduate of a high school vocational program testified:

I didn't get along very well with my (vocational) teacher. All he ever did was yell at us and tell us what we were doing wrong. He said this was the way it was on the job. Yeah, he was teaching us how to work (author's notes, 1984; emphasis added).

For revisionist critics, school is more than just "reading, writing, and arithmetic." School is "teaching how to work." Of course if that is true, then schooling is learning one's station in life. Or as Willis (1977) puts it, "learning to labour." Schooling is preparation for much that is to follow over one's life course. This is much like the Marxian axiom that social placement determines social consciousness. Consciousness is the result of daily repeated social interactions with others and with the material reality of one's life. Therefore it is argued that education, as a major part of an individual's social setting, works dialectically to produce and maintain social location.
EDUCATION AND THE SEXUAL DIVISION OF LABOR

While the hidden curriculum is one facet of school life, and while a "correspondence" between education and the economy cannot be denied (although the dynamics of this correspondence are certainly debatable), little mention is made among revisionists about how all this applies to women. Such terms as "sub-ordination to authority," "dependability," and "punctuality" all have a familiar ring when applied to women, at least as their roles have been traditionally defined. Barring the existence of a caste system, young women born to traditional mothers do not instantly become, themselves, traditional women. Instead this is helped along by the many life experiences which occur between birth and young adulthood. Of particular interest in this study is the role which schooling may play as a mediating influence in this process.

As others have argued, schooling may be either liberating or constraining (Illich, 1970). Given the posited relationship between schooling and the economy, however, it is hardly surprising that schooling is most often constraining. As Raskin (1972) says, it is a "channeling colony," guaranteeing occupants for the positions society needs to fill; that these positions perpetuate the reproduction and maintenance of the system, is a point not lost on revisionists. This kind of perspective gives new meaning to the words in the classic school song: "We're all in our places with bright, shiny faces."

Valli (1983) has argued that the hidden curriculum is especially pernicious for young women—it truncates what may already be restricted horizons. Not only do young women learn to be acquiescent order-takers rather than order-givers, but they learn early-on that some occupations
are more appropriate for them. For example, schools offering special training in homemaking and home economics legitimate "wifing" as a suitable and desirable career for young women to pursue (Lasch, 1979).

This has given rise to modifying the traditional white collar-blue collar dichotomy to add a third category—pink collar, long called "women's work." This is a significant part of the materialization of patriarchal ideology that defines and supports the devalued though critical and essential work that women actually do (Sokoloff, 1983) but where men hold the leadership positions and women continue to serve.

As it concerns women, the values of meritocratic individualism contradict the capitalist economic system which restricts women from equal access to the rewards of the system. The work women do both at home and for pay benefits capitalism and men. First, housework frees men from many household responsibilities so that they can work in capitalist factories and second, women in the labor force generally assume low paying and often demeaning jobs that hold little authority or security. Staffing these jobs with women who are willing to do them keeps profits relatively stable.

Gender inequality is a complex interaction of behaviors and attitudes that defines the relationships between men and women. Virtually all social institutions unequally distribute resources according to a patriarchal plan that maintains power in the hands of men (Albert and Hahnel, 1978). To Sokoloff, the patriarchy refers to gender conflict, including a material base women's labor and gender consciousness. In this way, one can understand contemporary and historical patriarchal societies to consist of a system of relations establishing interdependent and interest
among men that enables, and even requires them to dominate women (1980, 154).

Employers are aided by the school's willingness (or self-defined calling) to see that students find their "places" as soon as possible. School tracking plays an important role in this, for it is there that some initial sorting occurs.

For young women, tracking may lead to gender-related meaning to work that further serves to perpetuate a sexually divided labor force (Valli, 1983). In turn, the reproduction of this system may lead to the reproduction of other sex role realms, especially marriage and procreation. Thus, different tracking mechanisms may have very different long-range outcomes to them. It is these post-school tracking effects which are of special interest in this study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The question to be addressed in this study is: how crucial is track placement in high school for understanding later life outcomes—particularly with reference to young women. The life outcomes to be considered here include marital and fertility behaviors, educational attainment, self-esteem, and gender role attitudes.

It is commonly assumed that such early post-high school considerations as marriage and fertility are especially important for women. Status attainment researchers have shown that certain sex-specific variables cannot be ignored in an individual's life course (see Falk and Cosby, 1975; Hogan, 1980; Waite and Stolzenberg, 1977). However no one has fully investigated the degree to which tracking, a
structural indicator, is itself responsible for charting the course of an individual's later life. Much of the present study has grown out of Valli's ethnography, which showed how high school girls are socialized in their school curriculum (via track) to be docile, deferential, accepting individuals cast into traditional women's work and, subsequently—by extension—women's traditional roles.

It is unknown to what degree and in what ways young women are, in fact, influenced by the dynamics of the tracking process. Valli has demonstrated how this works for young women in vocational and general tracks, but what of those in the academic track? Are they, too, slotted for "more of the same"? I.e., do they merely aid and abet the reproduction of the current system of class and sex relations? In this study, young women in the academic track are compared with those in non-academic tracks. The thesis to be tested is that there will be between-track differences on all crucial indicators. Thus academic young women should have very different kinds of life outcomes—postponing marriage and fertility, having higher self-esteem, having non-traditional sex role attitudes, and striving for greater equality in gender roles. The plausibility of these statements will be developed in the review of literature.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. The first chapter introduces the problem to be researched. Chapter Two outlines the correspondence principle of Bowles and Gintis and reviews relevant literature. Also in this chapter the theoretical model to be tested is
outlined. Chapter Three discusses the data, methods, and procedures used in the study. The results of the statistical tests are discussed in Chapter Four. Chapter Five presents conclusions and implications of the research.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Until recently, much of the literature in the sociology of education perpetuated the ideal and ideology of educational equality. By focusing on Parsons' thesis that schools were the means to overcoming ascribed social handicaps, such as poor family backgrounds, researchers subsequently ignored the noncognitive demands and the "hidden curricula" that continued to differentiate the socialization experience students have in school. To Parsons (1959), schools are merely a transitional institution between life in the family and eventual labor force participation where students compete for future adult statuses.

Though schools do prepare children for adult positions in the economic structure, can we say that education operates in such a Utopian way that all the participants are competing equally? Schools may not be the passive entities Parsons describes. The boundaries between institutions are not always rigidly drawn. How can we relate education and the dominant values of American culture with the labor demands of the economic system? Are schools really engaged in "managerial education" in which the learning process is "managed" to meet the demands for a stratified labor force (Green, 1969)?

With these questions in mind, this chapter will address the following: 1) curriculum tracking programs; 2) the relationship between bureaucratic social structure and education; 3) the correspondence theory as presented by Bowles and Gintis; 4) the critique of this
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theory; 5) empirical tests of the correspondence principle; and 6) the theoretical model guiding this research.

TRACKING

In most high schools, students are grouped into distinct curricula or tracks, a process that often begins in elementary grades. Rosenbaum (1976:6) defines tracking as "any school selection system that attempts to homogenize classroom placements in terms of students' personal qualities, performances, or aspirations. Thus tracking is a general term that includes both ability grouping and curriculum grouping and emphasizes their social similarities." Some students are placed in industrial, clerical, or other vocational programs in which they study basic math and language lessons and take job related classes. Advanced students are placed in academic programs that prepare them for a college career. In this track, students study advanced mathematics, science, literature, foreign languages, and other college subjects (Parelius and Parelius, 1978). The general track includes those students in the middle ground. These pupils are taught a general curriculum that can prepare them for college entrance but at a less accelerated pace. Assigning students to homogeneous curriculum tracks is a complex process based on three factors: standardized test scores; teacher grades, recommendations, or opinions about students; and the pupil's race and socioeconomic background (Rist, 1970; Persell, 1977).

Proponents of tracking contend that it serves to resolve the contradictions in the functions of education (Shavit, 1984). The adaptive function requires schools to be devoted to the production of
scholastic excellence. The integrative function requires that education be accessible to the entire population. To manifest the former, schools must be selective and maintain high academic standards, but for the latter function, the requirements must accommodate the wide distribution of scholastic abilities. Tracking is thought to resolve this problem. "The selective tracks are entrusted with the responsibility of producing scholastic excellence, while the low tracks provide educational opportunities to the 'masses'" (Shavit, 1984: 210).

Opponents of tracking, as will be seen in greater detail later, view it as an agent of social control in which social classes and inequality are reproduced. Students from disadvantaged backgrounds are generally assigned to low tracks that prevent them from further educational and socio-economic attainment. Upper-class students, however, are assigned to tracks that prepare them for better positions in the economy (Shavit, 1984; Bowles and Gintis, 1976).

The question of importance for this research is the degree to which tracks create class differences among women. The next section reviews the literature to determine if significant differences in curricular divisions do exist.

Differences Between Tracks. Previous research identifies several differences between curriculum programs within schools. One of these differences is the type and quality of instruction offered students. Persell (1977) cites several studies indicating that such differences exist and are significant. In so-called "slow-learning" groups, teachers stress basic skills and employ dull, unimaginative, and often repetitive instructional techniques, whereas with high ability
students, teachers emphasize conceptual learning and assign more independent projects. Rosenbaum (1976) found that the distribution of teachers varied by track—better teachers work with college track students. With data collected from teachers and students, Rosenbaum learned that instructors spend less time and devote less energy in preparing for and teaching noncollege track classes in comparison to academic track classes. Though on occasion noncollege students get the same teachers as the academic students, they do not get equal attention, concern, or quality of instruction.

Another way that tracks differ is by unequal access to educational resources. Heyns (1974) established that students in college tracks received more positive academic counseling, encouragement, and meetings with counselors than noncollege students. In addition, academic students regularly received superior class materials, laboratory facilities, field trips, and visitors than other students (Rosenbaum, 1976). Furthermore, vocational students are discouraged from participating in extra-curricular activities such as student government or newspaper.

Finally, teacher-student and student-student interaction varies by track. Freiberg (1970) found that academic track students receive more praise and empathy and less criticism than other groups. Rosenbaum (1976) also reports that a large number of noncollege students are the target of direct insults voiced not only by other students but by teachers and administrators as well.

Effects of Tracking. The literature points out several consequences of curricular divisions. First, all of the variables upon
which track divisions are usually made correlate with social class, race, and other ascribed characteristics. This means that students in a particular program will be more homogeneous than the school's total student population (Parelius and Parelius, 1978). Students from middle and upper class backgrounds are found in high-ability tracks while those from lower classes are over-represented in low-ability groups. Similar findings are reported for race: minorities are disproportionately placed in noncollege tracks. The result of this segregation may be that vocational and general track students do not receive adequate learning stimulation and that tracking may therefore serve to maintain existing class differences (McPartland, 1969; Heathers, 1969).

A second major implication of tracking is its effect on academic achievement. After an extensive review of the literature, Persell (1977) concludes that "separation into ability groups has no clear-cut positive or negative effect on the average scholastic achievement of the students involved" (92). However, academic students generally improve slightly while noncollege students experience substantial losses in scholastic achievement. Rosenbaum (1976) studied IQ scores of tracked students and found that the scores of academic students became more dispersed over time but the remaining students' marks became more similar to each other. His concluded that students in academic tracks were encouraged to develop individual growth and greater self-direction. Some succeeded, some did not. Vocational students, however, were sorted into a learning environment that
stresses conformity. The net result of these processes is greater academic differentiation among students.

A third consequence of tracking concerns students' sense of self. Though the literature is not definitive on this subject, most of the research concludes that track has a negative affect on nonacademic students. Students in advanced programs are labeled as such and treated in ways that boosts self-esteem and motivation. Nonacademic students, on the other hand, are often labeled as "dumb" by teachers and peers and consequently may come to see themselves in a negative way.

Finally, tracking has proved to produce differences in the attainment of further education. Those who are not taught mathematics or English beyond the basics have greater difficulty gaining admission to a four-year college or university. These students lack the formal credentials as well as the conceptual skills required to succeed in higher education. To do well in college often requires extensive remedial work that adds to the time and cost of the degree (Parelius and Parelius, 1978).

In conclusion, tracks appear to segregate students according to characteristics they bring to school. If placed in the academic track, one has a certain advantage over the others. Therefore curriculum differences may very well serve as an agent for maintaining class advantages and disadvantages (Alexander and McDill, 1976).
When studying the reproduction of the stratification system, researchers in the Marxian tradition have typically concentrated on workers' dialectic interaction with the workplace. Thinking that "modes of production" refers only to the economy, many fail to see that there is "social production" taking place in other institutions as well. When Marx himself writes, "In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will..." (1978), the idea of a mode of production becomes increasingly complex.

Generally the term "mode of production" is used to identify and categorize different forms of economic production and distribution (e.g., capitalism, feudalism, etc). For our purposes, the internal construction of these economic systems is of greater interest and it is thought to have two divisions—(a) the forces of production and (b) the relations of production. The former term implies the society's means of material production including the crafts and skills of the society's technology. The latter term, the relations of production, refers to the social arrangements that direct the forces of production. Here we find the institutionalized norms of power and the hierarchical structure of authority relations which legitimate the stratification of society (Heilbroner, 1980). Relationships in the organization are thus formalized giving "legal" dominance to some and not to others. The idea here is that inequality is built into the system because of the "rational" authority structure and the ideology that governs the relations among group members, thereby justifying the
distribution of wealth that produces dominant and subordinate classes. In other words, inequality becomes a structural feature of modern bureaucratic organization that is not due necessarily to individual differences in skill or capability.

The form of organization itself—that is, the relations of production—then becomes the primary agent through which those holding social power maintain it. Structured by a hierarchical division of labor and an undemocratic and bureaucratic framework of authority, the relations of production help those holding the dominant positions to control subordinates in order to further their own class interests. This conception of authority relations in production stresses that these characteristics are a "universal element of social structure" (Dahrendorf, 1959: 168) in modern capitalist society. Dahrendorf (pp.166-167) summarizes the qualities of these relations as follows:

1. Authority relations are always relations of super- and subordination.
2. Where there are authority relations, the superordinate element is socially expected to control, by orders and commands, warnings and prohibitions, the behavior of the subordinate element.
3. Such expectations attach to relatively permanent social positions rather than to the character of individuals; they are in this sense legitimate.
4. By virtue of this fact, they always involve specification of the persons subject to control and of the spheres within which control is permissible.
5. Authority being a legitimate relation, noncompliance with authoritative commands can be sanctioned; it is indeed one of the functions of the legal system to support the effective exercise of legitimate authority.

How are authority relations in the workplace linked to those in educational institutions? To understand how the schools select and allocate youths to adult positions in the social structure, we must
first make the connection between the structure of schooling and the attitudes and behaviors it cultivates in students. The theory outlined in this chapter follows the scheme designed by Bowles and Gintis (1976), which posits that the nature of bureaucratic education fosters attitudes and behaviors that are harmonious with participation in the labor force.

Schools, therefore, prepare young women (as well as males) for the kinds of activities and interpersonal behaviors that they can expect in the "real world." As Bowles and Gintis (1977a: 12) write:

(T)he relationships of authority and control between administrators and teachers, teachers and students, students and students, and students and their work replicate the hierarchical division of labor which dominates the workplace.

Revisionists, such as Bowles and Gintis, contend that schools act as a sort of "agent" for society: schools reflect the values of the general society and are biased in favor of the powerful classes. Schools provide structural restraints and are not the great individual equalizers that the technocratic-meritocratic perspective makes them out to be. Schools, however, are facilitators of the stratification system and "they facilitate better for some than for others" (Falk and Howell, 1981). Thus, schools do not accomplish their stated traditional liberal goals. Rather than foster creative individuality and educational and occupational equality, schools stifle fulfillment and create barriers to humanistic values. In this view, schooling "cannot be seen as a liberating agent, since it does not release people from the concerns and interests imposed by the social fabric..." (Jackman and Muha, 1984: 752).
The central underlying assumption of revisionist/reproduction theories of education is the special relationship between schools and the economy in which schools are thought to be the "handmaiden" of the economy. With emphases on grades, ranks, and degrees, the bureaucratization of education stratifies students as the economy stratifies workers. Students encounter an institution which singles out certain so-called ability groups for differential treatment that results in differential life outcomes. These lines are drawn typically by ascribed statuses—sex, race, and class—and perceived potential is measured on standardized exams and through other ascriptive means instead of proven ability. The structure of schooling partitions students into status groups that yields a work force already stratified to meet the demands, both cognitive and non-cognitive, of the capitalist workplace. This study takes the theoretical posture that the highly impersonal and specialized bureaucracy of formalized education, of which tracking is integral, organizes the consciousness of students in such a way as to reconstruct the existing relationships between social classes; a structure that in fact "mirrors" the kind of relations found in the capitalist workplace. For greater insight into this theory we turn to a discussion of the correspondence principle as presented by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis.

THE WORLD ACCORDING TO BOWLES AND GINTIS
In explaining the observed relationship between educational attainment and economic success, Bowles and Gintis devised a model that outlines the undemocratic and class-based character of economic and educational
experiences in American society. Rather than inequalities in cognitive education alone being responsible for social inequality, economic disparity becomes a function of the market, property, and power relations which define the society. The Bowles and Gintis model has five major points.

1. The first point emphasizes that the economic inequality and the types of personal development found in society are defined primarily by the market, property, and power relationships which constitute the capitalist system. And further, social change in the "degree of inequality and in socially directed forms of personal development" (1977a: 11) rely upon the processes of accumulating capital and economic growth.

2. Second, the educational system neither adds to nor subtracts from the total degree of social inequality. Education, on the contrary, is an important way by which the social relations of economic life are continued from one generation to the next. Schools provide a smooth passage for youth to move into the labor force. According to the theory, schools create and reinforce patterns of social class, racial and sexual identification among students which allow them to relate to their eventual position in the bureaucracy of the production process. Schools nurture types of personal development that are well-matched with the relationships of dominance and subordinacy in the economic sphere.

3. Third, these relations in school do not occur necessarily through the conscious intention of faculty and administrators in their daily activities, but through "a close correspondence between the
social relationships which govern personal interaction in the workplace and the social relationships of the educational system" (1977a: 12). Authority in the schools is structured along vertical lines from administrators down to students. Hence students have control over their programs similarly to the workers' control of their labor. Bowles, Gintis, and Meyer (1975: 8) suggest that alienated labor is reflected in the student's lack of control over his or her education, the alienation of the student from curriculum content, and the motivation of school work through a system of grades and other external rewards rather than the student's integration with either the process (learning) or the outcome (knowledge) of the educational 'production process'.

4. Fourth, the organization of education has varied historically in response to three factors: political and educational struggles associated with the process of capital accumulation, the extension of the wage-labor system, and the transition from an entrepreneurial to a corporate economy. The structure of education reflects the social dynamics of the economic system. From this final point, the democratic socialist orientation of Bowles and Gintis' work surfaces. Participatory control and democratization of social relationships among workers are central to educational reform. Once the foundations of property ownership and labor control are altered, education can overcome the social fragmentation and noncognitive specialization that characterizes it today. Nevertheless, at present, relations in school structure inequality and the competition for external rewards and credentials constitutes the "theme" of education. Thus doing well in
school typically means conforming to the values and expectations of the dominant social class.

5. Fifth, Bowles and Gintis show that the organization of education has taken distinct forms in different periods of American history. These forms have evolved in response to political and economic struggles associated with three historical processes: the process of capital accumulation, the extension of the wage-labor system, and the transition from an entrepreneurial to a corporate economy. This fifth point, though important in the grand scheme of the correspondence theory, is not crucial to the present study.

In its dissatisfaction with meritocratic explanations for schooling in modern society, Bowles and Gintis' argument deemphasizes the importance of IQ and cognitive test scores in explaining the intergenerational transmission of economic status. Though schools in fact advance and award the learning of cognitive skills, Bowles and Gintis contend that schooling also functions to develop the noncognitive traits that are necessary to fill labor positions in the capitalist relations of production. By stratifying students into different curriculum tracks, schools foster and reward the development of certain behavioral capacities while discouraging and punishing others. Different levels of the bureaucracy require different behavioral qualities, consisting mainly of different junctions of subordination and dominance (Brown and Saks, 1977); at the same time, experiences in schools are structured to sustain attitudes and behaviors that are in accordance with occupying special places in the labor force, that is, status positions. In this way, education becomes
a central structure for reproducing the existing order of social classes, a process known as the legitimation of inequality.

The concept of "correspondence" refers to those values, norms, structures, and processes of schooling that "mirror" the hierarchical social relations of bureaucratic, capitalist social organization. Therefore the patterns of authority, and more importantly, the outcomes of interaction, are not dissimilar to those found in the sphere of economic production. Since external awards (like economic rewards) are most highly desired (see Collins, 1979), then the personality and character traits that will achieve those rewards will be elicited by pupils and awarded by the school. By conditioning students to a set of social relations similar to those of work, education molds the development of needs, motivations, and aspirations, to the requirements of the workplace.

Schools do not exist in a "social vacuum" as functionalists present them (Gintis, 1972). To the contrary, the correspondence principle suggests that there is a tight fit between the structure of social relations that govern personal interaction at work and in school. Experiences in school, fragmented by curriculum tracks and grades, help to socialize a labor force which is differentiated along attitude and personality lines. These differences echo the social backgrounds of the students and direct them toward their probable economic futures. As Oakes (1982) asserts, this differential socialization "cements" the values and personality traits of the student's class of origin. Schooling reproduces "the self-concepts, aspirations and social class identifications of individuals to the
requirements of the social division of labor" (Bowles and Gintis, 1977a: 129). Schools become society's instrument for creating a learned but docile labor force. Hence, for example, minorities are often found in schools whose authority structures are repressive and arbitrary and where opportunities are limited. Likewise, working class students are taught behavioral control, passivity, and rule-following while middle and upper class students enjoy classrooms with open participation, less direct supervision, more electives, student leadership, and norms are internalized rather than enforced through coercive control (Oakes, 1982; Bowles and Gintis, 1977a; also see Morgan, 1977). And boys, more than their female peers, receive more behavioral criticism and instruction; more teacher interaction; more encouragement; and are directed toward more future-oriented, outside-the-home goals (Valli, 1982; Morgan, 1977; Lightfoot, 1975; Stacey, et al, 1974; Jackson and Lahederne, 1970;).

In summarizing the correspondence principle, by stratifying the socialization experience of students in the schooling process, the American class system reproduces itself. Bowles and Gintis theorize that in contemporary education different capabilities, attitudes, and behaviors are rewarded. Students become accustomed to the social conditions of work by confronting an education structure that closely resembles that of the workplace. Educational achievement amounts to the students' ability to conform to the values of the school rather than rewards for their actual accomplishments. Segmenting future workers into status groups along gender lines prepares young women for the pink collar world that awaits them. Education is unable (or better
unwilling) to equalize society and therefore reproduces and legitimates existing social inequality.

CRITICISMS OF THE CORRESPONDENCE THEORY

The work of Bowles and Gintis, primarily Schooling in Capitalist America, is a milestone in the education literature. Yet despite the apparent attractiveness of the correspondence principle as a contemporary application of marxist method and theory, it is not without criticism. Critiques of the correspondence principle range from polemical debates (Ault, 1977) to acute theoretical and methodological matters. This section reviews these criticisms as well as its paradigmatic polarity—the status attainment model.

At the paradigmatic level, the correspondence principle challenges traditional status attainment research. With its legacy from Parsonian thought, the status attainment model relies on the meritocratic assumption of the "free," homogeneous labor market (Horan, 1978). In attempting to understand the way in which status is inherited and achieved (Campbell, 1983), status attainment, also referred to as the Wisconsin model, stresses the characteristics that individuals bring with them into the labor market. These traits, such as aspirations (Haller, 1982), IQ (Blau and Duncan, 1967), ability (Duncan, 1968), and education, are judged as "positive" or "negative" with regard to openly competitive labor market conditions. The general hypothesis of status attainment is that differences in individual qualities result in the achievement of different levels of education and occupational and economic success. Though family background is important in the
Wisconsin model, its influence is seen to diminish as the individual acquires his/her own attributes. Probably the most important of these qualities is the child's educational and occupational aspirations (Haller, 1982), which influence the child's early achievements which, in turn affect income later in the life cycle (Falk, 1982).

Status attainment essentially becomes a theory of "human capital;" that is, one "invests" in those attributes such as education and training that will pay the most social dividends. Through this process, individuals with the most desirable skills and personality traits will gain access to the socially-prized economic opportunities.

In further contrast to the correspondence principle, the Wisconsin model views the social structure as comprised of levels of performance (occupations) that are differentially evaluated and rewarded in competitive situations (Horan, 1978). Structure then takes on a very subjective definition since it depends upon the prestige ranking of occupations by the general population. Social inequality, then, is not so much a structural feature of the labor market as it is a reflection of the rankings of the individual characteristics that people bargain with when competing for jobs.

Representing liberal ideology, the status attainment model is a highly individualistic and volunteeristic model which, if market conditions are homogeneous throughout the society, automatically excludes questions concerning the structural characteristics of that market and of education as a means for explaining stratification in society:
The competitive market situation...guarantees that the differential placement of individuals in the socioeconomic order is a reflection of the individual characteristics brought into the marketplace by the worker (Horan, 1978: 537).

To status attainment researchers, education is the means by which persons acquire the skills necessary to realize their aspirations. Theoretically, just as the labor market is freely competitive, so is education. Therefore, inherent in the theory of correspondence is the antithesis of the status attainment scheme. Status attainment claims that the labor market has few restrictions and the individual is responsible for conforming to the demands that will win the most rewards. The correspondence theory, however, posits that education restricts the experiences of students so that the probability of equal opportunities in the labor market is unlikely.

Now turning to specific criticisms of the correspondence principle, Tunnell's (1978) comments center on the ideological issues raised by Bowles and Gintis. According to Tunnell, schools reproduce economic inequality two different ways. One, it occurs in a non-legitimating sense by providing unequal resources to students, programs, and schools. In a capitalist system, "there will be economic inequality regardless of whether schools track or not" (335). Tracking, nevertheless, works as a channeling and formalizing process which initiates inequality "earlier than it would otherwise begin" (335).

Second, Tunnell argues that schools reproduce inequality by legitimating it through tracking, through the correspondence principle, and through reproducing sets of ideological beliefs. Tunnell asserts that Bowles and Gintis ought to concentrate on criticizing the liberal
policy of the non-legitimate programs because these policies actually violate and contradict liberal philosophy. However, liberals "could argue that tracking and differential financing [in education] ...are unjustifiable and ought to be ended. If they were ended, they would have little effect on capitalism" (341). Tunnell claims that the correspondence principle, by not attacking the liberal ideology and its acceptance of meritocracy, does little to indicate the actual causes of the so-called legitimate means schools use to reproduce economic inequality.

A second criticism is that the correspondence principle is conspiratorial. Tunnell claims that Bowles and Gintis see schools as deliberately formed by capitalists to meet their demands for structured inequality. Other critics such as Giroux (1981) and Gramsci (1971) note that correspondence theories rely too heavily on the concept of direct force in explaining the maintainence of social control and the reproduction of classes.

Third, Bowles and Gintis' explanation of class reproduction has been criticized as philosophically functionalistic. Tunnell makes mention of the inherent functionalist design of the conspiracy criticism noted above. To LaBrecque (1978), the theory has antecedents in both Durkheim and Marx and thus he interprets Bowles and Gintis as a mixture of functionalism and conflict perspectives. From Durkheim the correspondence principle fits into the social systems model which posits that social institutions function to allow the system to persist. Education's role is to pass along the values, norms, and knowledge required for social order and cohesion. On the other hand,
from Marx, the correspondence principle inherits the "society in conflict" ideology and the perception that the undemocratic structure of schools supports the dominant class of elites. The result is what Gorelick (1977) called "radical functionalism."

Yet another criticism of the correspondence principle as a theory of class reproduction is that it over-simplifies the relationship between the class system and education and that it takes a passive view of socialization. Apple (1979; 1980) believes that the "mirror image" analogy of the relationship between schooling and working is an over-simplification. According to Apple, "if schools are wholly determined and can do no more than mirror economic relations outside of them, then nothing can be done within the educational sphere" (1980, 48). The logic of the correspondence principle forces us to see the schools as only reproductive agents of social order and little else. By maintaining this position, correspondence theorists may miss the socialization of resistance and relative autonomy that is quite often found in school and the workplace. As examples, Apple points to studies that highlight covert worker or student resistance to authority; cases where workers quietly "rebel" against teachers or employers. Secondly, and more viably, he reviews Willis' (1977) work on working class boys in England that shows how these youths reject the norms of the school. Apple's critique claims that strict adherence to the correspondence principle implies a passive view of socialization. The correspondence, to Apple, is overly mechanistic: Do students always internalize norms unquestioningly? If this is the case, the
correspondence concept "misses" the actual responses of workers and students which may contradict the premises of the theory.

Giroux claims that the theory too narrowly focuses on control within the economic realm:

This is a crucial theoretical flaw because it tends to rest on a base/superstructure model of reproduction in which politics and ideological institutions such as schools appear epiphenomenal, secondary forces that have no autonomous or semi-autonomous existence of their own and which end up being absorbed by the imperatives of capitalist production (Giroux, 1981: 94).

Therefore consciousness is reduced to a passive voice and the socio-cultural forces that mediate between the forces of production and consciousness are lost (Giroux, 1981).

LaBrecque also charges the theory with being over-simplistic. First, taking a pluralistic view of society, LaBrecque contends that the characteristics of schools are also likely to be explained by other factors such as the competition between "relatively equal groups" (1978) rather than simply employing a model of elite societal control. Not considering this variable has the consequence of radical critics not appreciating the allegiance of the competing groups to schools as a useful weapon in the internecine warfare among themselves (LeBrecque, 1978: 197).

To illustrate this position, LaBrecque cites Daniel Bell's (1973) theory that those who comprise the new working class are not thinking about overhauling the economy but are concerned about their relative status within their own social class.
A fifth criticism is that if the structure of education "mirrors" the structure of the economy, it does not follow necessarily that the social relations of industry cause the organization of education. LaBrecque claims this criticism is a consequence of the correspondence principle's outright functionalism. Others such as Giroux argue that the theory ignores the role of capital and the role of other institutions in the socio-cultural sphere as factors that cause class reproduction. Gorelick (1977) claims the model is too static, underplaying contradictions in the capitalist system and discounting prospects for change. In addition she contends "the model of an all-powerful integrated structure ignores the potential agents of change—the victims of the system's oppression" (22).

Finally, from a strict Marxian approach, Gorelick questions the actual "leftness" of Bowles and Gintis. Bowles and Gintis, as seen earlier, emphasize the concept of hierarchy in their analysis of education. The hierarchical division of labor in schools and work is theorized to be the mechanism by which the capitalist class accumulates their wealth and power. Gorelick, however, challenges the significance of the concept. By stressing the mechanics of social hierarchy they "forget, neglect, or deny the processes of accumulation which is at the heart of capitalism" (28). The structure of hierarchies rather than exploitative class relationships is the principal target of analysis for Bowles and Gintis—"their major Satan is hierarchy" (Gorelick, 1977: 29).

Gorelick charges that Bowles and Gintis take a narrow view of alienation and fail to recognize the contradictions in capitalist
structure which may cause it. Their treatment of alienation reveals the "defects" in the hierarchy concept. In orthodox Marxism, the source of alienation is more than workers' loss of control of the labor process; it is also the fact that workers create the capital which dominates them. Though Bowles and Gintis have a material base in analyzing alienation to represent powerlessness, they fail to recognize it as a process of creation of wealth by workers, and robbery by owners. In 'hierarchy' the worker, creator of capital and antagonist of capital, is reduced to the mere victim of capital (Gorelick, 1977: 31, emphasis in original).

If schooling functions to stratify the working class in accordance with the needs of the division of labor hierarchy, then the concept of class changes from a qualitative concept to a quantitative, continuous one which hampers understanding of the contradictory problems of ruling class culture. Imagining class in this way makes it impossible to notice the exploitive relationships of class dominance and expose the contradictory nature of these relations. Gorelick concludes her polemic with the following: "For if the workers are merely the bottom rung of the hierarchy, how will they ever liberate themselves, and us, from the tyranny of a class system?" (1977: 33).

**EMPIRICAL TESTS OF THE CORRESPONDENCE THEORY**

Much of the criticism of Bowles and Gintis' theory is that they provide little empirical evidence of actual differences in the social relationships in schooling that could socialize students into groups whose attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors differ according to their
future economic roles. Hargreaves (1982) characterizes contemporary marxist sociology of education as restricted by a "theoretical closure" and an absence of empirical rigor explained by an optimistic commitment to social change. Marxian scholarship is tied down, supposedly, by its value-laden and politically-oriented origins and therefore is unlikely to analyze successfully the association between schooling and capitalism.

Probably a more accurate explanation for the small body of empirical literature in support of the correspondence theory (as well as other marxist sociologies of education) comes from Howell and McBroom (1982). To them, the correspondence principle serves as a "'sensitizing' perspective because...it is not fully and explicitly testable in its present form" (49). Hence there is a conceptual void in specifying the actual nature of the "corresponding" social relationships.

Nevertheless, a number of researchers have extracted several propositions from the reproduction theory of education for empirical testing (though not all tests are based on Bowles and Gintis' version of the theory; see Rosen, 1980). This section reviews the empirical research of the correspondence principle conducted thus far.

Using Olneck's "Kalamazoo Brothers" sample, Olneck and Bills (1981) test three propositions implied in the correspondence principle. These propositions are:

1. Holding constant relevant noncognitive traits will reduce the apparent relationship between years of schooling and economic success.
2. Holding constant measures of cognitive skill will not reduce the apparent relationship between years
of schooling and economic success, except insofar as cognitive and noncognitive characteristics are related. 3. The noncognitive characteristics which schools reward, for example with higher grades, are the same characteristics the labor market rewards.

Despite the fact that many of Bowles and Gintis' predictions are substantiated in the research of Olneck and Bills, they fail to support these hypotheses. They conclude that the formal reward structure of education does not respond to the same characteristics as does the reward structure in the labor market because of the wide variations in the grades of men with equivalent levels of educational achievement. Olneck and Bills agree with Bowles and Gintis in recognizing that sons of high status fathers get better first jobs but note that the causal factors are unrelated to noncognitive traits. Personality characteristics, however, are related to cognitive differences.

Based on their research, Olneck and Bills conclude the following: (1) High school grades do not differentiate successful from unsuccessful men with the same amount of schooling. (2) Men judged highly cooperative in school receive better grades but enter lower-status occupations. (3) The apparent effects of educational attainment on economic success persist even when measures of personality are controlled. (4) The effects of education on earnings can partially be explained by the association of attainment with cognitive skills. (5) Variations in cognitive skills are associated with significant differences in earnings. (6) The one measure of personality associated with higher earnings is unrelated to higher grades.
With these conclusions, Olneck and Bills believe abandoning the technocratic-meritocratic model would be premature. Olneck and Bills recommend that Bowles and Gintis should question the explanatory and interpretive premises of the technocratic-meritocratic model instead of disputing its empirical predictions.

Though Olneck and Bills' findings generally do not support the correspondence concept, their sample design makes the study ungeneralizable and hence an unsatisfactory test of the Bowles and Gintis thesis. First, respondents were aged 35-59 years when studied in 1973-74. The mean year of birth was 1930 so the average age of the respondents was about 43-44. The sample, then, was in secondary school when school tracking was little used. Olneck and Bills give no suggestion that the sample was systematically stratified by curriculum. Secondly, the sample is male and "virtually all" white. Women and minorities were certainly facing discriminatory education practices in their day, even in Michigan. By excluding such groups, Olneck and Bills make it easy to reject the propositions of Bowles and Gintis because it is precisely these groups that schools are thought to channel away from the better opportunities in the labor market.

Howell and McBroom (1982) and Oakes (1982) test hypotheses from the correspondence principle and find results that are more supportive, especially when considering the role played by the family. To Bowles and Gintis, the family reflects the experiences of parents at work. Parents socialize their children to have the self-concepts and aspirations to attain economic positions similar to their own. School relations reinforce personality developments already begun in the
family "haven" to facilitate the correspondence of intergenerational inequality (Howell and McBroom, 1982). This is what Falk and Howell (1981) and Howell and McBroom (1982) call the "family-school-economy troika".

Howell and McBroom (1982) analyze one specific part of the troika—"the correspondence of authority and interpersonal relationships experienced at home in the context of the family and at school with classroom teachers" (41). Their general hypothesis is that there should be a similarity in the "nature" of social relations in the home and in schools if certain personality traits that are deemed important for placement in the economic sector are cultivated in the family and then reinforced in schools. Interaction patterns in child-parent and child-teacher relationships are thus hypothesized to be positively related.

Using an all male sample, Howell and McBroom find that the linkage between social background and family relations is small; their results indicate that the correspondence principle has a weak link in inferring that occupational experiences actually influence social relations in the family between parents and (male) children (46).

However, Howell and McBroom are quite clear in reporting that the correspondence between family and school relations is significant:

Substantive correlations were obtained between specific dimensions of parent-child and teacher-student interaction patterns which conform to the correspondence principle (50).

Oakes' (1982) study is among the first to explore Bowles and Gintis' proposition that schools reproduce the consciousness of workers by sorting them into groups where different capabilities, attitudes,
and behaviors are rewarded. Analyzing 139 classrooms from 25 secondary schools, Oakes concluded that track placement, which is closely associated with race, social class, and gender, accounts for the differential treatment students receive at school:

Low track classes may help to socialize students from lower groups toward passivity; institutional relationships characterized by dominance, coercion, and distance; and alienation from the educational environment. On the contrary, relationships and interactions in high track classes may help socialize students toward more active involvement; institutional relationships that are more characterized by warmth and concern; and greater affiliation with the learning process (Oakes, 1982: 198-99).

If these conditions exist, Oakes hypothesizes that tracking serves to reinforce and reproduce established social inequality by "limiting some students' positive participation in the educational experience" (1982: 199).

Oakes' findings support the hypotheses drawn from Bowles and Gintis. Students in lower tracks were found to have more negative feelings about themselves and more apathy towards school. Her results support a strong association between level of educational aspirations, and self-concept with track-level separation. On the other hand, variables such as grades, liking the subject, perception of the subject studied, and general satisfaction with the class are less useful in explaining track differences.

Students' attitudes, according to Oakes, are distributed among track levels in ways that are consistent with the concept of the legitimation of inequality. Students in high tracks had higher aspirations and more positive self-concepts. Lower track students had
more modest aspirations, more negative self-concepts. In addition, these latter students felt they were not as well liked at school and felt a general sense of unworthiness.

Oakes' findings support a large literature on tracking which attests to the unequal assignment of track placements (for example see Rosenbaum, 1978; 1976). With this as the case, Oakes seems to have supported the correspondence principle: the unequal experiences kids have in school parallel the unequal social relations they can expect in the working world.

Finally, Colclough (1985) examined how the various aspects of the educational structure contribute to the maintenance of the mental-manual division of labor. She looked at the reproduction effects of public versus private schooling, the composition of school communities, and curriculum tracking. Her tests suggest that schooling experiences affects class reproduction and that tracking is the most important factor in this process. For her sample of manual class males, being in the vocational track significantly increases the probability of remaining in that class. Being allocated to the academic track for this group increased the chances of upward mobility. For males from the mental class, the effects are the opposite: if assigned to the vocational track, they are likely to experience downward mobility and the academic track increases the chances of remaining within the mental class.

Colclough's results strongly show that the structure of education is an important factor in the reproduction of social class. Of most importance, she finds that class reproduction is more a product of
curriculum tracking within schools than the type of school—public or private—or socioeconomic background of the school's community.

THE MODEL

In light of the correspondence principle, a model of social class reproduction is proposed. Following the logic of the models derived by Oakes, Howell and McBroom, and Colclough, the present model reflects social class processes. This model of class reproduction examines how the class origins of students are translated into similar class outcomes after passing through the class-sorting mechanism of schooling.

For the theory of correspondence to be tested adequately, two types of research are needed. One is to test Bowles and Gintis' hypotheses that the social relations of school reflect those in the workplace. Another is to use longitudinal data to ascertain if reproduction actually takes place because of those social relations. The present study is of the latter type; longitudinal data are used to compare life course processes of women assigned to academic tracks with those in vocational tracks. When a young girl is assigned into a track position in school, how will it affect her in later life? As Colclough mentions, these positions shape the educational experiences of students, subsequently allocating them to mental or manual occupations later on (1985: 14). Each position in school has attached to it behaviors, attitudes, and skills which help to socialize students to the different work habits and social demands of different positions in the workplace (Colclough, 1985; Bowles and Gintis, 1977). Therefore,
having been socialized into the work habits appropriate for staffing better jobs, there should be a fairly close association between position in the authority hierarchy and level of schooling for those in the higher classes (Wright and Perrone, 1977).

Schooling is a mediator for women as they move from their class of origin to their class of destination. Their experiences in schools may reinforce "feminine" behaviors and attitudes which condition them to a greater acceptance of the values of pink collar "women's" work. However, as Apple noted, pupils do not react passively to the educational bureaucracy. What is important here is that the educational structure itself guides some women into traditionalist wrappings, training them for a pink collar future. For many, this future promises a woman of always holding two less-than-desirable jobs—as a low paid labor force participant and as a non-paid domestic (Coverman, 1983; Chafetz, 1978).

Of course, the line between schooling and adult occupational behavior is not a direct one. Instead numerous activities and events occur along the way. Two of these have direct bearing on the sex-based relationship between schooling and the world of work: these are one's orientation toward sex roles and one's self-esteem. Track programs in schools will be explored to determine whether student attitudes seem to cluster within specific track levels.

Sex role values are an important mediator between track and job allocation for women. Lower educational achievement for both mother and daughter have been associated with a more traditional sex role orientation. Contemporary sex role beliefs, furthermore, are derived
from higher educational attainment for mother and daughter and work experience prior to marriage (Smith-Lovin and Tickameyer, 1978). A theory of correspondence might explain this relationship in two ways. One, a low track assignment makes it difficult to reach higher education after high school. And two, the differences in educational experiences would probably lead to different sex role orientations. If vocational tracks foster less independent thinking and greater conformity to traditional norms, then it is expected that women in academic tracks have a greater chance of maintaining contemporary sex role attitudes. If vocational students' esteem is low and their gender identity traditional, Oakes hypothesizes that these students at the bottom of the educational hierarchy have adjusted their attitudes to internalize the norms and values they have encountered.

Sex role attitudes are related to self-perceptions. Oakes (1982) found that self-concept is strongly related to track. Students in the academic track had significantly more positive attitudes about themselves than did students in low track classes. In support of Bowles and Gintis, Oakes' findings show that the relations in low track classes were more characterized by alienation, distance, and authority than high track classes. Not only do students at the bottom feel less affiliation with schooling, but they also feel greater detachment from their peers and even themselves. Despite the fact that students in all tracks report about the same levels of satisfaction towards their schools, it is speculated that

low track students see themselves and their own inadequacies, not the hierarchical structure or differential treatment of the schools, as
responsible for their current positions and future roles in the hierarchical structure (Oakes, 1982: 209).

Rosenbaum (1976) reports an association between tracking and esteem similar to Oakes. Students are aware that the academic track offers a better education, higher prestige, and probably better rewards than the vocational programs. Hence, students in the upper track hold a relatively higher position in the school hierarchy. Non-academic students believe that their choice of a noncollege track was a choice of an inferior position in the school.

(W)hen asked why they chose their track, nearly all noncollege-track students...explicitly state that they chose it because of their own personal shortcomings....A student's choice of a noncollege track becomes an admission to himself and to the school at large that he belongs in a lower status position (Rosenbaum, 1976: 167).

The program a student takes in school depends partly on self-perceptions. If a student perceives of him/herself as having high abilities and aspirations, then it is likely that the student will opt for a higher track curriculum.

Sex role attitudes and self-esteem are antecedents of and operate in conjunction with three additional variables—fertility, marital behavior, and educational attainment—in the correspondence between tracking and adult jobs. A contemporary sex role orientation, higher educational achievement, and labor force participation all increase a woman's intentions to have two or fewer children (Tickamyer, 1979). Though there is debate concerning the causal direction of these relationships, women who have more alternatives are less committed to
family activities and have lower fertility preferences. When women delay first marriages, they increase the possibility of secondary socialization into extrafamilial adult roles by increasing the probability of educational attainment, work before marriage, and financial independence (Smith-Lovin and Tickamyer, 1978: 554).

Later marriage also leads to lower fertility. Early marriages, on the other hand, tend to limit experiences outside the family arena and to reduce the chances for meaningful career employment.

Since World War II, the occupational structure of American society has expanded to allow more women into the labor force—creating opportunities for women to gain economic independence and have gratifying careers. While education has been found to have strong positive effects on women's employment (Waite, 1976), women having more education (and possibly a more modern sex role definition) may find themselves in incompatible roles. On one hand, women with more education are more likely to work in better jobs and have a greater identity and commitment to those occupational roles (Tickamyer, 1979; Waite, 1976). On the other hand, with this option available, motherhood and housewifing become less attractive life goals (Tickamyer, 1979) despite the social pressures to conform to the traditional expectations of women.

Not only are women subject to the forces of sexism as they enter the labor market, they are also confronted by the processes of schooling within corporate capitalism. Therefore, women from working class origins are more likely to be assigned to or to pick a vocational or general curriculum track in high school. According to the
correspondence principle, these students learn the behaviors, attitudes, and skills that are considered appropriate for manual statuses in the workplace (Colclough, 1985).

As stated earlier in this chapter, schooling is not a factor that may be thought of as actually causing the differences in attitudes and behaviors found in students taking different curricula. Most agree that students bring many of their skills, attitudes, and potentials with them to school and that the sorting of students is really a reflection of those differences. What Bowles and Gintis maintain is that the social relationships that accompany a particular track program cements the original student differences in attitudes and potential behaviors (e.g. fertility rates). Therefore, one benefit of using longitudinal data will be to see if students in vocational and academic tracks continue to have different experiences or if events in their life cycles begin to equalize.

Figure 1 provides a diagram of the model being used in this study. This model reflects the correspondence theory already discussed and concepts thought to be important in the correspondence process. These concepts are arranged in both logical and temporal ordering with early class placement as the key dependent variable. Given the theoretical propositions discussed and the literature already cited, nine hypotheses are listed for empirical testing. These hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1. Track assignment will be positively related to social class of destination. Women who took a vocational track in high school are more likely to eventually hold a lower class position than women from
the academic track.

Hypothesis 2. Women who took a vocational track will have a more traditional orientation to sex roles than women from the academic track.

Hypothesis 3. Women who took a vocational track will have lower self-esteem than those from the academic track.

Hypothesis 4. Women who took a vocational track are more likely to be married than women from the academic track.

Hypothesis 5. Women from the vocational track with lower levels of educational attainment will be less likely to hold a mental class position.

Hypothesis 6. Women from a higher track with no children are more likely to have a mental class of destination.

Hypothesis 7. Women from the academic track who are single are more likely to have a mental class position.

Hypothesis 8. Women from the academic track with non-traditional sex role attitudes are more likely to hold a mental class position.

Hypothesis 9. Women from the academic track with higher self-esteem are more likely to have a mental class position.

The general hypothesis in this research is that education works as a sorting mechanism to reproduce the existing class structure. To answer Gorelick's criticism that the correspondence principle focuses too strongly on the concept of hierarchical structure and not the historical processes of the accumulation of capital, hierarchy is
neither a causal factor in explaining the reproduction of social
classes nor is it the "demon" of modern social science. Hierarchy
becomes the device which "structures" the everyday experiences of women
as they progress in school. It is the embodiment of patriarchal values
and capitalist organization. Furthermore, hierarchy is not a "theory"
of conspiracy but a system of institutionalized values and practices
that are part of the American social system.
Critics of the correspondence theory have noted that Bowles and Gintis offered little direct empirical evidence to support their extensive hypotheses. While other studies have researched the structural differences between tracks and the similarities between school and family relations, there has been no longitudinal research to show the duration of the effects of differential tracking and authority relations in school on women. This study hopes to unravel some of the questions about tracking in schools: Who is in which track? How is track related to attitudes? How is track related to life outcomes?

The question of how social structure affects individuals may very well be the definitive sociological puzzle. Dating back to the triumvirate of classical sociology—Marx, Durkheim, and Weber—theories of social action have wrestled with this question. Arguing over the qualities the relationship between structure and individuals can take, sociologists have debated on which level (i.e. macro vs. micro) sociological theory should focus while some dispute the existence of structure itself. Theories of stratification and education have followed a similar pattern. Whereas individualist theories such as status attainment fail to consider structural characteristics of the labor market, education, and authority, structural theories often visualize the individual with an almost tabula rasa philosophy. Students receive messages passively while indifferently internalizing
norms and values with little negotiation or resistance. Is individual behavior simply a reflection of social structure? Is socialization such a dominating process that humans are passive receptors to its demands?

Questions addressed in this study concern the longevity of the outcomes of school tracking assignments. To what degree does vocational education determine life outcomes and reproduce the existing class structure? How do the early decisions students make determine the rest of their lives? Gaskell's (1985) ethnography of working class girls who selected business courses in high school addresses the first step in this process: the decision to enter a vocational program. Rather than taking a solely individualistic orientation to what may seem to be an individual problem, Gaskell shows that girls' decisions to take a vocational program in school are really a function of their class-based knowledge of the school and of the society. To Gaskell the problem

is to reconceptualize the issue in a way that incorporates both the orientation of the student, i.e., individual consciousness, and the organization of the school, i.e., social structure (49).

In order to avoid the failings of the purely structural perspective, the present research follows the approaches taken by Valli (1983), Gaskell (1985), and Willis (1977). According to Valli, there are three possible relations to cultural reproduction processes: acceptance, negotiation, and resistance. Young women will accept gender-related work messages when they are congruent with the past and the perceived future and when no alternatives are given. Negotiation
and resistance imply rejection of the cultural messages and practices and occur when there is incongruity, that is when the messages do not fit the student's self-image. Negotiation occurs when the individual or group perceives some sense of control or power over the situation and the struggle seems worth the strain. Resistance is selected when negotiation appears futile. Resistance can be as direct as refusing to follow an order or quitting a job, or it can take some covert configuration. Valli contends that women who opt for a vocational program in school and adopt a traditional sex role orientation receive ideological messages in school that support the gender-specific patterns and relations they had become accustomed to both at home and in the general society. In Valli's words:

Their primary mode of behavior, therefore, was to accept, almost to fall naturally and spontaneously into, a sexual division of labor and the subordinate roles for women it implies (1983: 214).

Gaskell's analysis of female vocational students indicates that certain class-based social-psychological factors structure the choices of female students to enter vocational programs. Working class girls enter school with perceptions and expectations that lead them to the vocational curriculum: they generally rejected the value of education, sought skills for jobs most available to women, and desired skills that would get them a job as soon as possible. Gaskell's study shows that students actively attempt to embed their backgrounds and orientations in a specific institutional context.

Willis (1977) also studied individual choices within a social context. In his study of English boys, he found that working class
students did not passively accept the socialization process of the school but found ways to undermine the formal activities of the institution and the students who conformed. Willis argues that working class culture confirms and rewards the values and behaviors of overt masculinity and physical labor. Students, therefore, make personal decisions about education in ways that are meaningful. Because of this resistance, the boys reinforce the expectations of the working class "culture" but condemn their own education and futures.

Society presents us with a cultural and structural backdrop which shapes our experiences, colors our outlook, and delimits our expectations and opportunities. Individuals make decisions within the context of their structural origins. In the dialectic between individuals and structure, it is reasonable to suggest that decisions reached by individuals will, in varying degrees, be congruent with this social context; thus expectations are shaped by prior knowledge of what society must be like. In this way, the expectations of the school and general society become accepted as a general expectation of life itself. Returning to the question of how class reproduces itself, we can see that social context becomes a determinant of life outcomes; it is within a social context that people make decisions which directly and indirectly influence such life outcomes as occupational attainment and fertility. Schooling is an important part of that context. In fact, as discussed up to this point, virtually all aspects of a woman's life are bound up in what Valli has called the "culture of femininity."

As seen in Chapter Two, the correspondence principle claims that the variation in structural arrangements between different curricula
work to create a splintered "consciousness" in the student population—the college (or, academic) track anticipating one set of life outcomes, the vocational track anticipating quite another. To examine this, the present model focuses on class processes rather than individual processes in order to learn if women who take the same curriculum experience similar life course events. The units of analysis for this study, then, are the women from each track in the high school years.

DATA
To test the central hypothesis that school tracking reproduces class position among women, data were used from the 1972 and 1979 waves of the National Longitudinal Study (NLS) of the High School Class of 1972. Selecting high school seniors from over 1,000 schools, the NLS conducted its base survey with followups administered in October of 1973, 1974, 1976, and 1979. A number of studies in occupational sociology and the sociology of education have documented the utility and versatility of this rich data file (for a review of users see Eckland and Alexander, 1980).

Sampling Process. After a series of field tests, the NLS commenced in the spring of 1972 with a national probability sample of 22,652 seniors from 1,070 public and private high schools. All high school seniors in the United States in 1972 constituted the population. The sample was drawn by a two-stage, probability, stratified design with schools as first-stage sampling units and students as second-stage units. Schools were stratified by region, twelfth grade enrollment,
proximity to institutions of higher learning, percent minority enrollment, income level of the community, and degree of urbanization. Schools with high proportions of minority group enrollments were over-sampled to increase the number of disadvantaged students in the sample (Eckland and Alexander, 1980).

For the present research, the analysis was limited only to those women for whom data were available for all necessary followup surveys. Furthermore, only whites are included in the sample. As Falk, Falkowski, and Lyson (1981) show, a subsample of whites represented in all panels of the data does not differ significantly from the total NLS sample. However, because of serious missing data problems with some items (over 50 percent in some cases), analyses of minority groups in the NLS data are potentially problematic, thus the (reluctant) decision here to omit them. Restricting the sample to white females surveyed in 1972 and 1979, the first and last years of the survey, leaves 5,146 respondents included in this study.

**OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE VARIABLES**

**Dependent Variable.** The dependent variable for this study is social class of destination. Defining social class is not only a trying theoretical issue but a complicated methodological one as well. Based upon the assumptions of a particular theory, the operationalization of class can take several forms. Functionalists, for example, see class as a set of categories which represent common status positions in society. An alternative view (and more Marxian)
conceptualizes classes as authority positions and the relations between them, such as Dahrendorf's command and obey classes.

Similarly Braverman (1974) distinguishes between manual and mental classes. Categorizing occupations based on their relationship to the means of production, Braverman separates classes by those occupations that design and plan work and those that execute work. The mental class refers to those positions requiring thinking and educated labor whereas the manual class requires less thinking and more physical labor. Braverman calls this the separation of conception from execution (1974). Braverman's scheme is based on his interpretation of the workplace in a monopolistic capitalist economy. Due to mass production, mechanization, and scientific management, workers have seen their jobs become highly specialized, routinized, and deskilled. The simplification of tasks reduces the value of the employee's labor since the completion of the job requires little skill or ego involvement. This "degradation" of labor lowers its price and provides management not only with a dominant role in the production process but with greater profitability structured into the system. Authority is centralized within management insuring management control over the "special knowledge of production" (Edwards, 1979: 104). If workers are more "controllable," Kanter (1977) contends, managers and owners are justified in receiving higher rewards and privileges.

Since the system of monopoly capitalism created the kinds of jobs dominated by women in today's economy, Braverman's operationalization of class position is particularly useful. This scheme indicates
relative positions in occupational settings without concern for traditional prestige rankings.

The dependent variable in this study, then, is Braverman's mental/manual class dichotomy. This conceptualization of class was used by Colclough (1985) and the coding scheme closely resembles hers. For specifications in coding, see Appendix 1.

Independent Variables. Of the six independent variables, school track is predicted to be the most critical in determining the correspondence between schooling and class reproduction. Track represents the program the respondent studied in high school. To operationalize track, dummy variables are created: 1=vocational track, 2=general studies track, 3=college prep track. Using NLS data on males, Colclough (1985) found that curriculum tracking is a critical factor in the reproduction of social class, but that the effects of all three tracks are not even. Her findings indicate that reproduction was stronger for academic tracks and vocational tracks. That is, those in the upper track were more likely to be from the mental class and subsequently to be employed in white collar jobs. Similarly, students in vocational tracks came from the working class and usually attained blue collar jobs. On the other hand, Colclough's study shows that being channeled into a general track has little significant effect on the probability of class reproduction. Nevertheless, all three track curricula are included in this study in order (1) to include the large number of respondents (nearly 30%) in the general track; and (2) to test whether Colclough's findings also hold for women.
Two of the independent variables theorized to have an impact on the class outcomes of women are attitudinal measures. These variables are hypothesized to have a positive effect on class reproduction. The first is sex role orientation (SEXRL79) which is measured by NLS in a ten item instrument scored on a four point Likert Scale. Respondents were asked if they agree strongly (=1), agree (=2), disagree (=3), or disagree strongly (=4) with the following items ("No Opinion" responses excluded from scale):

1. A working mother of pre-school children can be just as good a mother as the woman who doesn't work.

2. It is usually better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.

3. Young men should be encouraged to take jobs that are usually filled by women (nursing, secretarial work, etc).

4. Most women are just not interested in having big and important jobs.

5. Many qualified women can't get good jobs: men with the same skills have much less trouble.

6. Most women are happiest when they are making a home and caring for children.

7. High school counselors should urge young women to train for jobs which are now held mainly by men.

8. It is more important for a wife to help her husband than to have a career herself.

9. Schools teach women to want the less important jobs.

10. Men should be given first chance at most jobs because they have the primary responsibility for providing for a family.

These items were factor analyzed and an index was computed. (See APPENDIX 2 for factor matrix). Subjects were then divided into two
fairly equal-sized groups representing traditional (=1) and nontraditional (=2) attitudes towards gender roles.

Self-esteem (SELF79), the second attitude variable, was measured by an eight-item instrument. It, too, was measured by forced-choice categories eliciting strength of agreement. The items were:

1. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
2. Good luck is more important than hard work for success.
3. I feel I am a person of worth, on an equal plane with others.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. Every time I try to get ahead something or somebody stops me.
6. Planning only makes a person unhappy since plans hardly ever work out anyway.
7. People who accept their condition in life are happier than those who try to change things.
8. On the whole, I'm satisfied with myself.

Like sex role attitudes, the self-esteem measures were factor analyzed and an index was constructed. (See APPENDIX 3 for factor matrix). The sample was dichotomized into those with relatively low self-esteem (=1) and high self-esteem (=2). "No opinion" responses were not included in the scaling process.

In addition to these variables, three behavioral variables are included that are related to the correspondence process. Educational attainment is operationalized by NLS as a credential scale rather than by years of education. Since the first NLS questionnaire was administered near the completion of the sample's senior year in high


school, possible sampling error may be present due to the exclusion of those who did not finish school. It should be noted that there is no code for a respondent with less than a high school education. (See Appendix 4 for NLS coding of education). To represent more clearly an ordinal measure in this study educational attainment is recoded as follows:

1=High School
2=Vocational or business school
3=Some college
4=College degree and graduate study

Marital behavior (MARBEH79) was measured as single with marital plans, single with no plans, divorced/widowed/separated, married to first spouse, and remarried. In this research, all categories of single respondents are classified as 1=never married and all currently married respondents were assigned a 3. The frequency of subjects in the remarried category is quite small. The NLS category of divorced/widowed/separated remains the same (=2).

The operationalization of fertility status is consistent with the NLS data. Fertility (FERT79) is measured by the presence of children, both adopted and natural: 1=no children present and 2=having children.

A final independent variable to be considered is class of origin (CLORIGN). This variable operationalizes the respondents' fathers' position in Braverman's mental-manual dichotomy. See Appendix 5 for coding specifications.

**Statistical Analysis**

Given the dichotomous dependent variable, class of destination, log-linear logit regression will be used to test the hypotheses stated.
in Chapter Two. Class reproduction is expressed as a logistic function of class of origin, curriculum track, fertility, marital status, educational attainment, sex role orientation, and self-esteem as well as the two- and three-way interactions among these factors.

Logit analysis was performed in order to identify relationships among variables observed as discrete, categorical outcomes or events. Though the variables in a log-linear logit model must be discrete, they may represent an underlying continuum.

Log-linear differs from ordinary least-squares regression in several ways. Most importantly, the regression estimates parameters that indicate the relative influence of various independent variables on a designated dependent variable. Changes in a continuous dependent variable are measured in terms of standard-deviation units for each of the other variables. The standardized measure, beta, shows how much change in the dependent variable is produced by a standardized change in one of the independent variables when the others are controlled (Blalock: 1972). On the other hand, logit analysis builds a model that predicts the number of cases in a cell of a multidimensional contingency table. The values generated by a logit procedure represent outcomes of probabilistic events and the coefficients for the linear model represent the marginal changes in the probability of being in one cell of the dependent variable in association with each of the independent variables in the model (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977).

In a logit model, the dependent variable is not the actual value of the variable but the log odds. This is the ratio of the frequency that an event occurs to the frequency that it does not occur. Therefore log
odds also can be interpreted as the ratio of two probabilities (Norusis, 1985), for example, the probabilities of being in the manual or mental class.

The basic log-linear equation is as follows. The log of the frequency in cell \( ij \), where \( i \) is one value of the dependent variable and \( j \) is one value of the independent variable, can be written as

\[
F_{ij} = u + \Lambda_i + \Lambda_j + \Lambda_{ij}
\]

where

\[
F_{ij} = \text{the observed frequency in the cell,}
\]

\[
\Lambda_i = \text{the effect of the } i \text{th category of the dependent variable,}
\]

\[
\Lambda_j = \text{the effect of the } j \text{th category of the independent variable,}
\]

\[
\Lambda_{ij} = \text{the interaction effect for the } i \text{th value of each category,}
\]

\[
u = \text{the average of the logs of the frequencies in all table cells.}
\]

\( \Lambda \) represents the increments or decrements from the base value \((u)\) for particular combinations of values of the row and column variables. Each individual category of the row and column variables has an associated \( \Lambda \). The \( \Lambda \) parameter is the average log of the frequencies in a particular category minus the grand mean. \( \Lambda \) terms must sum to zero over all categories of each variable (Norusis, 1985).

In a logit model the log odds of each cell are predicted rather than the frequencies in each cell. To compute log odds
Log odds = 2 \times (\text{Lambda } i + \text{Lambda } j) = a = e(a)

where

i represents the first category of the dependent variable,
j represents the first category of the independent variable,
e(a) represents the natural log of value a (the natural log of a number is the power to which the number e is raised to give that number).

If a model has more than one independent variable, simply add the lambda coefficient of the additional term to the equation:

Log odds = 2 \times (\text{Lambda } i + \text{Lambda } j + \text{Lambda } k) = a = e(a)

There are two types of log-linear models—saturated and unsaturated. A saturated model contains all main-effects and interaction terms; each of the observed cell frequencies is reproduced exactly. Since the saturated model includes all permutations, the likelihood chi square equals zero with zero degrees of freedom. Saturated models exactly fit the data and are considered good starting points for exploring other types of models used to represent the data (Norusis, 1985). In an unsaturated model, one that does not contain all possible parameters, the observed and expected counts are no longer equal. Unsaturated models operate without interaction terms to test for independence. Chi square values based on the differences in observed and predicted values can be calculated.

To test for statistical significance, a Z value is computed to test the null hypothesis that lambda equals zero. It is assumed that the standardized lambda is approximately normally distributed with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Before discussing the results of the log-linear logit analysis, it is necessary to see how subjects are distributed with regard to the independent and dependent variables. One noticeable feature of the sample is that it has a primarily manual class background. That part of the sample from the mental class is quite small, constituting only about 8 percent of the total sample. The class of destination of the sample, however, is distributed more evenly with approximately 35.5 percent of the sample holding mental class positions (see Table 4.1). This latter figure is comparable with Colclough's class distributions for male subjects in the NLS (Colclough's sample included approximately 38 percent in the mental class and 62 percent in the manual).

While the sample is primarily from manual class origins, there are definite curriculum track differences in the distributions of the sample. As predicted (See Table 4.1), those in the vocational track in high school are concentrated in manual class destinations, especially relative to those in the academic track. Table 4.1 shows that in the total sample 83.7 percent of women in the vocational track reached a manual class destination but over 53 percent of women in the academic track had attained the mental class as young adults. Of all sample groups, women from the mental class taking a college-prep track have
Table 4.1
Distribution of Class Outcomes by Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mental Class of Destination</th>
<th>Manual Class of Destination</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Track</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Track</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Track</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Origin Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Track</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Track</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Track</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Origin Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Track</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Track</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Track</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the highest percentage who attain the mental class.

The distributions of marital status by track are presented in Table 4.2. Though the majority of the sample is married, marital status varies by track background. Of the academic track 62.5 percent were still single, while only 19.4 percent of vocational track women remained single. Since the respondents have little variation with respect to age, it seems that women from the vocational and general tracks have spent more time in marriage unions than the academic track.

When sex role attitudes are cross-tabulated with curriculum track, two items of interest are apparent (see Table 4.3). First, over 55 percent of the women in the sample have traditional sex role orientations. Second, women who studied a vocational program in high
Table 4.2
Marital Status by Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Single n</th>
<th>Single %</th>
<th>Divorced n</th>
<th>Divorced %</th>
<th>Married n</th>
<th>Married %</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3061</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>4872</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As school were highly represented in the traditional category. Women from the academic track were slightly more likely to hold more contemporary, non-traditional beliefs about proper sex-specific behaviors.

Table 4.3
Sex Role Attitudes by Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Traditional n</th>
<th>Traditional %</th>
<th>Non-Traditional n</th>
<th>Non-Traditional %</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2698</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>4878</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As suggested by the results in Table 4.4, the relationship between self-esteem and track parallels that of sex role attitudes and track. As young adults, women, who were in the general and vocational tracks in high school, are more likely to have low self-concepts than women who were in the academic track. Over 67 percent of vocational track women had a low self perception whereas just under 48 percent in the academic track had low self-esteem. These results, combined with those from Table 4.3, suggest that tracking may have social psychological
effects on students that are carried into later life. The lower levels of self-esteem and sex role attitudes from vocational students probably reflect the socialization patterns that stressed conformity to authority and discipline. Higher levels of these attitudes for academic tracks suggest that college-prep women are socialized into leadership roles and independent, self-directed work roles.

When class of destination is cross-tabulated with track and the other independent variables, interesting patterns emerge. Percentage distributions of respondents with respect to fertility (see Table 4.5) reflect both track and class differences. Women from all three tracks with children are over-represented in manual class destinations. Of the women from the vocational track only 13.7 percent with children reached the mental class whereas 86.3 percent were in manual class jobs. A similar trend exists for academic track women but the distributions are less dramatic: 36.6 percent with children reach the mental class. In all sample groups, women from the academic track benefit the most by remaining childless and are more likely to overcome the presence of children.
Table 4.5
Class Destination and Track by Fertility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample n=4,587</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Children Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Destination</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Destination</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>536</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Destination</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Destination</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>637</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Origin Sample n=313</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Children Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Destination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Destination</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Destination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Destination</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual Origin Sample n=3,659</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Children Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Destination</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Destination</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Destination</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Destination</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>479</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6  
Class Destination by Track and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>Manual</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>Manual</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>Manual</th>
<th>Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample n=4,646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Origin Sample n=319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Origin Sample n=3,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of respondents by marital status is presented in Table 4.6. As the data show, those who remain single are much likelier to attain mental class standing than respondents who are either married or divorced. A strong finding may be noted within the track distributions: the academic track has higher proportions falling into the mental class, regardless of marital status. These findings, along with Table 4.5 discussed above, suggest that women from academic tracks tend to remain childless and single longer than women assigned to other
curriculum programs. Since they are more likely to be found in the mental class, these women are delaying their families of procreation in favor of other activities. Women from the vocational and general tracks, on the other hand, are more likely to be balancing a job and a family.

Percentage distributions of respondents by schooling achievement reflect both class and track differences. First, Table 4.7 shows that college does have a pay-off for early class achievement. The more education a women gets the more likely she is to be in the mental class. Second, women from the academic track are found in the mental class in higher percentages than women from the general or vocational track regardless of educational achievement. For example, almost 22 percent of those women from the academic track who only completed high school were still able to reach the mental class without additional education. Only about 15 percent of women from the vocational track with high school degrees could do the same. Also, it appears that the academic track students are likelier to benefit from higher education, and as shall be shown later, are more likely to receive post-secondary schooling.

Looking at the two attitude variables, sex role orientations and self-esteem, we see again class and track differences in the distribution of respondents. Of interest in Table 4.8 is that women with a traditional sex role orientation are likelier to be in a manual class destination. In all tracks, women holding traditional values about their "place" in society are more likely found in the manual
Table 4.7  
Class Destination and Track By Educational Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Sch</th>
<th>Bus Sch</th>
<th>Some Col</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample = 2912</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>36 15.3</td>
<td>34 30.6</td>
<td>23 65.7</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>94 24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>199 84.7</td>
<td>77 69.4</td>
<td>12 34.3</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>289 75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 235 100</td>
<td>111 100</td>
<td>35 100</td>
<td>2 199</td>
<td>383 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>51 16.1</td>
<td>68 34.2</td>
<td>143 67.1</td>
<td>21 95.5</td>
<td>283 37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>265 83.9</td>
<td>131 65.8</td>
<td>70 32.9</td>
<td>1 4.5</td>
<td>467 62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 316 100</td>
<td>199 100</td>
<td>213 100</td>
<td>22 100</td>
<td>750 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>71 21.8</td>
<td>185 45.1</td>
<td>648 72.2</td>
<td>127 87.0</td>
<td>1031 57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>255 78.2</td>
<td>225 54.1</td>
<td>249 27.8</td>
<td>19 12.0</td>
<td>748 42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 326 100</td>
<td>410 100</td>
<td>897 100</td>
<td>146 100</td>
<td>1779 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mental Origin Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vocational Track</th>
<th>General Track</th>
<th>Academic Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Track</td>
<td>3 15.0</td>
<td>6 21.4</td>
<td>9 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 85.0</td>
<td>22 78.6</td>
<td>18 66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 20 100</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>17 100</td>
<td>33 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Track</td>
<td>4 36.4</td>
<td>7 41.2</td>
<td>17 51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 63.6</td>
<td>10 58.8</td>
<td>16 48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11 100</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>14 100</td>
<td>33 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manual Origin Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vocational Track</th>
<th>General Track</th>
<th>Academic Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Track</td>
<td>144 82.8</td>
<td>204 83.6</td>
<td>58 25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
<td>101 100</td>
<td>154 44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 174 100</td>
<td>144 100</td>
<td>144 100</td>
<td>345 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Track</td>
<td>30 17.2</td>
<td>40 16.4</td>
<td>58 25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 31.7</td>
<td>54 34.8</td>
<td>154 44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 174 100</td>
<td>144 100</td>
<td>144 100</td>
<td>345 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>36 15.3</td>
<td>51 16.1</td>
<td>71 21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>199 84.7</td>
<td>265 83.9</td>
<td>255 78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 235 100</td>
<td>316 100</td>
<td>326 100</td>
<td>410 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>51 16.1</td>
<td>68 34.2</td>
<td>185 45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>265 83.9</td>
<td>131 65.8</td>
<td>225 54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 316 100</td>
<td>199 100</td>
<td>410 100</td>
<td>897 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>71 21.8</td>
<td>185 45.1</td>
<td>648 72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>255 78.2</td>
<td>225 54.1</td>
<td>249 27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 326 100</td>
<td>410 100</td>
<td>897 100</td>
<td>146 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8
Class Destination and Track by Sex Role Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample n=4,651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 764</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>808</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 433</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>602</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Origin Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Origin Sample n=3,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 562</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>627</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 310</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class. Women with non-traditional gender role attitudes increase their distributions in the mental class in every case.

The pattern for self-esteem follows that of sex role attitudes. Having a stronger self image seems to help women gain mental class outcomes. Women with more confidence in themselves have a greater distribution in the mental class than women with a lower self concept. Of women from the vocational track with high self-esteem, over 20 percent have a mental class status as compared to only 14 percent of the vocational track women with low self-esteem. Table 4.9 indicates that particularly among the academic track, women with high self-esteem were highly represented in the mental class. The pattern is consistent throughout the sample; high self-esteem distributions are concentrated toward mental class positions with the academic track again having the highest proportions in this category.

In sum, what this descriptive analysis has shown is that respondents are unequally distributed by class destination vis-a-vis curriculum track and the other variables in the analysis; vocational track women are underrepresented in the mental class; the academic track and the mental class have the highest percentage of women who are single, have no children, have more education, and have the highest distributions with non-traditional sex role attitudes and high self-esteem. In short, there is reason to believe that some of the posited relationships should be supported. It is to tests of these relationships that we now turn.
Table 4.9
Class Destination and Track by Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sample n=4,648

**Low Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>14.1</th>
<th>188</th>
<th>20.8</th>
<th>454</th>
<th>47.1</th>
<th>754</th>
<th>28.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2662</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>20.5</th>
<th>175</th>
<th>34.9</th>
<th>637</th>
<th>59.0</th>
<th>895</th>
<th>31.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2881</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mental Origin Sample n=319

**Low Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>14.6</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>29.6</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>46.2</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>33.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>26.7</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>30.6</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>67.5</th>
<th>73</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manual Origin Sample n=3,702

**Low Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>14.8</th>
<th>152</th>
<th>21.7</th>
<th>379</th>
<th>48.0</th>
<th>617</th>
<th>29.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2073</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>21.0</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>35.9</th>
<th>544</th>
<th>58.9</th>
<th>751</th>
<th>46.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOG-LINEAR LOGIT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Results of the logit analysis [to read SPSS logit tables, see Appendix 5] confirm the propositions of the correspondence principle stated in Chapter 3. Curriculum track is a very strong predictor of students' class outcomes. As will be shown in this section, tracking mediates the reproduction of class; girls from the manual class taking a vocational program in high school are far more likely to be in the manual class as young adults than girls from the academic track.

Hypothesis 1. Track assignment will be positively related to social class outcome. Women who took an academic track in high school are more likely to eventually hold a mental class position than women from the vocational track.

A significantly greater proportion of students taking the academic track belong to the mental class as young adults. Table 4.10 indicates that the relationship between track and class destination is positive, as the statistical significance shows. For all women in the sample, the academic track increases dramatically the student's chances of reaching the mental class: a student in the prep track is almost six times more likely to fall into the mental class as someone in the vocational track (log odds 1.1471 to .1946).

As can be seen from the parameters in Row 1, complete reproduction of classes does not seem to be the case. Nevertheless the parameter of .4067 for the manual class suggests reproduction is stronger for this class. The odds for starting in the manual class, going through a vocational track, and ending up in the manual class are quite high,
4.9077. In other words, placement into the vocational track very strongly increases the chances of remaining in the manual class; in fact, you are about five times as likely to be in the manual class if you start there. Placement in the academic track, however, raises the possibilities of class mobility. Manual class women greatly enhance their chance to escape the manual class by taking an academic curriculum (based on a large negative coefficient and low log odds).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.10</th>
<th>Track Assignment and Class of Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sample Mental Class Reproduction Manual Class Reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.4259** -.3285** .4067**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSDST BY TRACK</td>
<td>Vocational -.3925** -.3735** .3887**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOG ODDS</td>
<td>Vocational .1946 .2456 4.9077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For women from mental class origins, the effects are reduced. Assignment into the academic track increases the probability of reproducing their position. However, downward mobility is experienced by many of those allocated to the vocational track. The differences between those in vocational and academic programs are statistically significant on this measure: the log odds for the vocational women to
remain in the mental class is only .2456 (and thus highly likely to be in the manual class) as compared to 1.3235 for mental class women in the academic program.

As expected, the general track has the least effect on class outcomes. The low values of the parameters, including the only non-significant result, indicate a weaker relationship although the overall effect is negative.

Hypothesis 2. Women who took a vocational track will have a more traditional orientation to sex roles than women from the academic track.

Since the NLS did not measure sex role attitudes in the first panel, it is not possible to ascertain if track mediates the reproduction of a traditional or nontraditional sex role orientation. However we can determine if tracks sort women into different groups based on their attitudes towards traditional gender roles. From Table 4.11, the log-linear equation shows that women from the vocational track are more likely to hold traditional sex role attitudes as young adults than women from the academic track (log odds 1.7843 to .92551, respectively). Given the lambda coefficient -.1765, women from academic tracks were significantly more likely to hold nontraditional gender attitudes. The general track appears to have little effect on sex role attitudes.

Though we have no information on the content of vocational programs experienced by the sample, other studies, such as Valli's (1983), demonstrate that vocational programs for women often convey ideological
TABLE 4.11
Sex Role Attitudes and Track Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEXRL79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Orientation</td>
<td>.1375**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXRL79 BY TRACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.1520**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.0245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-.1765**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05

LOG ODDS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>1.7843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1.3828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.9251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

messages regarding "appropriate" sex roles; of course this redefines and reinforces the cultural orientations toward a sexual division of labor. These programs presented manual class "female" jobs as secondary to or at least synonymous with a traditional sexual-home-family identity. Vocational programs create and replicate a culture of femininity that legitimates a sexual division of labor and the inferior and dependent roles it implies.

In...elaborating their lives at work, the students (from vocational programs) utilized a fairly conventional culture of femininity that identified them not as raw labor power, but as sex objects, on the one hand, and as office wives and mothers, on the other. In so doing, they partially realized ...their double subordination, in domestic labor and in wage labor. But...because they saw no alternative, they tended to fantasize an ideal future in which they worked part time and stayed home part time, regardless of the fact that this solution would only strengthen their subordination,
keeping them dependent on a male provider and condemning them to low-level positions in the job market (Valli, 1983: 214).

In preparing women for manual class jobs, the vocational track in school makes it easier for women to be less involved with their work than men. Since the traditional female role does not include the breadwinner component, women's identities tend to be less intrinsically connected to the wage labor system (Valli, 1983). This relationship between traditional sex roles, the vocational track, and manual labor jobs follows the logic of the correspondence principle. If women can be essentially "tracked into" a self concept that legitimates economic inferiority, "women's work" then benefits both men and the capitalist economy by continuing to have women perform most chores at home and work for low wages on the job (for much more on this, see Jenkins, 1984). In this way, the economy maintains a cheap labor supply and classes are neatly segregated. Given the findings reported above, Hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3. Women who took a vocational track will have lower self-esteem than those from the academic track.

In Hypothesis 3 we test the relationship between track and self-esteem. As seen in Table 4.12, self-esteem and track are related much as sex roles and track. The relationship between track placement and self concept is positive: women assigned to the academic track are over twice as likely to have higher self-esteem than the sample from the vocational track by 1979. In this case, both the vocational and general tracks are significantly associated with low self-esteem.
TABLE 4.12
Self-Esteem and Track Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF79</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.2108**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF79 BY TRACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.1500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.1079**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-.2578**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05

LOG ODDS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>2.0577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1.8916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.9103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings support Oakes' (1982) who found that students in low tracks have lower aspirations, feel more negative about themselves academically, and express more feelings of general unworthiness than students in higher tracks. Bowles and Gintis (1976) state that these feelings are reified by the social relations in school which vary by track: the lower tracks are characterized by alienation and authority whereas the higher tracks allow more independent work in an open atmosphere.

The current findings add a longitudinal element to the correspondence principle. Tracks foster different perceptions of self and women carry these non-cognitive differences into early adulthood. Later on, women from the vocational tracks tend to hold jobs that are
low in prestige, income, and self-direction. And as psychologists tell
us, these conditions are closely associated with low self-esteem
These job characteristics, as Bowles and Gintis contend, mirror the
social conditions found in the lower tracks in school. And as shown
here, social relationships that affected the student's self-esteem at
school are still operating on the job several years later. Therefore
Hypothesis 3 is supported.

Hypothesis 4. Women who took a vocational track will be more likely
to be married than women from the academic track.

This hypothesis proposes to test the effect of track assignment on
marital status (see Table 4.13). Judging from the constant
coefficients, the majority of respondents are married. However marital
status does not appear to be equally distributed among the three
curriculum tracks. Those in the vocational track are more likely to be
married than those from college-prep tracks (coefficients .1240 and
-.1968, respectively). The probability that a woman from the
vocational track is married is 2.2851 whereas it is only .2407 for
staying single. On the other hand, in the academic group, the single's
coefficient is positive (.2590) but the coefficient for being divorced
and married are negative (-.2322 and -.1545, respectively). The odds
that an academic woman will remain single is quite high at 4.7039 in
comparison to 1.3092 for being married. The general track again has
the weakest effect on marriage though it tends to follow the pattern of
the vocational track.
TABLE 4.13  
Marital Status and Track Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGLE</th>
<th>DIVORCED</th>
<th>MARRIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARBEH79 (Constants)</td>
<td>-.5152**</td>
<td>-1.1754**</td>
<td>.2892**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARBEH79 BY TRACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>-.1968**</td>
<td>.1277*</td>
<td>.1240**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-.0622**</td>
<td>.1045*</td>
<td>.0304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.2590**</td>
<td>-.2322*</td>
<td>-.1545**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

LOG ODDS
|                  |         |          |         |
| Vocational       | .2407   | .1230    | 2.2851  |
| General          | .3151   | .1174    | 1.8950  |
| Academic         | 4.7039  | .0599    | 1.3092  |

Many young women from both vocational and academic tracks were married by 1979 (see the Log Odds). But what explains the between-track difference among those women who remained single seven years after high school? Staying single may be a latent consequence of the socialization processes found in academic preparation. If academic track women are socialized to be personally more demanding and professionally more aggressive than the traditional gender expectations, then they may delay marriage to pursue nontraditional female roles. As Bowles and Gintis claim, the academic track prepares students for independent work habits, autonomy, and internalization of norms, and these factors may affect decisions to marry as well. So, Hypothesis 4 is supported.
Hypothesis 5. Women from the vocational track with lower levels of educational attainment will be less likely to hold a mental class position.

Hypothesis 5 tests the associations between track, educational attainment, and class outcomes. Just as increases in education affect women's labor force participation (Janowitz, 1976), we see from the models presented in Tables 4.14 and 4.15 that education has a positive effect on class destination. The coefficients follow a near perfect pattern. Respondents with at least some college training are more likely to be in a mental class position while those with high school or a business school education are likely to fall in the manual class. Even when compared to some college, graduating from college has a particularly strong positive effect on class outcome while obtaining

**TABLE 4.14**
Education and Class of Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSDST</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.1180**</td>
<td>.1549**</td>
<td>-.1273**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSDST BY EDATT79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-.8728**</td>
<td>-.7313**</td>
<td>.8640**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>-.3219**</td>
<td>-.2371</td>
<td>.3236**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>.3329**</td>
<td>.2274</td>
<td>-.3302**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>.8617**</td>
<td>.7410**</td>
<td>-.8575**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

**LOG ODDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class</th>
<th>Manual Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>.2210</td>
<td>.3158</td>
<td>4.3641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>.6651</td>
<td>.8485</td>
<td>1.4808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2.4639</td>
<td>2.1482</td>
<td>.4005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>7.0952</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>.1395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only a high school education associates strongly with a manual class destination. The odds for being in the mental class increase as educational achievement increases: with a high school education, .2210; business school training, .6651; some college, 2.4639; and with a college degree, 7.0952 (See Table 4.14).

The axiom that tracking segregates women into different class groups holds in the present models, though the vocational parameters narrowly miss statistical significance in measuring class reproduction. In the total sample (see Table 4.15), the vocational track has a negative effect on mental class destination except among those women who attend college. In addition, vocational tracking is associated with downward mobility for mental class women and class reproduction for women from the manual class. Mental class women in the vocational track are unlikely to reach mental class outcomes unless they attend college. If they were in the academic track, however, class reproduction was likely, though not significantly, with post-secondary business school training as well as college. For manual class reproduction, the log odds are very high, 6.9379, for those in the vocational track who attained a high school education. However, for manual class women in the academic track it is highly probable, and statistically significant, that upward mobility will occur. Therefore, women from both class backgrounds are more likely to reach the mental class if placed in the academic track. Education attainment affects women's occupational success in several ways. First, educational
### TABLE 4.15
The Effects of Track and Education on Class of Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.0483</td>
<td>.0423</td>
<td>.0668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY TRACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>-.1053**</td>
<td>-.1551</td>
<td>.0799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-.0287</td>
<td>-.0525</td>
<td>.0363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.1340**</td>
<td>.2075*</td>
<td>-.1162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY EDATT79</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-.8234**</td>
<td>-.6441**</td>
<td>.8218**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>-.3081**</td>
<td>-.1964</td>
<td>.3147**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>.3074**</td>
<td>.1945</td>
<td>-.3090**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>.8241**</td>
<td>.6461**</td>
<td>-.8275**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi square</td>
<td>p=.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>5.3625</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4.3898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

(a) In logit models, numerous empty cells distort the fit of the data and causes p-values to be unstable and unreliable. The model indicating mental class reproduction shows a poor fit of the data because of a particularly large number of empty frequency cells.

### LOG ODDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Business School</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>College Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.1719</td>
<td>.2003</td>
<td>1.6499</td>
<td>4.6375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.2003</td>
<td>.5386</td>
<td>1.9230</td>
<td>5.4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.2774</td>
<td>.7775</td>
<td>2.6624</td>
<td>7.4833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Class Reproduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.2201</td>
<td>.5388</td>
<td>1.1775</td>
<td>2.9055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.5388</td>
<td>.6614</td>
<td>1.4457</td>
<td>3.5673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.4545</td>
<td>1.1127</td>
<td>2.4317</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual Class Reproduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>6.9379</td>
<td>2.5163</td>
<td>1.1733</td>
<td>.2563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>6.3586</td>
<td>2.3062</td>
<td>.6625</td>
<td>.2349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>4.7058</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
<td>.4880</td>
<td>.1731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
achievement has a negative effect on women's fertility practices (Bumpass, 1969; Semyonov, 1980). Having children places severe constraints on career commitments. Highly trained women may feel unable or unwilling to compromise their occupational aspirations with the time, costs, and energies required of parenting. Second, women with higher levels of education are more likely to work in jobs with higher income, prestige, and intrinsic rewards (Tickamyer, 1979). Education is important for cognitive functioning and for possessing and valuing an orientation of individual self-direction (Kohn and Schooler, 1983). These values and behaviors are associated with the demands of mental class positions.

Third, the difference between completing and not completing college implies that something is significant about obtaining the degree credential. The degree certifies potential labor force participants and qualifies them for jobs in the bureaucracy that would otherwise be denied them. This finding seriously challenges the functionalist perspective. It is questionable that the function of education is to provide the skills necessary to attain a higher occupational status and income when the final year of college completed is more important than the second or third year of college.

In recent years, the educational requirements for most occupations have been upgraded. However, there has been no parallel advancement in the technical demands of these jobs (Collins, 1971). Thus while, more education (or, as Collins says, "credentials") is needed to obtain mental class jobs, the additional education is not a requisite for
performing the duties. Education becomes a gatekeeper, a control agent whose responsibility is to function as a selection process.

As past research has often shown, class background is strongly associated with college attendance. Advantaged classes are more capable of aiding and preparing their children for eventual entry into the positions of authority and control. Collins (1979) has referred to this as "the credential society" while Spring (1976) calls it a "sorting" mechanism. In short, education is a means of maintaining class boundaries, or as Spring says "staying in place."

Though this process is not directly tested in the present research, we can see here that students taking different paths in school arrive at different places in the class structure. As shown in Table 4.7, education achievement varies by track: vocational students are more likely to complete high school and business school training but academic students have higher rates of attending and graduating from college.

School tracking, as an important part of the education experience, functions to segregate students from one another. From Table 4.15, we see that the interaction of academic track and a college education creates extremely high odds for attaining the mental class. Obviously, studying a college preparatory curriculum in high school helps provide students with the appropriate skills and entry requirements for college, but it also provides them with non-cognitive qualities required for a successful college career.

In summary, reproduction is high among expected groups: manual class origin students in the vocational track with no college
education; and, mental class origin women in the academic track with at least some college. Nevertheless, this model reflects the importance of education on mobility in contemporary society. For women from the manual class, education can have a high pay-off and enhance upward mobility. However, assignment into the vocational track makes this difficult at best as they are less likely to gain entrance to college. Judging from the log odds for class reproduction, assignment to the academic track allows mental class women to receive more education and subsequent class reproduction. On the other hand, manual class women do experience mobility but are more likely to have their track assignment hold them back. One interesting finding is that many women from the manual class assigned to the academic track maintained their manual class position. Contrary to the meritocratic perspective, this indicates that in addition to education, other factors affect class reproduction and mobility. Hypothesis 5, women from the vocational track with lower levels of educational attainment will be less likely to hold a mental class position, is supported.

Hypothesis 6. Women from the academic track with no children are more likely to have a mental class destination.

In Hypothesis 6, we test the relationship between track, fertility, and class destination. As the data in Table 4.16 show, the presence of children has a strong negative effect on mental class achievement. From these data, there is little question about the impact that a child can have on women's class outcomes. Those who do not have children are over three times as likely to reach the mental class than women who have children. Women from the mental class are 4.6 times more likely
to maintain their position if they avoid having children. Manual class women with children, on the other hand, are over three times more likely to stay in that class than those without children. One explanation for this phenomenon is that mother and worker roles are incompatible, at least in the prevailing organization of work. Industrialized economies have generally been unaccommodating to maternal role needs offering mothers no child care service or household support. Cultural norms stress the values of the nuclear family and pressure women who try to rear children and seek employment. Therefore, women who occupy the roles of mother and employee may choose to have fewer children since childraising becomes a less attractive alternative, especially once the family is dependent upon the mother's income (Tickameyer, 1979: 168).
Table 4.17 presents the parameters and log odds showing the effects of track and the presence of children on class destination. Statistically significant in virtually all cases, the presence of children retards the progress of women in the labor market—the odds are roughly two to three times greater for childless women to have

| TABLE 4.17 |
| Track Assignment and Fertility |
| Total Sample | Mental Class Reproduction | Manual Class Reproduction |
| CLASSDST | | |
| Constant | -.4806** | -.4282** | .4616** |
| CLASSDST BY TRACK | | |
| Vocational | -.3521** | -.3151** | .3461** |
| General | -.0829** | -.0756 | .0790** |
| Academic | .4351** | .3907** | -.0425** |
| CLASSDST BY FERT79 | | |
| Children Not Present | .2329** | .3144** | -.2310** |
| Children Present | -.2329** | -.3144** | .2310** |
| chi square | 13.84 | .7529 | 8.9564 |
| degrees of freedom | 2 | 2 | 2 |

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

Log Odds For Mental Class Destination

| Children Present |
| Vocational | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Vocational | .3013 | .1187 | .4241 | .1206 | 3.1690 | 7.9839 |
| General | .5162 | .2034 | .6847 | .1947 | 1.8574 | 2.1632 |
| Academic | 1.4546 | .5730 | 1.7392 | .4947 | 1.4567 | 3.6700 |
mental class positions. Among women with children, those in the academic track are more able to overcome the liabilities of having children, especially those from higher class origins.

Looking at reproducing the manual class (+.4616), we find the odds for reproduction are 3.1690 for those in the vocational track with no children and 7.9837 with children. Interestingly, this compares with the odds for reproducing the mental class — 1.7392 with no children and .4947 with children. Even students from manual class origins who were in the academic track have a fairly high chance of remaining in their class of origin, 1.4567 without children and 3.6700 with children. For women from the mental class, the odds of being in the manual class after completing an academic track and having children is 2.0214; for the same group but without children, the odds drop to only .5748. For the total academic track, the odds of being in the manual class are dramatic, 9.9463 with children and .6874 without. A significantly larger proportion of women belonging to the manual class, taking a vocational curriculum, and bearing children have a far greater chance of remaining in the manual class.

These findings support the literature on the effects of motherhood on women's occupational status. Suter and Miller (1973) and Jencks et al. (1979) have found a negative relationship between the number of children and wife's earnings. Though income is not included in the present analysis, it can be assumed that mental class positions command higher salaries than those in the manual class.

In American society most employed women work in low-paying, support positions. Occupations such as nurse, secretary, and elementary school
teachers are dominated by women. It has been argued that the roles for these positions are simply continuations of traditional mother-wife roles—the care and support of men and children. Radical feminists envision motherhood as an institutionally organized experience. Due to the prevailing orders of capitalism and patriarchy, housework and childrearing were declared women's work. This ideology restricted the range of women's identity and social prestige and defined motherhood as a "natural" role.

Sokoloff (1980) contends that this definition of "proper" roles for women has merged housework with women's labor force participation. This process works in the following ways. One, women often enter the labor market to buy the goods and services they need in their jobs as mothers. Having children increases costs to the family and women may take any available job to supplement the household income. Two, women are treated as mothers when they enter the labor market. Employed women are likely to be labeled "working mothers" rather than employee. Women are often paid lower wages, denied promotions, or even refused jobs because of the belief that they want to get married and will leave the company as soon as a husband is found. Or, if a woman has children, she may be considered unreliable if she asks for time off to attend to ill children. Three, women play mother roles on the job such as nurturing, soothing, healing, teaching, and ego support.

Even unmarried women with no children of their own must mother men at work. These mothering tasks are sometimes paid for—as nurses, teachers, social workers, and so on—and are sometimes simply appropriated—boosting the boss's ego, making coffee, getting his reports into final shape before typing them, doing housecleaning tasks to help present the
boss to the public, and so on (Sokoloff, 1980: 220).

Wage labor for many women is an extension of their motherwork and as mentioned earlier, they always have two jobs—one at home and another in the labor market. This phenomenon is especially true for women in the manual labor class. Women in the mental class are more likely to be career/professionally oriented. For them the academic track curriculum enhances the possibilities of attaining a position with an ambiguous tie to motherwork. Still, the presence of children restricts economic activities for women though placement in the academic track offsets some of the limitations, thus Hypothesis 6 is supported.

Hypothesis 7. Women from the academic track who are single are more likely to have a mental class position.

The interaction between tracking and marital behavior is tested by Hypothesis 7. This interaction is strongly related to class of destination, as can be seen from Tables 4.18 and 4.19.

Table 4.18 shows the effects of marital status on class outcome. Like childlessness, being single has a positive effect on class outcome. Single women are over twice as likely to be in the mental class as married women. Divorced women are also more likely found in the manual class than single, never married, women.

Marital behavior has an important impact on class reproduction as well. Single women from mental class origins are 2.7 times more likely of reaching the mental class than married women and 3.4 times more likely than divorced women. Both marriage and divorce have a significant, negative effect on mental class reproduction.
TABLE 4.18
Effects of Marital Status on Class of Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSDST</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.3189**</td>
<td>-.1956**</td>
<td>.2866**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSDST BY MARBEH79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.2940**</td>
<td>.3727**</td>
<td>-.2866**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-.1979**</td>
<td>-.2369**</td>
<td>.1907**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.0961**</td>
<td>-.1358**</td>
<td>.0960*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10.

LOG ODDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.9514</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>.3557</td>
<td>.4211</td>
<td>2.5976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.4360</td>
<td>.5254</td>
<td>2.1494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being divorced and married are statistically related to manual class reproduction (log odds 2.5976 and 2.1494, respectively). Interestingly remaining single gives a log odds of 1.0 suggesting that single women are equally likely to attain the mental or manual class. However, the coefficient for being single is significant and negative which indicates that being single is associated with upward class mobility for manual class women.

The interaction between tracking and marital status further illustrates the impact these variables can have on women's class position. From Table 4.19 we see that the interaction between track and marriage results in quite substantial advantages for single women from the academic track, especially those from mental class backgrounds. Having been married or currently married are generally disadvantageous.
to class position, especially when interacting with track. The odds for women from the mental class remaining in this class are superior to

**TABLE 4.19**
Track Assignment and Marital Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.4222**</td>
<td>-.3065**</td>
<td>.3990**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY TRACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>-.3731**</td>
<td>-.3427**</td>
<td>.3660**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-.0954**</td>
<td>-.1023</td>
<td>.0927**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.4685**</td>
<td>.4450**</td>
<td>-.4587**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY MARBEH79</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.2136**</td>
<td>.2900**</td>
<td>-.2009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-.1256**</td>
<td>-.1357*</td>
<td>.1109**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.0880**</td>
<td>-.1543*</td>
<td>.0900*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.141</td>
<td>p=.161</td>
<td>p=.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi square</td>
<td>6.9080</td>
<td>6.5668</td>
<td>12.6216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees of freedom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

**LOG ODDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.3124</td>
<td>.1583</td>
<td>.1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.5444</td>
<td>.2763</td>
<td>.2979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1.6815</td>
<td>.8533</td>
<td>.9201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Reproduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.4876</td>
<td>.2081</td>
<td>.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.7885</td>
<td>.3366</td>
<td>.3243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2.3950</td>
<td>1.0056</td>
<td>.9688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual Reproduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>3.0901</td>
<td>5.7650</td>
<td>5.5290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.5938</td>
<td>1.1078</td>
<td>1.0625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the odds for manual origin women having upward mobility. In every category, the odds are higher for those from more advantaged homes.

The interaction between track and marital status reveals two general findings. One, the difference in remaining single and having been or presently being married indicates that many women choose between careers and marriage. Even among the advantaged class, the difference in odds is striking. The odds that single women, from all curriculum tracks, will remain in the mental class is over two times greater than for those currently married or divorced. As the literature has shown for many years, marriage impedes women's occupational progress. Married women are more likely to have children, which of course hinders career achievement.

Another concern is the status often given to married women's participation in the labor force. Women's employment outside the home has become crucial to the family's financial security. However, the wife's job is often seen as supplemental to the husband's income and somewhat optional. Her low income and the ideology of the male breadwinner cements economic dependence on her husband and forces her "to take more unstable, unskilled...jobs" (Sokoloff, 1981:136). In other words, the common perception is that married women do not need jobs as badly as men.

Two, with the exception of the general track, the parameters for tracking are larger than the coefficients for marital status indicating the relatively greater importance of tracking. In the total sample, single women in the academic track are far more likely to be in the mental class than single women from the vocational track, log odds
1.6815 to .3124, respectively. Again controlling on singles, the odds for those from the mental class in the academic track to be into the mental class are 2.3560. On the other hand, if a vocational track is taken the odds are reduced to only .4876 for experiencing class reproduction.

For women from the manual class, a similar pattern is found. Single women from the vocational track reproduce the manual class with odds of 3.0901. Whereas single women from the academic track have odds of only .5938 for remaining in the manual track. Among married women, the data show that those from the vocational track have odds of 5.8509 for manual class destinations. In the academic track the odds, though still high, drop to 1.0870.

In summary, while we know that marriage has social and economic costs for women in the labor force, school track does seem to reduce some of these liabilities. This model suggests that the track a woman experiences is a stronger predictor of class destination than eventual marital status. This is especially supported by the finding that married women from the academic track have fairly good chances of reaching the mental class. Hypothesis 7 is, therefore, supported.

Hypothesis 8. Women from the academic track with non-traditional sex role attitudes are more likely to hold a mental class position.

The relationship between sex role orientation, track, and class outcome is explored by Hypothesis 8. Table 4.20 presents the logit parameters obtained for the equation predicting class outcome by sex role orientation. Women holding non-traditional sex role attitudes are
TABLE 4.20
Effects of Sex Role Attitudes on Class of Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASSDST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.2936**</td>
<td>-.1801**</td>
<td>.2628**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSDST BY SEXROL79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>-.1474**</td>
<td>-.2124**</td>
<td>.1303**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>.1474**</td>
<td>.2124**</td>
<td>-.1303**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

LOG ODDS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>.4139</td>
<td>.4561</td>
<td>2.1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td>.7465</td>
<td>1.0667</td>
<td>1.3034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...significantly more likely to be in the mental class than women with traditional attitudes. Non-traditional attitudes also are associated with mental class reproduction. Mental class women are over twice as likely to remain in this class if they adopt a non-traditional attitude toward gender-specific behaviors. On the other hand, manual class reproduction is enhanced by traditional values by almost two to one.

Having a traditional sex role bias defines women's roles as focusing on family responsibilities. If the wife works it is only to balance the household finances. The occupation then becomes a job, rather than a career.

Conversely, women in the mental class have careers in which dedication and commitment are more frequently required. Though women in these kinds of occupations may define family roles differently, they
do not necessarily abandon mother and wife roles. Motivated by internally imposed demands, these women are more autonomous and independent than their manual class counterparts (Tangri, 1972).

Traditional orientations to gender-specific behaviors hinder women's attempts to maximize their own productive and creative potentials. The work that wives and mothers do has few returns: it is unpaid, commands low prestige, and leaves little time for other work. Sex role stereotypes exert pressure on women to conform to the stereotyped image of feminine behavior and prevents them from realizing their fullest potential (Sokoloff, 1981).

The ideology behind the gender division of labor contends that certain jobs are more suited for women than men. These jobs, historically, promoted the subordination of women to men by offering the fewest opportunities for rewards, prestige, and power:

Since sex roles are not based on the activities themselves, since women's jobs are not distinguished from men's jobs by amount of training or other incidental properties, and since the difference in salaries, status, and other benefits between women's and men's jobs cannot be explained in terms of training or importance to society, we can conclude that the main function of the sexual division of labor supported by sex roles is to keep women subordinate to men (Moulton and Rainone, 1983: 201).

Sex roles reinforce the sexual division of labor and support the devalued yet critical work that women do in the society.

However, the data in Table 4.21 show that track placement is a stronger predictor of class than sex role orientation. Among most of the parameters, the track coefficients are larger than the sex role coefficients. In the total sample, women with non-traditional
TABLE 4.21
Track Assignment and Sex Role Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.4160**</td>
<td>-.3216**</td>
<td>.3982**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY TRACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>-.3793**</td>
<td>-.3443**</td>
<td>.3780**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-.1013**</td>
<td>-.1078</td>
<td>.0954**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.4806**</td>
<td>.4521**</td>
<td>-.4734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY SEXRL79</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>-.1116**</td>
<td>-.1888**</td>
<td>.0954**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional</td>
<td>.1116**</td>
<td>.1888**</td>
<td>-.0954**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>= .115</td>
<td>p = .650</td>
<td>p = .327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi square</td>
<td>4.3214</td>
<td>.8623</td>
<td>2.2327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees of freedom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

LOG ODDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Non-traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.1630</td>
<td>.2554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.2843</td>
<td>.4442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.9104</td>
<td>1.4224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Reproduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.1810</td>
<td>.3851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.2904</td>
<td>.6180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.8899</td>
<td>1.8938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Reproduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>5.7156</td>
<td>3.9024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>3.2479</td>
<td>2.2175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1.0412</td>
<td>.7109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attitudes and who studied an academic track have very high chances for achieving mental class positions (odds = 1.4224). Women from the vocational and general tracks had quite low odds for reaching a mental class outcome. Though tracking is more critical for explaining both mental and manual class reproduction, sex role attitudes are significant. In all tracks, mental class women with non-traditional attitudes are more likely to remain in that class than if they subscribe to traditional values. Similarly in all tracks, manual reproduction is more likely for women with traditional attitudes than for non-traditional.

As stated earlier, the academic track tends toward a more open work environment with less direct supervision. Therefore a partial explanation of women's entry into the mental class is that superior education "liberates" young women from the psychological snare of a traditional sex role orientation.

An interesting finding is that academic track women with traditional gender role attitudes have higher chances of reaching the mental class than women with contemporary attitudes from other tracks. To account for this a second explanation is offered. This explanation concerns the changing occupational structure that has drawn women into low to middle level management jobs and other white collar positions. As the organization of work has evolved, women have increasingly been accepted in the workplace. However, job segregation by gender persists. Women dominate jobs such as nursing, lower levels of teaching, health technicians, and lower level administrators and managers. These jobs are attained by having the proper educational
credentials. Consistent with the dominant values toward female employment, these occupations are typically low paying so that women in all occupational categories make about 62 percent of male's incomes (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1981).

The new demands for women's participation in the labor market come from both the family's needs for her income and the economy's need for an additional labor supply. These push and pull factors have drawn women into the labor force despite holding traditional sex role attitudes that once may have kept them from accepting a paying job. Women with traditional attitudes predominately hold manual level jobs so it is probable that these women are less likely to visualize themselves as career oriented, preferring to emphasize family duties over all others. Taking an academic track in high school, however, prepares women for the mental class by socializing them into a less "feminine" work mentality and secondly, and more importantly, it provides them with the credentials to enter college and hold a mental class job. Hypothesis 8 is therefore accepted.

Hypothesis 9. Women from the academic track with higher self-esteem are more likely to have a mental class position.

In Hypothesis 9, the interaction between track, self-esteem, and class destination are tested. Table 4.22 presents the results for the equation showing the relationship between self-esteem and class of destination. Both the parameters and log odds indicate a statistically significant positive relationship; as might be expected, those with high self-esteem are more likely to attain a mental class position than those with low self-esteem. The relationship is quite clear—those
TABLE 4.22
Effects of Self Esteem on Class of Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSDST</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.2847**</td>
<td>-.1703**</td>
<td>.2565**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSDST BY SELF79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.1821**</td>
<td>-.1635**</td>
<td>.1754**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.1821**</td>
<td>.1635**</td>
<td>-.1754**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

LOG ODDS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.3932</td>
<td>.5113</td>
<td>2.3722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.8145</td>
<td>.9865</td>
<td>1.1761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with high self perceptions have about a two to one advantage on reaching the mental class.

Self-esteem is also related to class reproduction. Like high self-esteem helps all women reach the mental class, it improves the chances for mental class women to maintain their position. Mental class women with high self-esteem are almost twice as likely to stay in this class than those who have feelings of low self-worth. Conversely, manual class reproduction is facilitated by low self-esteem by an almost two to one ratio. Interestingly, manual class women with high self-esteem are also very likely to remain in the manual class (odds = 1.1761). Also of interest is that the impact of low self-esteem is less on women originating in the mental class. This suggests that other factors help these women to preclude negative self concepts. One
factor, undoubtedly, is the greater availability of resources. Another, as seen below, is one's curriculum in high school.

These findings support previous studies by Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) and Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978), among others, which have found differences in feelings of self worth by socio-economic background. The argument put forward by Rosenberg and Pearlin is that people learn their social value by comparing themselves to others. Typically these judgements are expressed in socio-economic terms, a kind of transformation of self into a commodity. Mental class people may pride themselves on having an advantaged position in society whereas the manual class and the poor are aware of their inferior class position and subsequently feel less of themselves.

Table 4.23 presents the parameters and the log odds obtained from the logit model above when track is added to the equation. With the exception of the general track, which generally has the weakest effect on class destination, the coefficients for track are larger than the esteem coefficients indicating that track has a greater effect on women's class outcomes. Regarding the log odds, the interaction between track and self-esteem follows a step-wise pattern in predicting a mental class future:

academic/high esteem—1.4818;
academic/low esteem—.8633;
general/high esteem—.4840;
general/low esteem—.2820;
vocational/high esteem—.2722;
vocational/low esteem—.1586.
TABLE 4.23
Track Assignment and Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.4073**</td>
<td>-.3174**</td>
<td>.3903**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY TRACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>-.3783**</td>
<td>-.3749**</td>
<td>.3760**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-.0906**</td>
<td>-.0841</td>
<td>.0834**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.4689**</td>
<td>.4590**</td>
<td>-.4593**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSDST BY SELF79</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.1351**</td>
<td>-.1578**</td>
<td>.1280**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.1351**</td>
<td>.1578**</td>
<td>-.1280**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .251  p = .329  p = .271  
chi square 2.7627  2.2215  2.61039  
degrees of freedom 2  2  2

** significant at .05; * significant at .10

**LOG ODDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Self-Esteem</th>
<th>High Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.1586</td>
<td>.2722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.2820</td>
<td>.4840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.8633</td>
<td>1.4818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Reproduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.1827</td>
<td>.3434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>.3267</td>
<td>.6142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.9681</td>
<td>1.8199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual Reproduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>5.9811</td>
<td>3.5844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>3.3314</td>
<td>1.9965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1.1252</td>
<td>.6744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even with low self-esteem, being in the academic track means having a higher chance of reaching the mental class than the other tracks with or without a high self concept.

The odds for predicting class reproduction follow the same model. Regardless of self-esteem, taking an academic track in school is more likely to be awarded with a mental class outcome. Track is the more salient variable in predicting class; esteem differences are detectable within curriculum groups. The pattern for manual class reproduction is reversed. Vocational track and low esteem facilitate reproduction. Again the main differences in class are curriculum tracks with variations by self-esteem within each track. The odds for manual class reproduction are 5.9811 for those with vocational training and low self-esteem but only .6744 for those women with a college-prep background and a higher self concept. Controlling for esteem with this group, the odds for reproducing the manual class jump to 1.1252 when considering those with low esteem and academic training. From Tables 4.22 and 4.23 we see that the mental origin sample is least affected by negative self perceptions.

The relationship between tracking and self-esteem and eventual class outcome is a two-sided coin. First, students realize that they study different curricula in different tracks and they perceive these assignments as social rankings (Rosenbaum, 1976). Track groups become status groups at school. Therefore the student perceives her world at school much the same way as adults view their status positions in the stratification system. Students then are sensitive to status inequities. Second, the objective structure of education differs
between track curricula. In the academic track, students experience greater "educational self-direction," to use Kohn's (1983) concept. Educational self-direction refers to the use of "initiative, thought, and independent judgment in schoolwork" (Kohn, 1983: 308). As the Kohn research group has shown, self-direction at school (and subsequently on the job) has a positive effect on self-confidence and reduces the likelihood of fatalism and ideational conformity. In the vocational track, on the other hand, education is less self-directed and consequently may reinforce low self-esteem. Just like class, tracks signify a radically different set of social experiences that may bestow different psychological meanings for individuals with unequal backgrounds (Rosenberg and Pearlin, 1978).
The purpose of this research has been to identify and empirically explore certain tenets of the revisionist thesis about the relationships between education and life events. This thesis, commonly known as the correspondence principle, argues that schooling socializes young people in such a way that it recreates a labor force suitable to the needs of the capitalist workplace. Instead of providing an open forum for individuals to cultivate their skills and abilities, as the opposing meritocratic position contends, schools channel students into curricula that reward the development of certain skills and behaviors and punish others. In conforming to the demands of a curriculum, students are actually preparing for the work conditions they will experience in their future jobs. The central problem of this research was to estimate the impact of curriculum tracks on women's stratification patterns. Relevant literature on the relationship between gender, education, and class was reviewed. Nine hypotheses stating the relationships between significant variables were tested using data from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972.

Findings of the research provide a statistical focal point for assessing some of the salient features of the correspondence theory. Track placement was shown to interact with other factors—such as education, self-esteem, gender role attitudes, fertility, and marital
status—to explain the reproduction of a mental–manual class dichotomy. The fact that many women do not achieve a mental class position is largely due to their participation in the vocational track. The findings of this research indicate quite clearly that the reproduction of the mental–manual division of labor is enhanced by the organization of education; in general, the main tenets of the correspondence principle are supported. This final chapter summarizes the findings of the research and reviews its implications for policy and future study.

SUMMARY OF THE EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Above all, the analysis reported in this study demonstrates the necessity of understanding curriculum tracking in explanations of a stratification system. The principal hypothesis, that curriculum tracking processes segregate women into predictable class futures, was supported. In virtually all models, tracking was the predominant variable in determining class: women from the vocational track were more likely to hold manual class jobs than women from academic tracks. Regardless of which independent variable was included (with the exception of education), the effect of tracking was stronger in predicting class destination. However, education attainment was affected by track placement: women from the academic track were more likely to attend and complete college.

From the various models scrutinized, a profile of women in each of the class categories can be drawn. Attitudinally, manual class women are more likely to hold a traditional gender ideology and have lower self-esteem than mental class women. Traditional sex role attitudes,
in many ways, govern women's orientations to labor force participation. Acquiescing to "female" expectations restricts women's occupational choices and, if women do work, they often take secondary, less important jobs for low wages.

Low self-esteem is also an important and meaningful part of the manual class woman's social profile. As Gaskell (1985) found, esteem contributes significantly to a girl's choice of a study plan in secondary school: the lower the esteem, the lower the track. From the present analysis, esteem seems to be related similarly to occupational choice as well. Again, however, the role of tracking statistically outweighs the effects of esteem on class destination.

The relationship between these attitude variables and tracking is part and parcel of the correspondence principle. As students confront the social structures of each track, it is very probable that they come away with different feelings about themselves and their gender identity. In Oakes' words: "These differences attest to the existence of different expectations for their future roles in society among students in the two track levels" (1982: 208).

Manual class women are more likely to be married and have children than mental class women. Delaying marriage and childrearing permits women a greater opportunity to integrate and pursue educational and occupational goals. It also frees women, to a certain extent, from the single (and male) breadwinner wage ideology—that is, her work is not necessarily secondary to her husband's career.

Most importantly, theoretically and statistically, is the reproductive potential of tracking. Curriculum tracks set the arena
early on for what one's life may be like in the future. Track assignment not only affects the amount of education one is likely to get, it also predicts the composition of the family household and attitudes. The outcomes of tracking, therefore, are long-lasting, continuing into young adulthood and spilling over into non-economic and non-educational aspects of women's lives.

Other research has shown that factors such as fertility, marital status, attitudes, and education affect women's position in the occupational structure in modern society. Much of the literature reviewed earlier on these issues generally fails to take into account the "channeling" mechanism (Raskin, 1972) of curriculum tracking as an explanatory factor. The present research however indicates that tracking is the prime variable in measuring class reproduction and, interacting with education, partially explains class mobility. If the post-industrial economy demands the low-wage services of women, then tracking mechanisms direct women into life outcomes that are associated with accepting low-paying and low-status jobs—hence helping assure that to a very large degree, life (and class relations) will go on much as it has before.

DISCUSSION

This research has attempted to clarify the continuing debate between the meritocratic perspective, with its emphasis on individual or "human capital" qualities in determining the patterns of social stratification, and the critical or conflict perspective, whose argument rests on the importance of the "correspondence" between social
structures. Forming the base of each position is, of course, an underlying ideology. Should we accept Gouldner's (1970) statement that all social theories are political theories, we might then conclude that the differences in these ideologies are not likely to be resolved through empirical research. However, it is possible to identify and test the theoretical assumptions of each position. Like the works of Colclough (1985), Oakes (1982), and Howell and McBroom (1982), testing the assumptions of the correspondence principle has been the goal of this research.

Given the general findings of this research, what conclusions can we draw about the credibility of the correspondence principle? Since curriculum tracks were designed to train students for their "probable futures," e.g. manual class students take the vocational track in preparation for manual jobs, we would expect track to have a strong impact on class destination. Since tracking is a fundamental component in the organization of schools today, it has been a primary concept in the revisionists' literature; many of these writers have been obliged to demonstrate its superiority over human capital factors as a predictor of adult class position.

As we have seen, the significance of track in the reproduction of social class is noteworthy. However, in light of the present findings, the extensiveness of the correspondence principle can be questioned (a position supported by Apple, 1979). As shall be seen in the discussion below, the correspondence principle fails to consider: (1) the reality of class mobility; (2) other relevant elements of social structure; and
(3) students' active participation in their socialization, especially vis-a-vis education.

Though the norm is that tracking facilitates the reproduction of mental and manual classes, class mobility occurs as well. The present findings indicate that mobility is not totally absent even among groups whose class reproduction is highly expected (such as mental class women in the academic track and manual class women in the vocational track). Correspondence theories of class reproduction may rely too strongly on the structure of education which does not account for the potential sources of social mobility. Indeed track was a significant predictor of class in the present models, however, we saw that non-structural variables, especially educational attainment, played an important part in determining class distribution as well. From the conclusions of this research, the correspondence theory fails to explain the total picture.

Another shortcoming in the correspondence principle is that it neglects other structural elements in explaining the relationship between education and class. One such factor is the structure of available opportunities. While educational achievement has increased and become more egalitarian, the subsequent inequality of educational opportunity (that is, differentials in social background in educational attainment) has declined (Boudon, 1976). Concurrently, however, the number of occupational positions requiring a higher educational background has not kept pace. These positions, which are fixed by technological and organizational forces, are unrelated to socialization
and to the individual factors affecting the attainment of higher education.

Despite the fact that people from disadvantaged background have become educationally less deprived relative to mental class people, education "has apparently not helped decrease the distance between the better off and the worse off as far as economic rewards are concerned" (Boudon, 1976: 1185). Educational gains and subsequent class position gains are lost because of the shrinking number of economic opportunities. Thus, to Boudon, class mobility patterns remain relatively stable.

Boudon's hypothesis, that social mobility is confined to the number of available positions, adds a new dimension to the Bowles and Gintis theory of correspondence. Tracking, consequently, becomes all the more important as a structure for sorting students into different occupational futures. Tracking performs an exclusionary function in which those in advantaged positions attempt to retain their privileges by limiting the number of "contenders" for these positions (Shavit, 1984: 218). In other words, tracking restricts access to the relatively small number of mental class positions. While the academic track awards students with the proper entry credentials required to compete for a mental class future, the vocational track greatly reduces the chance for students to acquire the mental class credentials that have been raised beyond their reach (see Collins, 1979). Therefore, at a structural level, education protects privileged positions and reserves them for the sons and daughters of economically advantaged parents.
Third, this research gives no reason to refute criticisms that the correspondence principle is mechanistic, that is, that students respond passively to the demands of education. Oakes (1982) and Valli (1983) have tested the hypothesis that tracks foster different types of personality traits and that in turn, as the correspondence principle claims, these tracks (and traits) may direct students in different career paths. But to what extent can we say that schooling "causes" behavioral or attitudinal change? Vocational education certainly does not cause young women to have traditional gender role attitudes, for example. What of students' perceptions of the world? Do tracks resocialize students for occupations or do they reinforce pre-existing differences in the student population?

To explain why working class boys get working class jobs, Willis (1977) argues that the working class script justifies and even celebrates manual labor through themes of toughness and machismo. In order to maintain this identity, working class boys resist the disagreeable expectations and restrictions imposed on them by the cultural script of formal schooling. Their rebellion eventually produces school failure that assures them of carrying a working class lifestyle into adulthood.

A similar script may operate for working class women. Contrary to the macho script for males, manual class women may hold a weakness or submissive script that legitimizes their feelings of low self worth, traditional gender role attitudes, lower educational attainment, higher fertility, and earlier first marriage. Entry into the vocational track then implies conformity to their subordinate script; by not attempting
an academic curriculum they resist the possibility of upward mobility. As Gaskell writes, the possibility of upward mobility for these women means dramatic shifts in their perception of reality.

We do not suggest here that the working class has a "culture" of its own. Nevertheless, the psycho-social expectations for manual class women may differ from the expectations for mental class women. Both resistance and conformity to these scripts (as well as to formal education) are possible. This consideration, too, has not been sufficiently explored by correspondence theories.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

These findings suggest tracking is "guilty" of legitimating social inequality by restricting access to favored positions and reinforcing the behavioral scripts students bring to school. Does this imply that if schools abolish tracking, social inequality would diminish?

As Boudon (1976) and others have written, inequality will persist in a capitalist society regardless of equalized opportunities for education. Within this context, the solution to reducing social inequality is not necessarily the elimination of stratified curriculum groups. If tracking were abolished, however, two consequences are possible. The first is that manual class students would rebel against a college preparatory curriculum and potentially be worse off than if placed in a vocational track. A second possible outcome of a single-track education program is that society would become saturated with "over-qualified" people who could not find jobs to match their
training (see Rumberger, 1981). In this case the threat of social discontent might increase.

According to the correspondence principle, the major role of education is to produce a work force willing and able to fill the different occupational positions in the capitalist system. This system is perpetuated by built-in inequalities in which the few, who own and control production, dominate the many. The inability to suggest policy recommendations about tracking is indicative of the close relationship between education and the political economy. As long as power differentials continue to exist in the capitalist workplace, the democratization of education, where many of students' self-actualization needs are met, is an unlikely event (see Bowles and Gintis, 1976).

**LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH**

Due to restrictions in the design and execution of this research, several problems exist that must be considered when evaluating its findings: limitations in the statistical models; limitations in the sample; and problems of establishing causality.

The primary limitation of this research is the relative weakness of SPSSX log-linear modeling. Since SPSSX models compute contingency tables of all possible permutations of the variables' values, each model can analyze effectively and efficiently the effects of only two or three variables that, in addition, must contain a small number of discrete values. Creating large models in SPSSX generates many zero-value cells in the contingency tables and the presence of these
"empty" cells distorts the analysis and renders the statistics useless. For our purposes, the lack of parsimony in this statistical package means that the relative influence of each variable on class destination can not be fully and accurately determined (as well as the relationships between independent variables). Therefore, the extent of the analysis is limited to (a) the main effect of each variable, and (b) the paired interaction effect between tracking and each remaining independent variable.

A second problem in this research concerns limitations of the sample. The NLS includes no data for women who did not finish high school—a portion of the population whose probability for being in the manual class is high. Among various social categories, this group can be quite large and since it is not represented in the sample, estimates of class reproduction may be conservative.

A final limitation in this research is the difficulty in determining original causality. The design of the study does not distinguish between causal factors that may originate in the family or in schools. What background factors are class-based and which originate in the schools or other places? Without appropriate data, we can only say that tracking operates as a mediator rather than as a causal agent.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The implications of the concepts explored by Bowles and Gintis have not yet been studied comprehensively. Further research is needed to determine the role schools play in creating class differences. It is
hoped that the present findings can stimulate work in two directions: more causal modeling concerning the class reproduction of women and the importance of education vis-à-vis the changing nature of the occupational structure.

Though there is little debate that tracking channels students into different life outcomes, tracking does not act as a solitary causal phenomenon. Perhaps of most importance in this research is that class reproduction was the result of the interaction between tracking and several factors known to affect women's location in the labor force. As the economy expands to include women and as families increasingly become headed by women, it is not prudent in stratification research to study women as family members, but as individuals within the class system (Acker, 1973). Though women are entering mental class jobs in much greater numbers than in years past, the positions women hold are not yet the same as men's in terms of authority and salary (Sokoloff, 1981). Class reproduction for women, therefore, is due partly to the reproductive structure of education, i.e. tracking, and to female-specific life course events (such as the limitations of fertility and marriage on women's occupational position).

What role has education played in the "progress" made by women in the last decade? It might be of interest to contrast tracks by specific occupational categories (including housewives) to assess the directions "female liberation" has taken. If the academic track channels women into mental class jobs, are these positions now dominated by women? Despite the upward mobility of women, gender inequality persists in this society. This introduces the debate over
comparable worth discrimination, a type of discrimination "that occurs when the sex composition of jobs affects their wage" (England and Norris, 1985:628). Do tracks channel women into mental class "women's work" that continues to pay women less than men because those occupations are dominated by women?

Braverman (1974) and Collins (1979) describe a movement toward routinized and fragmented jobs—jobs that are increasingly "deskilled." If this is the case, will education become more and more irrelevant? On the other hand, however, in both human capital and Marxist models of stratification, we see education increases one's chances to attain a higher status and class position. Evidence presented here in support of the correspondence principle suggests that certification may be the primary effect in determining adult occupational allocation. Getting into the highest track opens doors that are otherwise unreachable. As Rosenbaum (1976) notes, being in a higher track allows the individual to stay in the contest, to proceed to the next round of competition. However, as Spring (1976) counters, such "progress" may only reflect a marching-in-place, a maintaining of one's original class location. As we have seen in this study, this seems especially likely for women, despite being in a supposedly liberal era.
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## APPENDIX 1

Census Codes for Mental-Manual Categories: Class of Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Class (=1)</th>
<th>Census Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical, and Kindred</td>
<td>001-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Administrators, non-farm</td>
<td>201-245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Managers</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manual Class (=2)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Kindred</td>
<td>301-315, 320, 321, 323,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325, 326, 330-363, 370-372,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>374, 375, 381-395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen and Kindred Workers</td>
<td>401-580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except transport</td>
<td>601-695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Operatives</td>
<td>701-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers, non-farm</td>
<td>740-785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Tenants, Laborers, Foremen</td>
<td>801, 821-824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>901-992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>260-262, 264-266, 270-271, 280-285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2

Factor Matrix of Sex Role Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.69679</td>
<td>5.53279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.81565</td>
<td>.91204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70412</td>
<td>.65363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.71437</td>
<td>.60953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.67415</td>
<td>.50798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.79217</td>
<td>.47756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.76465</td>
<td>.36067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.81919</td>
<td>.34722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.63392</td>
<td>.32039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.79765</td>
<td>.27819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3

Factor Matrix of Self-Esteem Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.86671</td>
<td>5.50182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.76339</td>
<td>.76627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.89333</td>
<td>.44229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.86888</td>
<td>.40378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.82751</td>
<td>.28989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.82175</td>
<td>.27070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.73082</td>
<td>.18893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.84895</td>
<td>.13632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

Educational Attainment as Operationalized by NLS

1=High School
2=Vocational or business school
3=Less than two years college
4=More than two years college
5=College degree
6=Masters degree
7=Ph.D. or other advanced professional degree
## APPENDIX 5

Codes and Examples for Mental-Manual Classification: Class of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Class (=1)</th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer, Farm Manager</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Administrator</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sales Manager, Office Manager, School Administrator, Government Officer, Buyer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Accountant, Artist, Physician, Registered Nurse, Engineer, Teacher, Social Worker, Clergyman)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor or Owner</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Owner of Small Business, Contractor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manual Class (=2)</th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bank Teller, Bookkeeper, Secretary, Mail Carrier)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Baker, Mechanic, Machinist, Plumber, Carpenter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Construction Worker, Sanitary Worker, Farm Worker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operative</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Assembler, Machine Operator, Transportation Operative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protective Service</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Detective, Policeman, Security Guard, Fireman)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sales Clerk, Insurance Agent, Real Estate Broker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Barber, Beautician, Practical Nurse, Janitor, Waitor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NLS Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Draftsman, Medical or Dental Technician)
Before reviewing the results of the analysis, a brief discussion on reading SPSSX logit tables is in order. Table A6.1 below will be used to demonstrate the logit coefficients. First, the signs of the parameter coefficients show the proportion of people in the particular category to the two values of the dependent variable. (In all cases, the mental class is assigned the higher code and is positive. Therefore, the coefficients are based on the probability of reaching this destination). For example, in the total sample the constant value for the mental category of class destination is -.3910. Since the sign is negative this indicates there are more people in the manual class than in the mental. Similarly the parameter for having children is -.3014. This means that having children is associated with a lower class destination. Notice that the value for having no children is positive, therefore these people are associated with a mental class destination. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the terms for each variable must sum to zero.

{Important Notice: In the tables showing coefficients that indicate the degree of class reproduction, the particular value of the dependent variable, CLASSDST, is not named. The term CONSTANT is found in these cases. In the models that include the total sample and those that measure mental class reproduction, the constant term is the mental class value of the dependent variable. In the models measuring manual class reproduction, the manual class category is represented.}
Second, the log odds is the ratio of the frequency that an event occurs and the frequency it does not occur (Norusis, 1985). The log odds is expressed as probability of mental class destination to manual class destination (or the category of the dependent variable shown in Row 1 of each table). Note below that in the total sample the odds for being in the mental class are .8360 for women who have no children and .2503 for those who do. In other words, women without children are over three times as likely to be in the mental class than women with children. In the mental class sample, the odds are 1.1100 that having no children is associated with remaining in the class of origin. On the other hand, the rather high odds of 3.7285 indicate that having children is strongly related to manual class reproduction. Log odds with the value of 1, indicate the probability that the two events are equally likely to occur. If the coefficients are statistically significant, so too are the log odds.

Third, three models were analyzed for each set of variables. One model analyzes the total sample and shows the general effect of the variables on the dependent variable. A second model either observes the effects on those with mental class origins or attempts to measure mental class reproduction. In the latter case, the parameters show the effects of the variables on the rate of class reproduction, that is, the likelihood of remaining at the same class level of one's background. A final model is concerned with women with mental class origins. The procedure in these models are identical to those dealing with women from the mental class.
In summarizing the table below, we see a number of interesting findings. First, since the CONSTANT value represents the mental class value of the dependent variable and that term has a negative value, we know that more women in the sample are in the manual class. The constant for the manual class is a fairly high positive number indicating that women from this class have a strong chance for remaining in their class of origin. Second, women from mental class backgrounds are less likely to have children by 1979. Judging from the parameters and the log odds that follow, the presence of children hinders women's chances for placement in the mental class. Having children, on the other hand, enhances manual class reproduction and retards upward class mobility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSDST</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Mental Class Reproduction</th>
<th>Manual Class Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.3910**</td>
<td>-.3327**</td>
<td>.3606**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSDST BY FERT79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Not Present</td>
<td>.3014**</td>
<td>.3849**</td>
<td>-.2974**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Present</td>
<td>-.3014**</td>
<td>-.3849**</td>
<td>.2974**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01

LOG ODDS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children Not Present</td>
<td>.8360</td>
<td>1.1100</td>
<td>1.1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Present</td>
<td>.2503</td>
<td>.2381</td>
<td>3.7285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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