Men in traditional and nontraditional careers: Gender role attitudes, gender role conflict, and job satisfaction.

By: Thomas A. Dodson and L. DiAnne Borders

This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following article:

Dodson, T. A., & Borders, L. D. (2006). Men in traditional and nontraditional careers: Gender role attitudes, gender role conflict, and job satisfaction. *Career Development Quarterly, 54(4),* 283-296.

which has been published in final form at DOI: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2006.tb00194.x.

Abstract:

Men established in traditional (mechanical engineering, n = 100) and nontraditional (elementary school counseling, n = 100) careers were compared on their career compromise choices (sex type vs. prestige), adherence to masculinity ideology, gender role conflict, and job satisfaction. The engineers tended to choose sex type over prestige; the school counselors indicated a clear preference for prestige. The engineers reported more traditional gender role attitudes. The gender role variables had little predictive value for the career compromise choices. The Gender Role Conflict Scale (J. M. O'Neil, B. J. Helms, R. K. Gable, L. David, & L. S. Wrightsman, 1986) Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale predicted job satisfaction for both groups.

Keywords: gender roles | gender role conflict | job satisfaction | traditional careers | nontraditional careers | male psychology | career development

Article:

Men established in traditional (mechanical engineering, n = 100) and nontraditional (elementary school counseling, n = 100) careers were compared on their career compromise choices (sex type vs. prestige), adherence to masculinity ideology, gender role conflict, and job satisfaction. The engineers tended to choose sex type over prestige; the school counselors indicated a clear preference for prestige. The engineers reported more traditional gender role attitudes. The gender role variables had little predictive value for the career compromise choices. The Gender Role Conflict Scale (J. M. O'Neil, B. J. Helms, R. K. Gable, L. David, & L. S. Wrightsman, 1986) Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale predicted job satisfaction for both groups.

Investigations of nontraditional careers have primarily been focused on women's career choices and factors that influence their choices (e.g., Auster & Auster, 1981; Lemkau, 1983; O'Brien & Fassinger, 1993; Rainey & Borders, 1997). Relatively few researchers have studied men who enter female-dominated careers. A better understanding of why some men choose nontraditional careers is increasingly important as the labor market becomes more gender balanced (Jome &

Tokar, 1998; Lease, 2003). As more women enter male-dominated careers, more men may need to consider female-dominated careers, especially those with a shortage of workers (e.g., teaching, nursing). In addition, there are calls for more men to enter some specific nontraditional professions, such as elementary education, where they can serve as positive role models for children in public schools, particularly those from single-parent families (Allan, 1995; Gaskell & Willinsky, 1995; Hall, 1996). Studies of men who have made such career choices would be valuable to counselors, who then could design effective interventions that encourage more men to consider nontraditional occupations.

L. Gottfredson's (1981) career choice theory seems particularly relevant to the study of men's career choices, because it includes both indivictual and social-environmental influences, such as gender role expectations. L. Gottfredson outlined a developmental theory that addresses the impact of gender roles and role expectations as well as one's gender self-image on career choice. Beginning at age 3, L. Gottfredson argued, children learn which occupations are appropriate for men and women and narrow-or circumscribe-their career choices based on sex types of occupations. Sex type is the first boundary through which occupational preferences are circumscribed; one's gender identity governs the limits of sex-typed occupations that may be considered. L. Gottfredson believed these sex type boundaries are determined by age 9; occupations that are perceived to have the wrong sex type are eliminated from further consideration at this time. Later, individuals consider occupational prestige, social class, the effort required to achieve an occupation, and their individual interests and abilities related to potential career choices. Circumscriptions based on all of these factors result in a unique "social space" of occupations deemed acceptable by an individual (also called the zone of acceptable occupational alternatives).

Individuals often discover, however, that they will not be able to implement their most preferred career choices. They then must compromise and consider less preferred occupations. Compromise may result from anticipating future barriers to achieving preferred careers (e.g., future job market), or it can occur after such barriers are encountered. In either circumstance, L. Gottfredson (1981) believed the compromise process was the opposite of the circumscription process, in that individuals sacrifice interests first, followed by prestige and then sex type. Indeed, L. Gottfredson believed avoiding a cross-sexed job was of the highest concern, although it appears that cross-sexed-typed work is more of a concern for men than for women (Leung, 1988).

Although L. Gottfredson's (1981) theory did not speak directly to nontraditional career choices, her model does indicate that one's gender self-image interacts with one's understanding of the sex

types of occupations. Thus, men who have less constricted ideas about their own gender and gender-related characteristics of nontraditional occupations would be more willing to choose a nontraditional career than would men with more strongly held, traditional gender-related beliefs. Differences in gender role beliefs and attitudes, then, would influence a man's openness to pursuing a nontraditional occupation.

Indeed, there is fairly consistent evidence that traditional career men have more traditional gender role attitudes. Nontraditional career men have reported lower masculinity and higher androgyny scores (Lemkau, 1984), fewer traditional gender role attitudes (Haves, 1989), and more liberal social attitudes (Lease, 2003). In addition, Jome and Tokar (1998) reported that traditional career men were more homophobic and endorsed traditional masculinity ideology (i.e., antifemininity and toughness) to a greater extent than did nontraditional career men. In a follow-up study, Tokar and Jome found that college men's endorsement of masculine gender roles predicted their vocational interests, which, in turn, predicted the traditionality of their career choices.

Adherence to traditional attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, however, can have a deleterious effect on men. Adherence to traditional gender roles and the societal pressure to conform can lead to high levels of internal conflict and conflict with others. Such conflict occurs when "rigid, sexist, or restricted gender roles, learned during socialization, result in the personal restriction, devaluation, or violation of others or self" (Good et al., 1995, p. 3). The stronger the endorsement ot the "masculine mystique" (e.g., a man's work is a measure of his masculinity; male power, control, and competition are the way to success and respect; intimacy should he avoided; O'Neil, 1982), the greater the potential for conflict. Gender role conflict (O'Neil, 1990) occurs in all areas of a man's life, including family life and interpersonal relationships, as well as work. Thus, men in traditional careers might be expected to experience higher levels of gender role conflict than men in nontraditional careers. Jome and Tokar (1998) found some evidence tor this. They reported that men who pursued traditional college majors had greater difficulties related to expressing emotions and experienced greater discomfort with expressions of affection between men than did their peers who pursued nontraditional college majors.

Thus, investigations of the relationship between gender role constructs and the traditionality of men's career choices have been fruitful. To date, however, researchers have primarily studied college men's intentions regarding their career choice. Of interest are men who are well established in their careers, including those who have pursued traditional careers as well as those who have defied gender role socialization and instead pursued nontraditional careers. Accordingly, we chose to investigate career preferences and gender role beliefs and attitudes of

men currently employed in two contrasting careers: elementary school counselors (nontraditional) and mechanical engineers (traditional). We chose these two groups because, based on L. Gottfredson's (1981) map of occupations, the two have very similar prestige level ratings but quite divergent sex type ratings. Specifically, we investigated the following research questions: (a) When making career compromise choices, do men working in traditional occupations sacrifice prestige over sex type, and do men working in nontraditional careers sacrifice sex type over prestige? (b) Do men established in traditional careers, as compared with men established in nontraditional careers, have more traditional gender role attitudes and greater gender role conflict? (c) To what extent do gender role attitudes (i.e., adherence to masculinity ideology) and gender role conflict predict the prestige choice (over sex type choice) when making a career compromise decision in traditional and nontraditional career men? (d) Do men established in traditional versus nontraditional careers report different levels of job satisfaction? and (e) To what extent do gender role attitudes (i.e., adherence to masculinity ideology) and gender role conflict predict job satisfaction of traditional and nontraditional career men?

Method

Participants

Mailing lists were obtained from the North Carolina and Virginia branches of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the education departments in each state. From these lists, 200 male mechanical engineers and 200 male elementary school counselors were randomly selected, and postcards were mailed to them inviting their participation in the study. Those who replied were sent an instrument packet, which also contained informed consent information and a return envelope. Because of an early limited return rate, an additional 100 male engineers were selected and mailed instrument packets. Of the 500 packets mailed, 212 (42.4%) were returned. Of these, 12 were discarded because of incomplete data, leaving a total of 200 (40%) usable packets (100 engineers, 100 school counselors).

The nontraditional career group was composed of the 100 male school counselors, and the traditional career group was made up of the 100 engineers. The two groups of men were similar in age (overall M= 44.61, SD = 7.66; school counselors, M = 46.30, SD = 9.65; engineers, M = 42.92, SD = 4.36). A majority in both groups were White: 92% of the school counselors and 95% of the engineers. Both groups of men were well educated, with the school counselors having more education. All the school counselors had advanced degrees (86% had master's

degrees, 14% had higher levels of education); only 47% of the engineers had advanced degrees, with the rest having a bachelor's degree. Both groups had at least 3 years of experience in their occupations. Participants had been employed in their current positions for an average of 9.09 years (SD = 6.92, range = 1 to 32 years). In general, the school counselors had been in their current position slightly longer (M = 10.32, SD = 7.12) than had the engineers (M = 7.87, SD = 6.53). There was a wide range in annual salaries, from $27,000 to $200,000 (M = $64,658, SD = $31,798), with the engineers averaging a higher salary (M = $88,840, SD = $27,971) than the school counselors (M = $40,475, SD = $7,559). Fathers of the school counselors were, as a group, less educated than fathers of the engineers. Sixty-one percent of the school counselors' fathers had a high school diploma or less education as compared with 46% of the engineers' fathers, whereas 54% of the engineers' fathers had at least some college education as compared with 39% of the school counselors' fathers.

Measures

Participants completed a survey requesting demographic information: their age, ethnic group, educational level, years of employment, socioeconomic background (as determined by fathers' educational background; Blau & Duncan, 1967), parents' educational backgrounds, and parents' occupations. In addition, the survey included the following study instruments in the order presented below.

Job satisfaction. The Job in General scale (JIG; Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989; Smith et al., 1987), a global measure of job satisfaction, consists of 18 items. Respondents indicate whether the items (e.g., pleasant, waste of time) are descriptive of their jobs (yes, no, or? for unsure). After reverse scoring unfavorable items (e.g., bad), a total score is determined from assigning numerical values to responses (yes = 3 points, no = 0 points, and ? = 1 point), so that higher scores indicate higher levels of job satisfaction. Reliability coefficients of .90 to .95 for internal consistency have been reported (Balzer et al., 1997; Harwell, 2003; Ironson et al., 1989). The JIG has correlated positively with scales measuring intention to quit, life satisfaction, and trust (Smith et al., 1987).

Occupational choice. The Occupational Choice Dilemma Inventory (OCDI; Leung, 1993; Leung & Harmon, 1990) was created to examine Gottfredson's (1981) principles of compromise. Based on the methodology developed by Leung (1988), a three-level pool of occupations is coded tor prestige and sex type. Prestige is determined based on the Duncan Socioeconomic Index (SEI;

Duncan, 1961; Stevens & Cho, 1985), which includes levels of occupational prestige, education, and earnings for a variety of occupations. Based on the SEI, occupations are classified into high-, medium-, and low-prestige groups, with higher SEI scores indicating higher sociocconomic status (SES) and prestige. Sex type is based on the Male Dominance Index (MDI; Yanico, 1979); occupations that have a higher percentage of male workers have higher MDI scores. Occupations are classified as masculine, sex neutral, or feminine.

OCDI items are 60 forced-choice pairs of occupations; only the 30 pairs designed for male respondents were used. The pairings are arranged in sets and subsets that force the respondent to state a preference for prestige over sex type or vice versa (Leung & Plake, 1990). Occupations are paired so that the two occupations have the same Holland code, based on the system of G. Gottfredson, Holland, and Ogawa (1982), to ensure a high degree of equivalence in the field of interest. Items are randomly arranged by the three levels of prestige and sex type; they are also arranged so that the prestige and sex type choices are evenly distributed on the left- and right-hand sides of the questionnaire. Scoring is based on respondents' choices for each pair of occupations. The prestige choice score is the frequency with which an individual chooses the prestige choice over the sex type choice. The sex type choice score is the frequency with which an individual chooses the sex type choice over the prestige choice. In addition, the actual MDI and SEI scores for the chosen as well as the nonchosen occupations are summed and averaged.

Masculinity ideology. The Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986) measures the degree of endorsement and internalization of cultural belief systems about masculinity and the masculine gender role. Thompson and Pleck's factor analysis of the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984) yielded three factors composed of 26 items. These factors compose three subscales: (a) Status (e.g., "Success in his work has to be man's central goal in this life"), (b) Toughness (e.g., "When a man is feeling a little pain he should try not to let it show very much"), and (c) Anti-Femininity (e.g., "I might find it a bit silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love scene in a movie"). Respondents report their degree of agreement for each item on a 7-point scale (1 = very strongly disagree, 7 = very strongly agree). Ratings are summed and averaged forsubscale and total scores, with higher scores indicating higher endorsement of masculinity ideology. Thompson and Pleck reported alpha coefficients of .81 tor the Status subscale, .74 for the Toughness subscale, and .76 for the Anti-Femininity subscale for college students. Evidence of construct validity includes correlations with scores of masculine gender role stress (Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992).

Gender role conflict. The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986) assesses gender role conflict, which occurs when "rigid, sexist or restrictive

gender roles, learned during socialization, result in personal restriction, devaluation, or violation of others or self (O'Neil, 1990, p. 25). Respondents indicate their agreement, using a 6-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree), with 37 statements that make up four factor-analytically derived subscales: (a) Success, Power, and Competition (e.g., "I like to feel superior to other people"); (b) Restrictive Emotionality (e.g., "I often have trouble finding the words to describe how I am feeling"); (c) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (e.g., "I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me"); and (d) Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (e.g., "My school or work often disrupts other parts of my life [e.g., home, family, health, leisure]"). Subscale and total average scores are computed, with higher scores indicating higher levels of gender role conflict. O'Neil et al. reported alpha coefficients of .85 for the Success, Power, and Competition subscale; .82 for the Restrictive Emotionality subscale; .83 for the Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men subscale; and .75 for the Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale; as well as test-retest reliability coefficients across 4 weeks ranging from .72 to .86. O'Neil et al. also found that men classified as masculine (vs. feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated) had significantly higher scores on two GRCS subscales: Success, Power, and Competition and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men. In addition, Good et al. (1995) reported correlations of the GRCS with other measures of masculinity and fear of intimacy and found support for the scale's factorial validity.

Results

Means and standard deviations for each measure are reported in Table 1. The first research question concerned the men's proclivity to sacrifice prestige over sex type or vice versa. Mean MDI and SEI scores of the occupations the men chose and the mean MDI and SEI scores of the occupations they did not choose were compared using the OCDI to determine whether participants compromised sex type or prestige levels in their career compromise choices. If sex type was the preferred choice, the MDI chosen occupation mean would be higher than the MDI nonchosen occupation mean and the SEI chosen occupation mean would be lower than the SEI nonchosen occupation mean. The opposite would be true if prestige was the preferred choice. Within-group t tests indicated the engineers' MDI chosen occupation mean was significantly higher than the MDI nonchosen occupation mean, $t(99) = 2.686$, $p < .001$, whereas the SEI chosen occupation mean was not significantly different from the SEI nonchosen occupation mean, $t(99) = 0.459$, $p = .647$. Thus, only half of the required differences were found for the engineers; they chose occupations significantly higher in sex type but showed no differences in prestige of chosen and nonchosen occupations. The school counselors' MDI nonchosen occupation mean was significantly higher than their MDI chosen occupation mean, $t(99) = -4.76$, $p < .0001$, and their SEI chosen occupation mean was significantly higher than their SEI

nonchosen occupation mean, t(99) = 7.92, p < .0001. Thus, the school counselors had a clear preference in choosing prestige occupations over sex type occupations.

The second research question concerned a comparison of the traditional role attitudes and gender role conflict between the two groups. Two multivariate t tests were conducted to test for differences on the gender role measures by group. The Bonferroni correction was used to control for Type I error rate when evaluating the follow-up individual t tests (for the MRNS subscales, $\alpha = .017$; for the GRCS subscales, $\alpha = .125$). For the MRNS, the multivariate t was significant, hotelling's t = 0.0574, F(3, 196) = 3.75, p = .0119. The engineers had significantly higher Anti-Femininity scores (p = .0032; M = 22.58 for engineers, M = 19.42 for school counselors) and a trend toward higher Toughness scores (p = .0282; M= 29.21 for engineers, M = 26.91 for school counselors). There was no significant difference in the engineers' and school counselors' scores on the Status subscale (p = .8125). The multivariate t for the GRCS was also significant, hotelling's t = 0.1924, F(4,195) = 9.39, p < .0001. The engineers had significantly higher scores on all four GRCS subscales: Success, Power, and Competition (p <.0001); Restrictive Emotionality (p < .0001); Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (p = .0054); and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (p = .0003). (See Table 1 for the group means for these four subscales.)

The third research question concerned the degree to which the gender role measures predicted a prestige choice (over a sex type choice) when making a career compromise decision. To address this question, we conducted a stepwise multiple regression analysis for each group, assessing which of the MRNS and GRCS scores predicted the OCDI prestige choice score. For the school counselors, only one significant variable entered the equation: the GRCS Restrictive Emotionality subscale score (p < .0001), with higher Restrictive Emotionality scores predicting fewer prestige choice preferences. Although this regression equation was statistically significant, F(1, 98) = 15.98, p < .0001, it accounted for only 14% of the variance in prestige choice score. A significant equation was also found for the engineers, F(1, 98) = 5.15, p = .0075, with two MRNS subscale scores being significant predictors. Both the Status (p = .0102) and Toughness (p = .0174) subscales predicted the prestige choice score. Again, although the model was statistically significant, these two variables combined accounted for less than 10% of the prestige score variance. Given the very low R^sup 2^ values, neither of these two prediction equations has much practical importance.

Table 1 is omitted from this formatted document.

The fourth research question concerned a comparison of job satisfaction of the two groups of men. The t test indicated that the school counselors had significantly higher levels of global job satisfaction (M= 47.40) than did the engineers (M= 43.58), t(198) = 3.84, p = .0002. The effect size of this difference was moderate (.53).

The fifth research question concerned the extent to which the gender role measures predicted job satisfaction. Stepwise multiple regression analyses for each group tested which MRNS and GRCS subscale scores predicted global job satisfaction scores. For the school counselors, only one significant variable entered the equation: the GRCS Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale score, $F(1,98) = 13.98$, $p = .0003$, with higher levels of conflict predicting lower levels of job satisfaction. Although this regression equation was statistically significant, it accounted for only 12% of the variance in prestige choice score. Given the very low R^sup 2^ value, this prediction equation has little practical importance. After four steps, a significant equation was also found for the engineers, $F(4, 95) = 5.96$, $p = .0003$, with the MRNS Status subscale score ($p = .0460$) and the GRCS Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale score ($p = .0003$) being significant predictors. As with the school counselors, higher levels of conflict between work and family predicted lower levels of job satisfaction. In addition, higher status predicted higher levels of job satisfaction. This model accounted for 20% of job satisfaction variability for the engineers.

Discussion

In general, the mechanical engineers in this study reported more traditional choices, attitudes, and beliefs than did the elementary school counselors. The engineers tended to choose sex type over prestige when making career compromise choices but wavered in their preference when faced with sex type occupations low in prestige. In contrast, the male elementary school counselors indicated a clear preference for prestige type occupations; they were willing to sacrifice traditional male sex type occupational choices in order to gain greater prestige. Career sex type, when pitted against career prestige, was of little concern to the school counselors. These results seem to reflect the men's real-life career choices. They also partially reflect results reported by Leung and Plake (1990) in their comparison of college-age men and women. Leung and Plake reported that the male college students appeared to have greater rigidity in terms of sex type adherence and a higher threshold of status compromise, which is similar to the findings for our engineers hut in contrast to the findings for our school counselors. In the Leung and Plake study, only the female college students were willing to pursue prestige positions by giving up their sex type preferences.

The engineers and school counselors also differed significantly on five out of seven gender role measures used in this study, with the engineers consistently reporting more traditional attitudes. In terms of masculinity ideology (as measured by the MRNS), both groups reported moderate

beliefs regarding men's need to achieve status and gain others' respect. The engineers, however, endorsed stronger antifemininity beliefs (i.e., men should not do anything that might appear feminine) than did the school counselors and tended to report higher scores on the MRNS Toughness subscale. Moreover, the engineers also reported significantly higher levels of conflict about their socialized beliefs and behaviors on all four GRCS subscales. The engineers reported more experiences of conflict regarding success and status, expression of emotions, finding acceptable ways to express their feelings and thoughts with other men, as well as balancing home and family with work. In short, it appears that these engineers were experiencing some measure of cost in their lives related to their adherence to traditional male gender role expectations. Indeed, there is consistent evidence that men who experience greater gender role conflict also experience more psychological distress (e.g., Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good, Robertson, Fitzgerald, Stevens, & Bartels, 1996; Simonsen, Blazina, & Watkins, 2000), although the men's psychological distress was not measured in this study.

The gender role belief differences reported in this article are similar to those reported by Lease (2003) and Jome and Tokar (1998) for college students. Lease found that male college students' more liberal social attitudes predicted nontraditional career intentions. Similar to the findings for our engineers, Jome and Tokar found that college-age men in traditional majors endorsed antitemininity and toughness to a greater extent than did men in nontraditional majors. In addition, Jome and Tokar found that the college men in traditional majors reported greater difficulties with two aspects of gender role conflict: restrictive emotionality and restrictive affectionate behavior between men. The engineers in our study reported higher levels on all aspects of gender role conflict. Differences in age and psychosocial development may explain the contrast with our results. First, it is likely that the college men were not supporting a family. In addition, the dominant socialization of the college student environment is such that issues of being successful (getting good grades), having power (status among peers), and competition (grade achievement) have no bearing on whether a male college student chooses a nontraditional or a traditional major.

In one of the few studies of gender role conflict in older men, Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995) found that middle-aged men experienced greater conflict related to success, power, and competition than did college-age men. In general, our participants were similar in age to the middle-aged men in the Cornoyer and Mahalik study, but our school counselors reported much lower levels of gender role conflict than did the men in Cornoyer and Mahalik's sample. Given the large differences we found between the school counselors and the engineers, age clearly should not be seen as a definitive discriminator of gender role conflict differences.

The gender role variables proved to have little predictive value with regard to men's prestige choices. The lack of more definitive relationships between the gender role variables and prestige (over sex type) career choices is curious, particularly because the engineers tended to make more traditional career choices (sex type over prestige) and the school counselors consistently made nontraditional career choices (prestige over sex type). Clearly, other variables were influencing the priority these men gave to the prestige or sex type of the careers listed. It may be that the exclusive focus on prestige and sex type oversimplified the career choice decision. The men may also have been influenced by other relevant factors, such as their career interests and values. Hesketh, Elmslie, and Kaldor (1990) contended that sex type, prestige, and interests are not independent considerations. They described the career compromise process as cumulative, with interest preferences (developed last) incorporating career prestige and sex type preferences (developed earlier). In support of their alternative career compromise theory, Hesketh et al. found that their participants, regardless of gender and social class, reported that interests were rated most important, followed by prestige and sex type. Our results could also have been influenced by the artificial nature of the forced-choice task we presented to the men; these were not choices they were actually considering. Nevertheless, despite the lack of predictive relationships among these variables, the two groups of men were fairly consistently different, in expected ways, in their career compromise choices and gender role attitudes and beliefs.

There was more consistency in the gender role variables' predictions of job satisfaction?. Perhaps not surprisingly, the two subscales with the most career-specific items, the GRCS Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale and the MIlNS Status subscale, were related to job satisfaction. The GRCS Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale accounted for a significant amount of the variance in the school counselors' and engineers' satisfaction with their work. In other words, regardless of their career traditionality, the men who found work to be interfering with their home life also found their jobs less satisfying. In addition, for the engineers, greater emphasis on achieving status predicted higher levels of satisfaction with their current position. The MRNS Status subscale includes several items regarding a man's responsibility to be successful at his work, including financial success, as one avenue to being respected and admired by others. Thus, for the engineers, part of their job satisfaction seems rooted in the status they feel in their career work. The school counselors also endorsed traditional status beliefs, but these beliefs did not predict their job satisfaction. One possible explanation is that, in general, the male school counselors reported lower levels of fathers' educational attainment and thus likely came from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (cf. Blau & Diincan, 1967). It appears that, similar to Lemkau's (1984) finding, the career choices of our nontraditional career men represented upward mobility in comparison with their family of origin. For the school counselors, then, a focus on status could be an expression of their effort to rise above the SES level in which they grew up, but not a major factor in enjoyment of their work per se.

Nevertheless, and despite a wide discrepancy in salaries, our school counselors expressed much more job satisfaction than did the engineers, although the engineers also tended to be fairly satisfied with their positions. This result contrasts with some previous reports that men in nontraditional careers were generally dissatisfied with their jobs (e.g., Haring-Hidore & Beyard-Tyler, 1984) and characterized their experience as negative (Betz, Heesacker, & Shuttlcworth, 1990; Williams, 1993). It may be that the experience of men in nontraditional careers today is different from that of men in earlier decades, so that men today are able to enjoy and find satisfaction more easily in their nontraditional occupations. We did not address this possibility in our study, nor did we ask the men why they chose their occupations or what they specifically enjoyed or found satisfying in their work. At the least, however, we do know that the school counselors reported that they experienced significantly less gender role conflict regarding the role of work, success, and power in their lives than did the engineers.

Several limitations need to be kept in mind when considering our results. In particular, our sample represented only two occupations representative of the career traditionally continuum. Although the two are fairly representative of traditional and nontraditional career choices for men, they were quite different in terms of educational level (i.e., all of the school counselors but less than half of the engineers had at least a master's degree). Thus, caution is in order when generalizing results to other occupations. Relatedly, the OCDI was a simulation of the career compromise process and, by necessity, included only a limited (although representative) number of occupations. In addition, most of our participants were Caucasian, so our results should not be applied to men of color, and all were living and working in the Southeast. Clearly, studies of men in other locations, from different ethnic backgrounds, and who are employed in a range of nontraditional occupations are needed to understand their decision making and experiences. In particular, longitudinal studies of men, beginning no later than middle school, are needed to document the ongoing process of career circumscription, compromise, and choice, with a focus on identifying those factors that encourage men to pursue nontraditional careers. Of great interest would be those factors that allow some men to defy strong gender socialization expectations in their career choices. Do these men have more liberal attitudes and less gender role conflict at early ages (cf. \Vatts, 2003)? How is parental education related to men's gender attitudes and career choice? Once men are established in their careers, does the traditionality of the work environment exacerbate or ameliorate their gender role conflict or their adherence to traditional gender role attitudes?

Our results suggest that at least some men would benefit from interventions designed to help them explore nontraditional occupations. One approach, in schools and elsewhere, is to directly

address the issue of "men's work" versus "women's work" in an effort to break through stereotypical notions about careers. In contrast, Hesketh et al. (1990) suggested that counselors focus on interests underlying various careers, providing clients with more detailed information regarding actual on-the-job work in an occupation. Relatedly, clients also need up-to-date information regarding occupations that no longer tit stereotypes of them (e.g., increased use of technology in nursing and libraries). Our results also indicate that information on job stability may be of particular interest to some men, such as those from lower SES backgrounds.

Career counselors should include consideration of gender role attitudes and beliefs when working with male clients. Career counselors may need to discuss with their clients how gender role socialization can shape interests and constrict choices but should not assume that men with some traditional beliefs (i.e., emphasis on achieving status) will dismiss consideration of nontraditional occupations. It may be that these beliefs actually contribute to some men's nontraditional choices, although this speculation requires empirical study. Just as important, all counselors should be aware that some men in traditional occupations, even those who express job satisfaction, may be experiencing conflicts regarding their adherence to gender role expectations, including the role of work in their lives. Counselors can also alert employers of men in traditional and nontraditional careers that work demands and stresses that interfere with men's family life, health, and leisure are serious detractors from job satisfaction. Employment policies that help lessen the work-family conflict may enhance not only male employees' job satisfaction but also their job productivity, performance, and even the decision to stay on the job.

References

Allan, J. (1995, May). Anomaly as exemplar: The meaning of role modeling for men elementary teachers. Resources in Education, 30(5), 154-155.

Auster, C. J., & Auster, D. (1981). Factors influencing women's choice of nontraditional careers: The role of family, peers, and counselors. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 29, 253-263.

Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., et al. (1997). User's manual fur the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 revision) and the Job in General (JIG) scales. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green University.

Betz, N. E., Heesacker, R. S., & Shuttleworth, C. (1990). Moderators of the congruence and realism of major occupational plans in college students: A replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37, 269-276.

Blau, P., & Duncan, O. (1967). The American occupational structure. New York: Wiley.

Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43, 461-465.

Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes toward masculinity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 14, 6.

Cournoyer, R J., & Mahalik, J. R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 11-19.

Duncan, C). D. (1961). A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In A. J. Reiss Jr. (Ed.), Occupation and social status (pp. 109-137). New York: Free Press.

Gaskell, J., & Willinsky, J. (Eds.). (1995). Gender informs curriculum: From enrichment to transformation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M., & Bartels, K. M. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. Journal of Counseling & Development, 75, 44-49.

Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., O'Neil, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M., DeBord, K. A., et al. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 3-10.

Gottfredson, G., Holland, J., & Ogawa, D. (1982). Dictionary of Holland occupational codes. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Gottfredson, L. (1981). Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations [Monograph]. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 545-579.

Hall, D. (1996, September 11). Odd man out. Education Week, 16, 28-32.

Haring-Hidore, M., & Beyard-Tylcr, K. (1984). Counseling and research on nontraditional careers: A caveat. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 33, 113-119.

Harwell, M R. (2003). Review of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG). In B. S. Plake,). C. Impara, & R. A. Spies (Eds.), The fifteenth mental measurements yearbook (pp. 490-492). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Hayes, R. (1989). Men in female-concentrated occupations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10, 201-212.

Hesketh, B., Elmslie, S., & Kaldor, VV. (1990). Career compromise: An alternative account to Gottfredson's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37, 49-56.

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 193-200.

Jome, L. M., & Tokar, D. M. (1998). Dimensions of masculinity and major choice traditionally. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 52, 120-134.

Lease, S H. (2003). Testing a model of men's nontraditional occupational choices. The Career Development Quarterly, 51, 244-258.

Lemkau, J. P. (1983). Women in male-dominated professions: Distinguishing personality and background characteristics. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 8, 144-165.

Lemkau, J. P. (1984). Men in female-dominated professions: Distinguishing personality and background features Journal of Vocational Rehavior, 24, 110-122.

Leung, S. A. (1988). An examination of circumscription and compromise in career decisionmaking among colUge students Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Leung, S. A. (1993). Circumscription and compromise: A replication study with Asian Americans. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40, 188-193.

Leung, S. A., & Harmon, L. W. (1990) Individual and sex differences in the zone of acceptable alternatives. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37, 153-159.

Leung, S. A., & Plake, B. S. (1990) A choice dilemma approach for examining the relative importance of sex type and prestige preferences in the process of career choice compromise. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37, 399-406.

O'Brien, K. M., & Fassinger, R. E. (1993). A causal model of career orientation and career choice of adult women Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40, 456-467.

O'Neil, J. M. (1982) Gender role conflict and strain: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. In K. Solomon & N. B. Levy (Eds.), Men in transition: Changing male roles, theory, and therapy (pp. 86-109). New York: Plenum.

O'Neil, J. M. (1990). Assessing men's gender role conflict. In D. Moore & F. Leafgren (Eds.), Problem-solving strategies and interventions for men in conflict (pp. 23-28). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. Sex Roles, 14, 335-350.

Rainey, L. M., & Borders, L. D. (1997). Influential factors in career orientation and career aspiration of early adolescent girls. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44, 160-172.

Simonsen, G., Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47, 85-92.

Smith, P. C., Balzer, W., Brannick, M , Chia, W., Eggleston, S., Gibson, W, et al. (1987). The revised JDI: A facelift for an old friend. The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 24, 31-33.

Stevens, G., & Cho, J. H. (1985). Socioeconomic indexes and the new 1980 census occupational classification scheme. Social Science Research, 14, 142-168.

Thompson, K H., & Plcck, J. H (1986). The structure of male role norms. American Behavioral Scientist, 29, 531-543.

Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales tor masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. Sex Rules, 27, 573-607.

Tokar, D. M., & Jome, L. M. (1998). Masculinity, vocational interests, and career choice traditionality: Evidence for a fully mediated model. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45, 424-435.

Watts, R. H., Jr. (2003). Safeguarding factors for gender role conflict in adolescent males. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Williams, C. (1993). Doing "women's work": Men in non-traditional occupations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yanico, B. (1979). Male dominance index values for occupations, postsecondary curricula, and apprenticeship training programs. Unpublished manuscript, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.