

2015

Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent

Melanie L. Saari

Wilfrid Laurier University, fedorchukmay@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>

 Part of the [Developmental Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Saari, Melanie L., "Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent" (2015). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 1703.

<http://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/1703>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent

by

Mélanie Saari

THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Psychology

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Arts Degree

Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo

© Mélanie Saari 2014

Abstract

This study was conducted to determine whether adult gender-based wage inequities are mirrored in the adolescent population. A developmental perspective was taken while examining this topic, so as to pinpoint stages when divergences based on gender might occur. In order to ascertain this, 157 pre- and young adolescents ranging in age from 12-15 years old participated in our survey and a subset of this group (n=89) participated in the follow-up interview. Contained in both the survey and interview were questions pertaining to remuneration, employment, negotiation, gender stereotypes and attitudes about money. Results indicated that young females seem to receive a better financial start within the home than their male peers. However, females tend to take up stereotypic work which may limit their development of new professional skills. Additionally, females do employ negotiation strategies, but they seem to only employ them with parents and not with employers. Instead they seem to expect their employer to set their wages, without thought to, or desire for, the possibility that they could impact their employer's decision. Furthermore, development of these skills or beliefs does not appear to be linear. Instead particular ages bring forth their own unique differences, and such milestones as the transition from elementary to high school bring about various changes to girls' and boys' experiences with work and wages. Overall, the issue of gender-based wage inequality is far more complex than was originally hypothesized and would benefit greatly from longitudinal study in the future.

Acknowledgments

To begin I would like to first thank my advisor, Dr. Eileen Wood, for all of her effort and guidance in helping to produce this project. She has been a great source of knowledge and direction for this paper. I cannot thank her enough for her *many* emails, edits and encouraging messages that helped me get through this study from so far away.

Second, I would like to thank each of the members of my committee, Dr. Alexandra Gottardo and Dr. Chris Alksnis, for their commitment to this project and for their invaluable expertise. I have greatly appreciated their flexibility and willingness to accommodate, even on such busy schedules.

Third, I would like to thank Katherine Wood for all of her hard work on the interview portion of this study. I am so grateful to have had her with me as I navigated new territory (interview coding) and tackled a mountain of transcripts. I couldn't have gotten through all of those interviews without her.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Mark, for his continual love, support and reassurance through this project. I would want no one else by my side through it all, and no one else with me to celebrate when it's finally finished.

Table of Contents

Introduction	8
Roadmap	8
Pay and Gender	8
The Impact of Socialization	10
Literature Review Summary	17
The Present Study	18
Questions and Hypotheses	19
Method	20
Participants	20
Materials	21
Survey	21
Demographic Information	22
Views Regarding Gender Roles	22
Past Work Experiences	23
Views of Money	25
Current Understanding of Negotiation Practices and Past Attempts	27
Receipt of Money in Varying Circumstances	28
Current and Past Saving Practices	28
Social Desirability	29
Interview	29
Money and Negotiation Inside of the Home	29
Money Outside of the Home	30
Social Comparison	31
Attitudes towards Current Wages	31
Feelings about Current Understanding of Wages	31
Procedure	31
Survey	32
Interview	33
Results	33
Survey Data: Remuneration	37
Survey: Work Experience and Type of Work	37
Overall Work Experience	41
Inside versus Outside Work	44
Survey: Influence of Parents on Child Job-Type	45
Survey: Beliefs and Attitudes about Work and Wages	46
Survey: Gender Roles	51
Survey: Views of Money	52
Survey: Current and Past Saving Practices	54
Survey: Social Desirability	56
Examination of Predictor Variables	56
Predictors of Number of Chores	57
Remuneration	58
Predictors of Negotiation and Negotiation Success	59
Predictors of Money Attitudes	61

Reassessing survey data predictors: Number of chores, remuneration, negotiation and money attitudes	62
Number of Chores	63
Remuneration	63
Negotiation	63
Attitudes about Money	64
Interview Data	65
Inter-rater Reliability	65
Interview Findings	66
Discussion	67
Reviewing the Hypotheses	70
Examining Age and Gender Differences in Remuneration	70
Assessing Age and Gender Differences in Employment and Chore Type	71
Examination of Age and Gender Differences in Parental Employment	74
Further Age and Gender Differences in Developing Wage Expectancies	76
Negotiation Tactics	77
Social Comparison	77
Attitudes about Money	78
Gender Stereotypes and Stereotyped Work	79
Putting Remuneration into Context	80
Predicting Number of Chores	81
Predicting Remuneration	83
Predicting Negotiation	83
Predicting Attitudes about Money	83
Limitations	84
Future Directions	86
Closing Comments	87
Tables	91
Appendices	140
Appendix A: Parental Information and Consent Forms	140
Appendix B: Oral Invitation to the Child	147
Appendix C: Debriefing Form	148
Appendix D: Online Survey	149
Appendix E: Interview Questions	166
References	168

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Participant Information for the Survey and Interview Data as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 2. Descriptive Summary of Responses to Questions about Sources of Remuneration as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 3. Descriptive Summary of Responses to Questions about Wage Increases as a Function of Age

Table 4. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Reported Total Number of Chores Completed

Table 5. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Average Frequency of Chores, Average Enjoyment of Chores and Frequency of Remuneration for Chores

Table 6. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Beliefs about Own Work as a Function of Age

Table 7. Descriptive Summary of Means for the Children's Sex Role Identification as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 8. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Endorsement of Female Stereotypes as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 9. Descriptive Summary of Means for *Overall* Participant Ratings of *Responsibility Over Completion of Household Tasks* as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 10. Descriptive Summary of Means for the *Responsibility* of Completion of 'Masculine' Household Tasks as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 11. Descriptive Summary of Means for the *Responsibility* of Completion of 'Feminine' Household Tasks as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 12. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Ratings of *Decision Authority* Overall as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 13. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Ratings of Household *Authority* for 'Masculine' Decisions as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 14. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Ratings of Household *Authority* for 'Feminine' Decisions as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 15. Descriptive Summary of Means for Proportionate Money Attitude Subscales as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 16. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses Regarding the Implicit Negotiation Beliefs Scale as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 17. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses Regarding Perception of the Process of Past Negotiation Attempts (Subjective Value Inventory)

Table 18. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses to Questions of Successful Negotiation Outcomes

Table 19. Summary of Means for Length of Time Owning a Personal Bank Account by Age and Gender

Table 20. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses on a Social Desirability Scale as a Function of Age and Gender

Table 21. Summary of Thematic Analysis of Student Responses to Interview Questions

Table 22. Significant Gender-Related Findings for Participant Interview Data

Table 23. Significant Age-Related Findings for Participant Interview Data

Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent

Children typically have access to a considerable disposable income, as approximately 90% of them receive a steady income by the age of 11 (Furnham, 1999). They tend to earn this disposable income through completing household chores, doing odd jobs, and/or the receipt of gifts for special occasions. As they usually do not have financial responsibilities at this age which would prevent them from buying desired products, retailers like to direct their marketing efforts towards them (Calvert, 2008). The access to pay, the opportunities it affords, and the decisions made surrounding it can impact the future lives of adolescents. Therefore, the present study examines the important role of remuneration in the lives of preadolescents and early adolescents, their experiences with earning money, and their challenges.

Roadmap

In order to determine the extent to which adult pay inequities are mirrored in the adolescent population several intervening variables are assessed. Gender stereotypes can influence not only the types of occupations individuals choose but also their performance during negotiation attempts, as well as their satisfaction with pay. Therefore, gender-stereotype adherence is assessed through adolescent attitudes towards women, the types of work boys and girls seek, and the extents to which gender-based roles are reinforced in the home. Furthermore, as negotiation techniques and abilities can directly impact one's salary attainment, adolescent understanding of negotiation techniques and early negotiation experiences are examined in order to gain an understanding of adult wage disparities between men and women that obtain equivalent credentials and perform similar work.

Pay and Gender

It is no secret that children living with a single parent have been found to receive the least disposable income (usually in the form of an allowance), while those that live with both parents receive the highest (Lintonen, Wilska, Koivusilta, & Konu, 2007). Also, those who reside in rural areas receive less than those in urban areas (Lintonen et al., 2007). The reasons for these discrepancies seem fairly obvious, as families with two incomes typically make more than those with one, allowing for more flexibility in the use of finances; also urban areas usually provide a wider array of career opportunities for parents than are found in rural areas, again allowing for more financial success and flexibility. Additionally, it is well known that disposable income fluctuates as a function of age; with disposable income peaking during adulthood and falling with retirement (Statistics Canada, 2013). However, interestingly at the age of 14 gender also begins to influence disposable income, creating differences that multiply with age (Lintonen et al., 2007). Therefore, the role of gender will be explored further in the following paragraphs, in order to examine the extent to which it interacts with age and impacts pay determination.

Desmarais and Curtis (1997) demonstrated this gender pay phenomenon among Canadian University students. While reporting about work that had been done over the previous summer, significant gender differences were found amongst students. In fact, when controlling for age, university major, and type of summer job, on average males made \$1.13/hour more than females. Additionally men reported working an average of 3.27 hours more a week than women. Therefore, over the course of 12 week summer job male students would, on average, make an estimated \$921.15 more than their female peers. As stated earlier, this salary discrepancy widens with age (Lintonen et al., 2007), reaching surprising proportions in older adult populations.

According to Statistics Canada (2013) on average women make \$3.89 less an hour than men, and this statistic represents a significant improvement from past years (Statistics Canada,

2013). Therefore, over the course of just 1 year, on average, a woman would make roughly \$7,080.00 less than a male counterpart. Could this be simply due to a discrepancy in the educational achievement of males and females? Unfortunately it is not, as women earn an equivalent percentage of Bachelor (58%), Masters (54%), and Doctorate (44%) degrees (Turcotte, 2011); therefore it appears as if the reasons for these pay discrepancies may be more complex. To understand the factors that may come into play regarding gender based wage discrepancies, it is first important to explore the development of the concepts and stereotypes associated with gender in North America.

Just prior to this examination it must be noted that there exists a gap within the gender-wage literature, existing between 2002 and 2006. Furthermore, much of the research concerning gender stereotypes and wage discrepancies took place during the 1990s. This may be problematic in that early findings may differ from more recent ones, due to potentially relevant cohort differences. For example, the 'typical' structure of the family itself in the 1990s may differ greatly from that found today. These fundamental structural differences could cause a loosening of gender-stereotypical behaviour among today's adolescents, as their concept of what is appropriate action for men and women may have changed over the course of this time gap. It is important to maintain this understanding while examining the literature, so as to contextualize possibly inconsistent findings.

The Impact of Socialization

When children gain mobility and competence they look to those they depend on, such as their parents, for both physical and social guidance in order to learn of and navigate through their ever-expanding world. Through modeling, children begin to exhibit gender-specific behaviours

that reflect that of their parents (Poulin-Dubois, Serbin, Eichstedt, Sen, & Beissel, 2002; Serbin, Poulin-Dubois, & Eichstedt, 2002), and as a result receive reinforcement for gender-appropriate actions as well as consequences for the deviant ones (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Peters, 1994; McHale, Crouter, & Whiteman, 2003). Based on these reactions, children begin to regulate their own behaviour in order to gain more socially desirable outcomes. According to Bussey and Bandura (1999) male roles are viewed as inherently having more power and status than female roles, making it much more difficult for a male to take up a female role than vice versa, as it would be regarded as a step down for the male. For example a male who engages in a feminine activity, such as putting on make-up, will receive a stronger reaction than a female who engages in a masculine activity, like playing a sport (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; McHale, Crouter, & Whiteman, 2003); therefore males would be much less likely to engage in gender ‘inappropriate’ activity than would females.

Even at the young age of 24 months, children have been shown to display gender-stereotypic behaviour. For example, children were able to correctly identify which gender *should* participate in gender-specific activities (Martin, Wood, & Little, 1990). However, this finding was only partially supported in subsequent research. Poulin-Dubois et al. (2002) presented children with two dolls (one identified as a male and one as a female), then children were asked which of the two dolls the child wished to play with during varying types of activities. There were three male and three female stereotypical activities, as well as three neutral activities described. Interestingly, only female children consistently correctly paired the male dolls with male activities, and the female dolls with female activities. Male children did not show this same type of awareness until the age of 30 months, when they would consistently correctly choose the male doll for stereotypically male activities. However, male children did not demonstrate this

same understanding for female stereotypes, as they would pick the male doll for female activities as often as they would pick the female doll for those same activities. One conclusion for these male/female differences in outcomes is that children first master same-sex stereotypes (Poulin-Dubois et al. 2002; Martin et al., 1990).

As stated previously, children not only model the behaviour of their parents, but also have their gender-appropriate behaviour reinforced through a variety of avenues. For example, gender stereotypes are expressed by parents through the types of toys they purchase for their children, the activities they encourage their children to participate in, and the manner in which they dress their child (Blakemore & Hill, 2007). Most notably, the types of values that are encouraged by parents differ based on gender. One example of this is that mothers tend to encourage their daughters to engage in socially based roles, placing importance on interpersonal relationships, while encouraging their sons to value autonomous roles (Bussey & Bandura, 1999). These differing priorities, based on gender and reinforced in the household, seem to translate into expectations for the workplace (Weisgram, Dinella, & Fulcher, 2011; DiDonato & Strough, 2013).

Due to the greater importance that women tend to place on interpersonal relationships, women seem to approach the workplace differently than do men, in that they focus less on promotions and salary (Desmarais & Curtis, 1999; Weisgram et al., 2011). This notion is referred to as 'job facet importance' (Major & Konar, 1984). Although men and women report valuing salary equally (Iverson, 2000; Jackson, Sullivan, & Gardner, 1992; Major & Konar, 1984), women report the valuing of personal development opportunities, pleasant working environments and flexibility of schedule for family life, more so than do men (Jackson et al., 1992; Weisgram et al., 2011). Men place greatest importance on personal achievement and

success (Iverson, 2000). This priority discrepancy may propel women to engage in social comparison, leading them to accept less for their work than a man would in the same position (Bylsma & Major, 1994; Major & Konar, 1984). The concept of social comparison itself will now be explored in relation to its effects on income acceptance and satisfaction.

In social comparison, one individual or group gauges what is an appropriate action by what others in their same position are doing or receiving. For example, a woman would look to those in similar career positions to identify what is considered an ‘appropriate’ salary for her own work. As long as this woman feels that she is receiving the same salary as those similar to her, she is likely to report high satisfaction with her income (Bylsma & Major, 1994; Keaveny & Inderrieden, 2000). As can be anticipated, however, a problem develops if a member of an already disadvantaged group is compared to other disadvantaged members, as this would prevent any member from receiving appropriate compensation (Bylsma & Major, 1994; Keaveny & Inderrieden, 2000). Finally, if a woman is comparing herself to a dissimilar individual, such as a man, she may feel less deserving of the salary she receives, even if it is equal to that of the man (Desmarais & Curtis, 1997) and even if she is performing work that is equal to that of her male colleague.

In determining an appropriate salary for a new job, individuals will tend to use their past income as a benchmark, if it is made salient (Desmarais & Curtis, 1999; Desmarais & Curtis, 1997). This means that if one received a low salary in their past position, such as a woman who had been making less than she should, then if prior salary is made salient she would expect a similarly low salary in her next position, therefore perpetuating the gender-based wage gap (Desmarais & Curtis, 1997). These gender differences are consistent with gender stereotypes regarding the worth placed upon male versus female work. Additionally, they hint at differing

values that men and women hold in regards to the workplace (i.e., personal success versus a pleasant working environment).

When asked to allocate pay between themselves and a partner, for work that they had completed, both men and women allocate more to a female than a male partner. Additionally, both men and women rate their female counterpart as more competent than a male peer (Callahan-Levy & Messe, 1979). However, female participants expect significantly less compensation for the work that they had done, than did male participants who had completed an equivalent task (Callahan-Levy & Messe, 1979; Babcock, Laschever, Gelfand, & Small, 2003). These findings support the notion that work done by men and women is valued differently, even by the worker him/herself. Therefore, not only does it seem that gender stereotypes affect what one believes to be true about the outside world, but more importantly what one believes to be true about one's own abilities.

These expectations regarding pay seem even to be apparent at the young age of 5 years, in that gender differences in negotiation strategies (or lack thereof) emerge. In a pay allocation scenario known as the ultimatum game, young girls (5 years old) have been found to offer their partner a greater share of their monetary reward than same aged boys. Furthermore, when the girls were provided the option to keep more of the reward, without their partner's awareness, they typically opted to 'split' the reward with their partner favouring fairness over personal gain. This decision strategy was not mirrored in the choices of the boys in the same situation. In fact the boys often decided to keep more of the reward for themselves, employing more strategic negotiation techniques in order to maximize the game's outcome in their favour (Murnighan & Saxon, 1998). Therefore, even at this young age boys and girls exhibit behaviour reminiscent of what is found in adult populations.

An example of these same gender differences found in adult populations is that of the negotiation attempts of MBA graduates. Of the 21% of MBA graduates who negotiated for an increase in salary, only 56% of them were actually successful in their attempts to increase their wage from their initial base rate of pay. Interestingly, in this case men and women were equally successful in achieving a raise however men were able to negotiate significantly greater gains than females (Gerhart & Rynes, 1991). Therefore, despite both men and women making more than they had initially, there still existed an obvious discrepancy between the two salaries. Although, these discrepancies may appear small (a difference of 1% in pay), over the course of one's career this small amount can have a dramatic financial impact (Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1996).

A large portion of the gender differences that appear in negotiation seems to stem from the misperception or stereotype that men are simply better overall negotiators than women. In actuality, women are not found to be poor negotiators, but men simply seem to be able to negotiate for greater gains, which may account, in part, for the financial discrepancies that are found between men and women. Additionally, when partnered with a male during a negotiation, females performed worse than when they were paired with a female. This may indicate that women may be more susceptible to stereotype threat when in the paired with an opposite-sex partner (Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002; Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2001).

If this stereotype threat were truly impactful, then it would show itself most strongly in male-dominated workplaces, as it is in these instances that women are viewed to be 'out of their element'. This has been found to hold true, as women report having lower job performance expectations for male-dominated jobs, while holding higher expectations when anticipating a female-dominated workplace (Bridges, 1988; Oswald, 2008; DiDonato & Strough, 2013).

Additionally, when gender stereotypes are made salient to female participants, they report greater skill for and liking of female-oriented jobs, than when gender stereotypes were not made salient. Even female participants that did not report having ‘femininity’ as part of their self-concept, reported greater anticipated skill in female-oriented jobs relative to male-oriented ones (Oswald, 2008). Therefore, stereotype threat may not only cause women to perform badly within a negotiation setting involving the opposite-sex, but may also cause women to feel negatively about their job performance in general. These negative feelings that emerge in response to stereotype threat may also work to maintain gender-based job segregation.

Contrary to popular opinion, job segregation does not suddenly emerge within adult working populations. Instead this gender-based separation is also apparent among working pre-adolescents. Pre-adolescent girls have been found to take up work in the home (i.e., babysitting), while boys have been found to be employed in positions that take place outside of the home, such as delivering newspapers (Mortimer, Finch, Owens, & Shanahan, 1990) or doing manual labour (Hirschman & Voloshin, 2007). In addition to these sources of income, many pre-adolescents receive a regular allowance from their parents. Although there are no reported differences between the amount of allowance that male and female pre-adolescents receive (Lintonen et al., 2007) and between what they expect to receive (Peters, 1994), there do seem to be gender differences that emerge in regards to pocket money and gifts (Furnham, 1999).

Overall, it appears as if males are given more weekly pocket money (small sums of money) than females, whether for completing household tasks or not (receipt of pocket money may not depend on the completion of chores and it may not necessarily be in the form of a fixed weekly allowance). Additionally, it seems that males receive more money as gifts than do females (Furnham, 1999). The exact reasons for why this is the case are still unknown, however a

variable which may be influential in determining compensation for work done, could be the individual's understanding of money itself (the monetary value of one's work, how wages are determined, how to increase wages, etc.). For example, if one has an accurate understanding of the monetary value of one's work, then they would be more likely to engage in negotiation if they felt they were being underpaid. Among girls aged 11-16 years, even older girls were unclear in their knowledge of how wages were determined and how to discuss exchanging work for money, while same aged boys did not report this limitation (Furnham & Cleare, 1988).

Moreover, when asked if and why they would open a bank account, boys were able to articulate more sophisticated reasons for doing so than same aged females (Furnham, 1999), demonstrating a more highly developed understanding of money and its value. These findings are consistent with more current literature, which states that boys tend to take a more active role in procuring money for themselves, than their female peers (Sneed et al., 2006).

In terms of saving ability, boys and girls report employing differing strategies for doing so. Although two thirds of adolescents aged 11-16 years report currently saving money, many of them are only doing so at home, with only a few saving within an institution such as a bank. Despite more frequent reports of saving from girls than boys, boys were more likely to be saving through the use of a bank account than were girls. This finding could reflect either the difference in the pre-adolescent's personal understanding of money (e.g. utility/purpose of money), or the difference in how girls and boys are encouraged by their parents to handle money. Additionally, boys are more likely to 'shop around' for the best bank, and to enquire about their personal accounts in order to maximize personal gains (Furnham, 1999).

Literature Review Summary

Through the above literature evaluation, some common threads have emerged regarding gender differences in pay equity that appear at ages as young as 5 years and become magnified in adulthood. The most important threads regarding the development of views regarding pay equity seem to hinge on differences in ideas of negotiation, job facet importance, feelings of entitlement, and the understanding of money itself (the monetary value of one's work, how wages are determined, how to increase wages, utility/purpose of money, etc.). As has been explored, these gender differences seem to be reinforced most strongly in the home through the creation and maintenance of gender-based roles, which then seem to be expressed when adolescents enter the workplace. However, in order to fully understand how these roles transfer to the workplace, one must first examine early earning experiences which 'set the stage' for later wage expectation.

The Present Study

With the aim of assessing the development of wage expectations, this study will take an exploratory approach to the investigation of the types of jobs that boys and girls (between the ages of 12 and 15) hold, the pay they receive and their feelings concerning it, their attitudes towards and attempts at negotiation, and the extent to which gender socialization in the home impacts these attitudes. Additionally, early saving experiences will be examined in order to glean the current level of understanding and valuing of money that pre-and early-adolescents have prior to their entering the formal workforce. These experiences should help to define precursors for wage expectations, as the older boys and girls should be beginning to work outside of the home. Therefore, the knowledge base of the older boys and girls may differ significantly from that of those working only in the home as well as those who have not yet had the opportunity to work for pay. Particular attention will also be paid to any gender-based differences that emerge.

Questions and Hypotheses

1) It is hypothesized that the wage discrepancies that are found in adulthood will be reflected in this pre-and early-adolescent population. Specifically, it is hypothesized that:

a) On average boys will make more money than their female peers.

b) Boys will be more likely to pursue work outside of the home (i.e. landscaping) while girls will favour more traditional work inside of the home (i.e. babysitting).

2) It is hypothesized that pre-and early-adolescents that reside in homes that adhere more strongly to stereotypical gender-based roles (as reported by the child), will be more likely to reflect these roles in their attitudes and work-related choices.

The study will also explore age differences and describe current beliefs and experiences in an adolescent and preadolescent sample with regards to a variety of other possible variables. For example, this study will analyze variables relating to key themes such as negotiation skills and success, chore and allowance experience, gender stereotypes, social comparison, saving strategies and knowledge about pay.

Method

Participants

In total, 157 participants volunteered for this study. Participants were recruited from 8 Canadian grade 7 and 8 classrooms and 15 grade 9 and 10 high school classrooms. In total, 3 school boards granted permission for the study: Waterloo Region District School Board, the Algoma District School Board and the Huron Superior Catholic District School Board. Within those school boards 7 schools were utilized (1 in Waterloo and 6 in Sault Ste. Marie).

Parental consent forms were distributed and collected by teachers. Only those students who returned signed consent forms were permitted to participate in the study. Consent forms requested permission for the child's participation in the survey, and optionally, involvement in a one-on-one interview (See Appendix A for a sample consent form). Parents, who agreed to their child taking part in the interview, were additionally asked if their child could be anonymously quoted in future publications.

Ages of participants ranged from 12-15 with 81 females ($M_{\text{age}} = 13.68$, $SD = 1.12$) and 76 males ($M_{\text{age}} = 13.57$, $SD = 1.06$). A summary of participants as a function of age and gender is presented in Table 1. The majority of participants identified themselves as White (87.9%) with 6.4% Asian, 5.1% Other (Native –Métis, Cree or Unspecified Native Canadian, Caribbean), and 0.6% Black. When selecting the 'Other' category participants were asked to specify their ethnicity. Participants' family structure was varied in that 70.1% of participants were from a two parent home (lived with both mother(s) and father(s)), 24.8% of participants resided in homes with a single parent, 3.8% lived with a parent and someone who was not a family member, and 1.3% chose 'other' to describe their living arrangement. Of those who resided in a single parent

household, 51.2% resided with their mother, while 46.2% rotated between each parent, and 2.6% lived with their father. Additionally, 59.9% of participants reported having an older sibling(s), with 38.2% stating that they did not – 1.9% of participants did not respond to this question. Finally, 55.4% of participants stated that they had a younger sibling(s) with 43.3% reporting that they did not – again 1.3% did not respond to this question.

Of the 157 participants who completed the survey, 89 took part in the interview sessions (44 females, 45 males). Interview participants ranged in age from 12-15 years (see Table 1 for a summary of age data for interview participants), and were selected from a convenience sample based on parental and individual consent.

Materials

One survey and one structured interview were prepared for this study. All students completed the survey through either hard copy or online format. The format of the survey depended on the individual student's needs and available equipment. Subsamples of students completing the survey were additionally invited to complete the interview.

Survey

The survey was comprised of 8 sections assessing demographic information, views regarding gender roles, past work experiences, views of money, negotiation, receipt of money, financial practices, and social desirability. All participants were randomly assigned an anonymous participant code to use in the completion of the survey and were given one of two website addresses to access the survey electronically

(<https://adobeformscentral.com/?f=ZLKteJ2aUZozEw%2AswsIR6Q> or

<https://adobeformscentral.com/?f=Okq2w3LCJBFFjyeaBjdhbg>). Both URLs led to the same

survey (refer to Appendix D for sample survey); the purpose for using two URLs was to allow for an increased number of responses to be collected, as there was a restriction upon number of responses per URL.

Demographic Information

Each participant responded to 10 forced-choice questions regarding their age, gender, ethnicity, number and type of siblings, living arrangement (who they lived with), whether or not their parents worked outside of the home, and their parents' occupations.

Views Regarding Gender Roles

Views regarding gender roles were assessed through 4 measures: the Children's Sex Role Inventory (Boldizar, 1991), 'Adolescent's Attitudes toward Women Scale for Adolescents' (Galambos et al., 1985), the 'Who should have the most say for purchasing items?' (Moschis & Moore, 1979) scale, and a Home Gender-role Inventory. Reliability for each of these scales is provided below.

The Children's Sex Role Inventory (CSRI) was comprised of 30 questions, employing a 4-point Likert type scale with anchors 'not at all true of me' and 'very true of me'. This scale was the short version of the CSRI developed by Boldizar (1991). This scale assessed participants' self-concept identification as masculine, feminine, and/or neutral. For the masculine subscale an example of one of the questions used is, "I can control a lot of the kids in my class". An example of one of the feminine questions employed is, "It makes me feel bad when someone else is feeling bad". Finally, an example of one of the neutral items utilized is, "People like me". Reliability ratings for the present sample was $\alpha=.79$ for the Masculine subset, $\alpha=.85$ for the Feminine subset, and $\alpha=.44$ for the Neutral (androgyny) subset.

The ‘Adolescent’s Attitudes toward Women Scale for Adolescents’ was comprised of 12 questions, employing a 4-point Likert type scale with anchors ‘strongly agree’ and ‘strongly disagree’. This measure was adapted by Galambos et al. (1985) to suit the adolescent population. This scale assessed participant attitudes towards the differing treatment of men and women. Low scores represent low endorsement of stereotypical views. Some items (counter-stereotypic items) were reverse scored to reflect this, therefore even if a participant scored highly on the counter-stereotypic item their score on the measure was transformed to reflect low endorsement of stereotypical views. One of the questions used was, “More encouragement in a family should be given to sons than daughters to go to college or university”. Reliability for the present sample was adequate at $\alpha=.74$ overall.

The ‘Who should have more say in purchasing items?’ inventory was comprised of 10 forced choice questions regarding who the participant believed should have more say (authority) in varying household decisions/purchases. Categorical response choices included mother, father, both, or I don’t know. For example, “Who should have the most say for purchasing/deciding the following items: buying groceries?”.

In the Home Gender-role Inventory there were 14 forced-choice questions to which participants responded regarding their belief as to who (the mother, the father, both, or I don’t know) was responsible for completing various household chores. “In your home, whose responsibility is it for completing the following household tasks: cleaning the bathroom?”.

Past Work Experiences

Previous work experiences were assessed through 3 measures including the Experiences with Chores measure, the Pay Self Efficacy scale by Kim et al. (2008) and the Children and Pay

Equity measure. The Experiences with Chores measure asked participants about chores they might complete in the home. This measure was constructed for the present study. It was comprised of 3 sections: listing chores, evaluating chores, and remuneration for chores. Participants were asked to list chores that they were responsible for, in a free-response format. Then using a 5-point Likert scale, anchored with 'always' and 'never', participants were asked to rate how often they were responsible for completing each of the chores they had previously listed. For example, "For each chore you listed above (in the same order you listed them), how often are you responsible for doing that chore?" A second 5-point Likert scale, anchored with 'love it' and 'hate it', asked participants about their enjoyment level in completing their listed chores. For example, "For each of the chores you listed above (in the same order as listed) indicate how much you enjoy doing that chore." Following these ratings a yes/no question was presented, which asked whether participants were paid for any or all of the chores that they typically complete. If participants responded affirmatively, then they were asked to identify how often they were paid (on a 5 point Likert scale with anchors 'always' and 'never'), how much they receive, and who pays them for their work (mother, father, both, or I don't know).

The second measure, the Pay Self Efficacy scale (Kim et al., 2008; Riggs & Knight, 1994), began with the statements, "If you have a job, please answer the following set of questions about your job. If you do not have a job please answer the following set of questions about your chore(s)." Following these statements participants responded to a forced choice question concerning which type of work they would be responding in regards to (job or chores). Then participants responded to a series of 14 questions, using 7-point Likert scales anchored with 'strongly disagree' and 'strongly agree'. An example of one of the questions used is, "I have confidence in my ability to do my job". For the present sample reliability was adequate at $\alpha=.74$.

The third measure, Children and Pay Equity, began with 3 forced-choice (yes/no/I don't know) questions which asked participants about work outside of the home that they had completed recently. For example, "Do you currently have a job outside of your house?". Following this measure, participants responded to 4 open-ended questions asking about a current job: the type of work they did, the pay that they received for that work, and the number of hours they worked. One example of a question was, "How many hours a week do you work?"

Views of Money

Current attitudes about money and its value were evaluated through the use of 2 measures: the Money Attitude scale (Yamauchi & Templer, 1982) and the Pay-for-Performance Perception (Kim et al, 2008; Heneman et al., 1988) scale. The Money Attitude scale had 23 items and employed a 7-point Likert scale with anchors 'always' and 'never'. Questions ascertained participants' beliefs about their use and valuing of money. This scale also utilized 3 embedded subscales which are as follows: Power-Prestige, Retention-Time and Distrust. An example of one of the Power-prestige questions is, "I use money to influence other people to do things for me". One of the Retention-time items used is, "I save now to prepare for my future". Finally, a sample question used in the Distrust subscale is, "It bothers me when I discover I could have gotten something for less, elsewhere." Reliability on this measure for the present study was $\alpha=.78$ for Distrust, $\alpha=.86$ for Power-Prestige, and $\alpha=.83$ for Retention-Time.

The Pay-for-Performance Perception scale was a 4 item measure that utilized a 7-point Likert Scale with anchors 'strongly disagree' and 'strongly agree'. This scale asked participants about their beliefs regarding how to get a wage increase. A sample question is as follows, "If I perform especially well on my job, it is likely that I would get a pay raise." Reliability for this

measure was reported at $\alpha=.71$. Reliability for the present study was $\alpha=.55$. Due to the poor reliability of this measure no further analyses were conducted using it.

Current Understanding of Negotiation Practices and Past Attempts

Participant understanding of negotiation practices and their past experiences were examined using 4 measures: an Implicit Negotiation Belief scale (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007), the Subjective Value Inventory (Curham et al., 2006), a Wage Increase Inventory, and a Past Negotiation Experience measure. Reliabilities for each of the measures are provided below.

The Implicit Negotiation Belief scale consisted of 7 questions which were presented using a 7 point Likert scale anchored by 'very strongly agree' and 'very strongly disagree'. These questions were used to gauge participant beliefs about the nature of negotiator qualities. For example, "Everyone is a certain kind of negotiator and there is not much that can be done to really change that." Low scores on this measure reflect the belief that negotiation ability is influenced by experience. Some items on the scale were reverse scored to support distinction of this belief from the idea that negotiation ability is solely innate. Therefore, participants who endorsed the idea that 'experience teaches in negotiation' may have scored highly on particular items that supported this belief, however their resultant transformed scores were low. Kray and Haselhuhn (2007) reported reliability as $\alpha=.87$. For the present sample, reliability was $\alpha=.50$.

The Wage Increase Inventory involved a set of 4 questions, presented in a 5-point Likert scale format, anchored with 'always' and 'never'. Participants were asked how often they spoke about negotiation with their parents or peers, and how often they actually made a negotiation attempt. An example of this is, "How often do you ask for an allowance increase?" Reliability for the present study was $\alpha=.64$.

The Subjective Value Inventory (SVI) included 8 questions concerning a past negotiation attempt made by the participant. The participant was instructed to “Please answer the following set of questions if you have ever been able to successfully negotiate (ask for) for more money, either at home or at work. Use a situation that is easiest to remember.” Questions were presented using a 7-point Likert scale and anchored with ‘not at all’ and ‘perfectly’. An example of a question used was, “How satisfied were you with the outcome? That is, how much did the outcome benefit you?”. High scores on this measure reflected satisfaction with the negotiation process/outcome. Again, participants may have scored low on select items, even if they endorsed satisfaction with their negotiation, as these items were then reverse scored. As this inventory was an adapted version of Curhan et al.’s SVI, reliability needed to be recalculated. Therefore, reliability for the present study was found to be good at $\alpha=.90$.

The Past Negotiation Experience measure involved a series of 3 forced-choice questions asking participants about a past negotiation attempt which yielded a wage change. If the participant had previously expressed success at negotiation, then they responded to questions concerning the outcome of their attempt. For example, “If you have successfully negotiated for a wage increase, how many times have you been able to do so?” which was followed by, “How comfortable do you feel with asking for more money?”

Receipt of Money in Varying Circumstances

The frequency of receipt of monetary gifts and pay for work done was evaluated using 1 measure. The Money Inventory involved 7 questions using a 5-point Likert Scale, which were anchored with ‘always’ and ‘never’. Participants responded to questions about the frequency of receipt of pocket money, monetary gifts, allowance, and pay for work. An example of the

questions used in this measure was, “How often do you receive the following: Money for special holidays (e. g. Christmas, Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, Ramadan, Other)?” Reliability of this measure for the present study was $\alpha=.60$.

Current and Past Saving Practices

The saving strategies employed by the participants were assessed using one measure. The Saving Styles measure included 4 questions. The first 3 questions were presented in a forced-choice (Yes/No/I don't know) format in which participants responded to questions regarding whether they were currently saving money and whether they used a bank account to do so. For example, “Do you save regularly?” The 4th question in this measure was also presented in a forced choice format however the possible responses differed in that they were anchored with ‘less than 1 year’ and ‘more than 4 years’. Participants responded to this question only if they had previously affirmed that they used a bank account. This final question read, “If yes (you do have a personal bank account), how long have you had the account for?”

Social Desirability

Participant tendencies to respond to survey questions in a socially desirable manner were assessed through an adapted version of one measure: the Brief Social Desirability scale (Blake et al., 2006). The adapted version of the Brief Social Desirability scale consisted of 14 true/false questions (instead of 16 questions) which were prefaced with the statements, “Below you find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and decide if that statement describes you or not. If it describes you, check the box for 'True'; if not, check 'False'.” Questions ranged from, “I always admit my mistakes openly and face potential negative consequences” to, “I occasionally speak badly about others behind their back”. Reliability for the present study was

$\alpha = .69$. Following these questions one final question was asked using a 7-point Likert scale, anchored with 'very honest' to 'very dishonest'. The question read, "On a scale of 1-7, with 1 indicating very honest and 7 indicating very dishonest, please indicate how truthful you thought your responses were."

Interview

All interviews were audio recorded and conducted using a set of scripted questions (refer to *Appendix E* for sample questions). Interviews consisted of 5 sections pertaining to money made in the home (e.g. allowance) and outside of the home (e.g. babysitting/landscaping), social comparison, attitudes towards their current wages, and feelings about their understanding of wages.

Money and Negotiation Inside of the Home

Receipt of money and negotiation in the home was evaluated using 3 questions, which encouraged open-ended responses. Participants responded to questions regarding their current receipt of allowance, how the allowance system functioned in their home, and whether they commonly negotiated for other things (other than allowance). If participants appeared unsure of how to answer these questions, then a verbal prompt was used. On such prompt was, "For example, who gives you your allowance?" If participants stated that they did not receive an allowance, or money for work they did in the home, then the researcher asked whether the participant negotiated for other things in the home, before proceeding to the next set of questions.

Money Outside of the Home

Wages made outside of the home were assessed using 2 sets of questions that again encouraged open-ended responses.

In the first set of questions participants were asked about their current working status outside of the home (i.e. “Do you do any other jobs to make money”), how they came to possess their job, how they were paid for their work, and how they felt about their earned wages. Again if participants appeared unsure of how to answer verbal prompts were used such as, “How long have you had the job?” and “How do you feel about the job and the amount you get paid?” However if the participant responded such that they did not have other work, then the researcher proceeded to the next set of questions.

The second set of questions again encouraged an open-ended response and involved a hypothetical babysitting scenario. Participants were told, “Let’s pretend a neighbour came to you to ask you if you would babysit their two children (who were 5 and 6 years old). Tell me about what you would expect to get paid and how you would go about asking for that.”

If the participant had stated that they did not receive money in-or outside of the home, than the interview was ended at this point. However, if they had responded that they did receive money either in-or outside of the home, then the researcher proceeded to the next sets of questions.

Social Comparison

Participant feelings regarding social comparison were examined with two questions. Participants were asked to respond in an open-ended manner to the question, “How much money do you think you make in comparison to your friends or classmates?” Following the participant’s

response they were asked to specify who he/she was thinking of during their response. For example, “Who were you thinking of when you answered the last question?”

Attitudes towards Current Wages

Attitudes about current earnings for work completed were assessed using a series of 5 questions which again encouraged open-ended responses. Participants responded to questions concerning their feelings towards their overall earnings (i.e. allowance and job), whether they had previously discussed their earnings with anyone, if they had previously attempted to negotiate for higher wages, and what negotiation tactics they had employed (or what reservations might have kept them from trying). For example, “Overall, across all of your jobs, how do you feel about what you are getting paid?”

Feelings about Current Understanding of Wages

Current level of knowledge regarding wages was examined using one open-ended question, which read “How well informed do you feel about getting paid? Is there anything you wish you could find out more about?”

Procedure

All participants completed the survey and a subsample of students at each age completed the interview.

Survey

Surveys were completed individually or in groups (ranging in size from 3 to 13) depending upon the number of students available for participation at any given time. Most participants completed the survey in a group setting, in an empty room within their school during

the regular school day; however some participants completed the survey in a laboratory at Wilfrid Laurier University during convenient meeting times. Both locations had laptops and desktops that were pre-loaded with the survey to permit students to immediately begin work on the survey after having received brief instructions reviewing the purpose of the study, and the rationale for providing a code number rather than using identifying information. Following these instructions, the researcher assigned each participant their anonymous code and asked participants if they had any questions. When the participants were ready, they were informed that they could start the survey.

The researcher supervised the completion of the online survey, and answered individual questions as they arose. When each participant had finished their survey their results were electronically submitted. They were then thanked for their participation that day and either returned to their ongoing class, or immediately debriefed and returned to a parent (if tested in the University lab setting and not to completing an interview), or immediately proceeded to complete the interview portion of the study (in University setting).

Interview

Following the conclusion of surveys in each school, one-on-one interviews were conducted; in the University lab setting participants proceeded to the interview immediately following the completion of their online survey. Students who had been approved for the interview (through parental consent) were asked for verbal consent to take part in the one-on-one interview. Participants who confirmed their willingness to participate were interviewed individually in a familiar, empty room or classroom within their school (if tested in the University setting, both the survey and the interview were completed in the same lab room).

Before initiating the interview, a verbal review of the purpose of the interview was provided to each participant. As stated previously, all interviews were audio recorded. Participants were identified using the same code number used for the survey. This allowed survey and interview data to be matched. Participants were encouraged to ask for elaboration or clarification if any interview question was ambiguous or difficult to understand. When the interview questions ended the recording device was turned off. With the device off, the researcher asked the participant if they had any questions regarding the study. The participant was then debriefed, thanked for their participation, and returned to their class or parent.

Results

Two sources of data, the survey and interview sessions, were analyzed. Within the survey 4 general topics were explored including: remuneration, work experience, influence of parents on child job-type, and beliefs and attitudes about work and wages. Qualitative methodologies were used to examine the interview data to identify themes. Themes were then analyzed quantitatively to assess potential age and gender differences in their prevalence. For both the survey and interview analyses age data were aggregated into two categories – younger (12 and 13 year olds) and older (14 and 15 year olds) adolescents.

Survey Data: Remuneration

To examine hypothesis 1, measures assessing remuneration were compared as a function of age and gender. Hypothesis one asserted that wage discrepancies found in adulthood would be reflected in this sample such that boys would make more than girls. In addition, it was expected that increases in remuneration would be seen with increasing age. In total there were 10 possible

measures to assess remuneration in this study, however, only 9 were included in analyses (one measure ‘how much are you paid for your current job’ was excluded due to low responses).

Nine individual questions addressed potential sources of difference for remuneration for boys and girls. Seven questions sampled sources from which participants could acquire money (i.e., birthday, special occasion, allowance, part-time job, pocket money, odd jobs, and simply asking for money) and the remaining two questions queried the frequency of payment for chores and the likelihood of gaining additional funds after asking for an increase in allowance. Each item was scored on a 5 point Likert scale (minimum score=1, maximum score=5). Overall, for both male and female participants the highest sources for receiving money was through monetary gifts for birthdays ($M_{\text{female}}=4.19$ and $M_{\text{male}}=4.55$) followed by other special occasions ($M_{\text{female}}=3.75$ and $M_{\text{male}}=3.98$) (see Table 2 for summary of means).

At the outset, these multiple sources of remuneration were aggregated to see if these multiple measures could be analyzed as a scale of remuneration. Two possible scales were considered. The first involved aggregating the first 7 questions. Reliability for this scale was inadequate, Cronbach’s $\alpha=.59$. A second possible scale included all 9 items. Reliability for this scale was better, Cronbach’s $\alpha=.67$ but still inadequate. As a result, all subsequent analyses used each question as a unique source of remuneration.

A 2 (gender) X 2 (age) MANOVA was conducted with each of the 9 ‘sources of remuneration’ items serving as the dependent measures (see Table 2 for summary of means). Pillai’s trace tests indicated no significant main effects of gender, $F(1,72)=1.248$ $p=.286$ or of age, $F(1,72)=1.65$ $p=.128$, nor any significant age by gender interactions, $F(1,72)=1.484$ $p=.18$. Given the exploratory nature of these analyses subsequent univariate tests were examined. These

univariate analyses indicated a main effect for gender for the question that involved asking a parent or guardian for money and receiving it after asking, $F(1,72)=4.732$, $p=.033$. The main effect suggests that girls ($M= 3.22$, $SD =1.312$) were more likely than boys ($M=2.68$, $SD=1.228$) to receive money when directly asking for it. Three main effects for age emerged, the first being for the question involving ‘a weekly allowance’, $F(1,72)=4.633$ $p=.035$, the second for ‘how often paid for chores’, $F(1,76)=6.815$ $p=.011$, and the third for ‘asking a parent or guardian for money and receiving it after asking’ $F(1,76)=6.255$ $p=.015$. The main effects suggest that younger adolescents ($M=2.54$, $SD=1.63$) receive a weekly allowance more frequently than older adolescents ($M=1.89$, $SD=1.23$), that younger adolescents ($M=3.39$, $SD=1.39$) are paid for chores more frequently than older adolescents ($M=2.66$, $SD=1.33$) and that older adolescents ($M=3.29$, $SD=1.27$) receive money when asking for it more frequently than younger adolescents ($M=2.63$, $SD=1.24$). Also, a trend for an age by gender interaction emerged for the question involving receipt of ‘a weekly allowance’, $F(1,76)=3.43$, $p=.068$, such that older female adolescents ($M=1.33$, $SD=.62$) were the least likely to receive a ‘weekly allowance’ ($M_{OlderMales}=2.30$, $SD_{OlderMales}=1.42$; $M_{YoungerFemales}=2.67$, $SD_{YoungerFemales}=1.62$; $M_{YoungerMales}=2.40$, $SD_{YoungerMales}=1.67$).

An independent samples t-test was conducted comparing males ($M=10.9$, $SD=7.86$) and females ($M=10.25$, $SD=12.16$) in the amount of payment they received for completing chores. There were no significant differences as a function of gender, $t_{39}=.026$, $p=.84$.

In addition to direct sources of remuneration available to these participants, potential for increases in remuneration through knowledge of, or success with negotiation for wage increases, were also examined through the four questions that were initially part of the Wage Increase Inventory created for this study. Individual questions were used as the unit of analysis as the

aggregated four item-scale yielded a reliability that was unacceptable (Cronbach's $\alpha = .64$). The four questions assessed how often participants spoke about negotiation with their parents, how often they spoke to their peers about wage increases, how often they negotiated for increased remuneration and how often they were granted a wage increase post-negotiation. Visual examination of the individual items for this scale indicated that few participants heard about or engaged in discussion involving wage increases with all but one mean falling below 2 (see Table 3 for summary of means).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) MANOVA was conducted for the four questions (see Table 3). The Pillai's trace indicated no main effects of age ($F(1,134)=1.812, p=.991$) or gender ($F(1,134)=0.72, p=.131$), nor were there any significant age by gender interactions ($F(1,134)=.20, p=.938$). Given the exploratory nature of these analyses subsequent univariate tests were examined. These univariate analyses revealed a main effect for age that approached significance ($F(1,134)=3.33, p=.07$) for the question involving the frequency with which parents discuss negotiation of wages. No other main effects or interactions were significant, largest $F(1,134)=.334, p=.564$, for an age by gender interaction for the frequency with which parents discuss negotiation of wages with participants.

Overall, among the sources of remuneration, there were generally few differences between boys and girls and similarly, few differences across age. Interestingly, the only main effect for gender was a trend with girls receiving more money when they directly asked parents for it. For age, it seems that younger adolescents received more allowance and were paid more frequently for chores, while older adolescents more frequently received money when directly asking a parent or guardian for it. Additionally, a more complex outcome was detected through a trend for an age by gender interaction, where older female adolescents were the least likely to

receive a weekly allowance. In these cases, where differences did appear, the outcomes were only partially consistent with Hypothesis 1 in that, with age, boys made more than girls. The main effects and interaction also suggest the opposite effects predicted by Hypothesis 1 with the trend toward younger adolescents receiving more than their elder peers. Based on these findings, no consistent support is available for Hypothesis 1.

Survey: Work Experience and Type of Work

In order to understand work experience in the present sample, participants experience with chores and other non-chores work were examined. Two sets of analyses were conducted. The first analysis reflects an examination of chores and paid work. Subsequent analyses examine more closely the type of chores and work. Specifically, to examine hypothesis 2, which asserted that boys would be more likely to pursue work outside of the home (e.g., landscaping) while girls would favour more traditional work inside of the home (e.g., babysitting), chores and other work were coded with respect to whether they involved work inside versus outside the home.

Overall work experience:

Participants were asked to list all current chores. In total, 91.72% of the participants identified having responsibility for at least one chore, while 8.28% of the participants identified no chores or left the question blank. A total number of chores score was tabulated for each participant. Overall, participants were responsible for approximately 4 chores ($M=4.37$, $SD=2.30$ chores) (see Table 4 for summary of means). A 2 (gender) by 2 (age) ANOVA was conducted to examine possible differences as a function of gender and/or age in the number of chores completed. Only the significant main effect of gender emerged, $F(1,157)=8.52$, $p=.004$, such

that females reported having more chores than males ($M_{\text{female}}=4.90$, $SD_{\text{female}}=2.27$; $M_{\text{male}}=3.80$, $SD_{\text{male}}=2.22$). The main effect for age and the interaction were not statistically significant.

Payment for completing chores was also assessed. Overall, slightly more than half of the participants (53.5%) indicated that they were not paid for chores while 37.58% of the participants reported being paid and 8.92% of the participants did not respond to this question. A Crosstabs Pearson Chi-square was conducted in order to determine possible age and gender differences in whether participants were paid for completing their chores. Age was significant $\chi^2=5.506$, $df=1$, $p=.019$, with the younger adolescents reporting that they were paid more often than the older adolescents (54.2% and 45.8% respectively). There were no significant differences as a function of gender, $\chi^2=2.2$, $df=1$, $p=.138$.

Three additional scales assessed how frequently participants were asked to do their self-identified chores, participants' enjoyment of their chores, and how frequently they were paid for their chores. Scores for each of these scales represented an aggregated average score. Specifically, participants responded to a 5-point scale for each chore listed for each of these questions (anchors of 5= once a day, to 1=never for frequency of chores, 5=love it to 1= hate it for enjoyment and 5=always to 1= never for payment frequency, respectively). Responses were summed across chores for each measure for each participant and then divided by the total number of chores for that (see Table 5 for summary of means). A 2(gender) X 2(age) MANOVA was conducted to assess potential age and gender differences in participants' frequency ratings for chores completed and payment and their emotional response to the chores. Pillai's trace indicated no significant main effects (age: $F(1,13)=.2.07$, $p=.182$; gender: $F(1,13)=.1.04$, $p=.424$), nor any interactions (age by gender: $F(1,13)=.1.14$, $p=.389$). Given the exploratory

nature of these analyses subsequent univariate tests were examined, but these also revealed no significant main effects or interactions.

Perceived self-efficacy for chores and work completed was also assessed. Participants self-identified whether they completed the Pay Self Efficacy scale, with respect to chores or paid work. Overall, many more participants responded to this question from the perspective of completing chores relative to paid work ($t_{(145)}=8.30$, $p<.001$) with 63.06% of participants using chores as their referent, relative to the 29.93% who referred to paid work and 7.01% who did not answer this question. An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine possible gender differences in participants' use of either chore or paid work as their referent for the Pay Self Efficacy scale. No significant differences were evident as a function of gender for which referent participants used, $t_{(144)}=1.267$, $p=.207$. Overall, 18.47% females and 11.46% males used job as their referent, 31.85% females and 31.21% males used chores as their referent, and finally 7.01% of participants did not respond to this question.

In general, average responses to the Pay Self Efficacy Scale reflected relatively strong self-efficacy ratings for both females and males ($M_{\text{female}}=5.02$, $SD_{\text{female}}=.76$; $M_{\text{male}}=5.04$, $SD_{\text{male}}=.96$) (see Table 6 for summary of means) with mean scores consistent with a rating of 'somewhat agree' with statements provided. The 2(gender) X 2(age) ANOVA conducted to assess potential age and gender differences in participants' beliefs about own work/chores did not yield any significant main effects or interactions, largest $F(1,135)=2.14$, $p=.219$ for the interaction of gender and age.

Three individual questions assessed previous and current work experience where participants have earned *income outside of the home*. The questions examined whether: (1)

payment had ever been provided by someone other than a parent (yes/no/I don't know), (2) employment was current (yes/no/I don't know), and (3) whether employment had occurred within the year previous (yes/no/I don't know). Few participants used the option 'I don't know', therefore, these responses were not included in subsequent analyses.

Pearson Chi-square analyses were conducted for each of the three questions. Comparisons revealed significant differences for age ($\chi_{age}^2=5.945$, $df=1$ $p=.015$) only for current employment outside of the home such that older participants (71.4%) were more likely than younger participants (28.6%) to be employed outside of the home. Comparisons for whether payment had ever been provided by someone other than a parent approached significance, $\chi_{age}^2=3.398$, $df=1$ $p=.065$ such that older participants (61.7%) were more likely than younger participants (38.3%) to have ever been paid for work by someone other than a parent. Whether employment occurred within the year previous, was not significant ($\chi_{age}^2=2.156$, $df=1$ $p=.142$).

Gender could not be compared for the question of payment by an adult other than a parent as there were an insufficient number of female respondents that answered negatively to this ($n=3$). There was, however, a trend for current employment, $\chi^2=3.01$, $df=1$ $p=.083$, such that more females than males were currently employed doing work beyond what would be expected of their typical household chore responsibilities. No gender differences or trends were found for the question regarding whether employment occurred within the year previous, $\chi^2=.68$, $df=1$ $p=.41$.

Overall, both age and gender seem to have affected some important aspects of participants' past work experiences. Interestingly, females on average reported doing more chores than males. Additionally, trends in the data suggested that females were more likely to

report having a job beyond the chores expected of them. Interestingly, it appeared that older participants were far more likely than younger adolescents to have a job outside of their regular chore responsibilities and there was a trend suggesting that they also indicated greater payment from outside the home.

Inside versus outside work

Two measures examined the location in which participants completed their work (inside versus outside the home). The first measure asked participants to list the chores they completed and a second asked participants to identify additional work they completed beyond chores. For the first measure, the type of chores participants completed was coded into two categories: inside the home (e.g., vacuuming, dusting, dishes, etc.) or outside the home (e.g., mowing the lawn, shoveling, walking the dog, etc.) activities. Based on these categories, participants could be grouped into one of three categories: all chores were conducted in the home, all chores were conducted outside the home, or participants completed both types of chores (some inside and some outside the home). Additionally, a fourth group was identified for participants who did not report completion of any chores.

Overall, twice as many females than males reported completing chores that take place ‘inside the home’ (33.1%_{females} versus 14.6%_{males}). However, almost twice as many males than females reported responsibilities for chores that take place both ‘inside and outside of the home’ (26.1%_{males} versus 15.3%_{females}). Finally, more than twice as many males than females reported having no responsibility for chores (‘no chores’ (7%_{males} versus 3.2%_{females})).

Examination of age differences using a Pearson Chi-square analysis was conducted for a comparison of inside chores, chores that took place both inside and outside of the home, and

those that indicated 'no chores'. This comparison indicated no differences as a function of age, $\chi^2=2.455$ $df=2$ $p=.293$. Age differences were not possible for the 'only outside chores/work' category because an insufficient number of younger ($n=0$) and older adolescents ($n=1$) in this sample had only outside chores.

A similar Pearson Chi-square analysis was conducted to compare location of chore work across gender. Again only three chore location categories were compared as 'only outside chores/work' had an insufficient number of respondents. Chore location and gender were significantly related, $\chi^2=17.705$ $df=2$ $p<.001$, such that females (69.3%) completed more inside chores than males (30.7%), males completed more 'inside and outside chores' (63.1%) than females (36.9%), and males (68.8%) were more likely than females (31.3%) *not* to have to complete any chores at all.

One question from the Children and Pay Equity measure addressed participants' employment by asking what they currently did for work *above and beyond* what they did as regular chores. For this second measure, the type of work participants held were coded into two categories, a job 'inside the home' such as babysitting, pet-sitting, house-sitting, or house cleaning (outside of regular chores), or a job 'outside of the home' involving any duties outside the home like soccer refereeing, snow shoveling, working for a law firm or other organization, etc. Similar to the previous measure assessing inside and outside chores, the responses to this measure allowed participants' work to be grouped into one of 3 categories. These categories were assigned as follows: those holding only job(s) inside of the home (as determined by the criteria above), those holding only job(s) outside of the home (as determined by the criteria above), or those holding both a job inside of the home as well as a job outside of the home (total of two or more jobs). A present/ not present scale was created for each category. Overall, less

than half of the participants reported having to do any work above and beyond their expected chores. Of those who did report additional work, 15.92% of participants reported working inside of the home, 23.57% reported working outside of the house, 7.64% reported having both a job inside the home and outside of the home and the remaining participants (52.87%) either self-identified as unemployed or failed to report being required to do any kind of work beyond expected chores.

Examination of participant employment (outside of regular chores) was conducted using Pearson Chi-square analyses. Comparisons for age were only conducted for the two categories no job(s) and job(s) only outside of home, as the combination employment-type 'job(s) inside the home as well as job(s) outside the home' and 'the employment-type job(s) only inside the home' had an insufficient sample size ($n < \text{or} = 4$ participants). Comparisons revealed a significant relationship with age for job outside of home, $\chi^2=8.02$ $df=1$ $p=.005$, such that older adolescents were the most likely to hold a job outside of the home (75.6% compared to 24.4%).

In terms of gender, statistical comparisons again could not be made for the category 'job(s) inside of the home' as too few males reported holding this employment-type (only 3 male participants reported work 'inside the home' compared to the 22 female participants that reported work 'inside the home'). Additionally, statistical comparisons for the category job(s) both inside the home as well as job(s) outside the home also could not be made as only 3 male participants reported this employment-type, compared to the 9 female participants that reported this same type of work. Therefore, comparisons for gender were only conducted using the two remaining selections, job(s) outside the home and no job(s). Comparisons did not reveal any significant relationships, however descriptively more males than females held jobs outside of the house (58.5% compared to 41.5%) and more males than females either self-identified as unemployed or

failed to report being required to do any kind of work beyond expected chores (56.3% compared to 43.8%).

Together these results support a pattern of outcomes where female participants, perform the chores in the home more often than males. When examining work beyond typical chores it was also evident that females were more often employed inside the home than males. For the most part these responsibilities did not change as a function of age, except for an overall increase in ‘outside the home’ employment for both males and females in older adolescence. Therefore, the findings provide some support for hypothesis 2 that girls were more likely to report working inside the home while males were more likely to report working outside the home.

Survey: Influence of Parents on Child Job Type

To examine hypothesis 3, measures assessing parental and participant employment were compared as a function of age and gender. Hypothesis 3 asserted that pre-and early-adolescents residing in homes that adhered more strongly to stereotypical gender-based roles (as reported by the child), would be more likely to reflect those roles in their attitudes and work-related choices. In total, there were two measures that evaluated parental employment.

Parental employment was assessed through two open-ended items, ‘what does your mother do for a job’ and ‘what does your father do for a job’, which were found in the demographic information measure. Participant written responses were then transformed into one of two categories: gender-stereotypic job and non-gender-stereotypic job. For example, a father who was reported to work as a mechanic would be categorized as stereotypic while a father reported to be a nurse (a stereotypical ‘female’ occupation) or a gender neutral occupation would be categorized as non-stereotypic. Each participants’ mother and father was assigned a

stereotypic job score (0 or 1, with 1 representing gender stereotypic job or 0 representing non-stereotypic job). Evaluation was based on conventional stereotypic assignment of occupations and the experimenter made all evaluations. Overall, 58.23% of all participant fathers held a stereotypic male job, and 47.47% of all mothers were reported to hold a stereotypical female job.

Two Pearson chi-square analyses were conducted in order to examine potential age and gender differences among this sample of adolescents with respect to whether mothers or fathers stereotypic in occupations differed as a function of the age or gender of the sample. As described above, mothers and fathers occupations were classified as stereotypic or not stereotypic. Chi square analyses were conducted first for mother's occupation. Comparisons revealed differences that approached significance for age ($\chi^2=3.683$ $df=1$ $p=.055$) for the mother stereotypic scale such that older participants (64%) were more likely than younger participants (36%) to have a mother that held a stereotypic job. Gender was not significant ($\chi^2=.293$ $df=1$ $p=.588$) for the mother stereotypic scale. Descriptively, males and females had a near equal number of mothers in stereotypic jobs, 50.7% and 49.3% respectively. Comparisons did not reveal significant differences as a function of age ($\chi^2=1.256$ $df=1$ $p=.262$) or gender ($\chi^2=.03$ $df=1$ $p=.862$) for the father stereotypic job scale. Descriptively, more females than males had fathers in stereotypic jobs, 52.2% and 47.8% respectively. Finally, older adolescents (59.8%) were more likely than younger adolescents (40.2%) to have fathers that held stereotypic jobs.

In summary, the influence of gender stereotypy in parental employment was not observed in relation to children's gender or age. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Survey: Beliefs and Attitudes about Work and Wages

This study also explored young and pre-adolescent beliefs and attitudes about work and wages through the examination of four topics. These topics included gender roles, views of money, current understanding of negotiation practices and past attempts, as well as current and past saving practices. Analyses examined these issues as a function of age and gender.

Survey: Gender Roles

Children's self-identification for feminine, masculine and neutral characteristics was assessed through the Children's Sex Role Inventory. Overall, for the masculine scale participants rated these characteristics ($M=28.04$, $SD=5.14$) between 'a little true of them' and 'mostly true for them', and feminine traits ($M=30.46$, $SD=5.31$) reflected a score of 'true of me' (see Table 7 for summary of means).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) MANOVA was conducted to assess potential age and gender differences in participants' sex-role identification for each of the feminine and masculine traits. Pillai's trace indicated a main effect for gender ($F(1,135)=18.53$ $p<.001$), but no other main effects (age: $F(1,135)=.255$, $p=.775$) or interactions (age by gender: $F(1,135)=.634$, $p=.532$). Subsequent univariate tests supported that there were no main effects of age on either the masculine or feminine subscales, $F(1, 135)= .28$, $p=.597$ and $F(1, 135)=.369$ $p=.544$ respectively. There was however, one significant main effect for gender for the feminine scale, $F(1,135)=33.274$, $p<.001$. Females ($M= 32.65$, $SD =4.38$) endorsed more feminine statements about themselves than did males ($M=27.95$, $SD= 5.27$) (see Table 7 for summary of means). There was no significant main effect of gender for the masculine scale $F(1,135)=.156$ $p=.694$, nor were any interactions significant, largest $F(1,135)=1.244$ $p=.267$ for the feminine subscale.

Participants endorsement of females stereotypes was assessed through the ‘Adolescent’s Attitudes toward Women Scale’. Overall mean scores indicated that the vast majority of the statements were not highly endorsed by participants in this sample ($M=19.99$, $SD= 5.05$) (see Table 8 for summary of means).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) ANOVA was conducted to assess potential age and gender differences in participants’ sex-stereotyping of women. There was a significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 143)=11.82$, $p=.001$, such that males were more likely to endorse female stereotypes ($M=1.79$, $SD=.49$), than were females ($M= 1.56$, $SD=.42$) (see Table 8 for summary of means). There was no main effect for age, $F(1, 143)=1.296$, $p=.257$, nor was there a significant interaction, $F(1, 143)=2.468$, $p=.257$.

In addition to standardized measures assessing endorsement of feminine and masculine traits and stereotypes associated with women, the current study created two measures, one measure to assess stereotypic responses to *responsibility over completion* of household tasks and a second measure to assess *authority over decisions* made within a household.

Responsibility for household tasks were assessed through a 14 item measure where participants could endorse mothers, fathers, both mothers and fathers or unsure as possible alternatives for who had responsibility for each household task. The first of two analyses compared *overall* differences in the assignment of responsibility across each of the 4 categories. A 2(gender) X 2(age) MANOVA was conducted to assess potential age and gender differences in participants’ assignment of task responsibility within the household. Dependent variables included the number of responsibilities rated as pertinent to each of the 4 possible categories: mothers, fathers, both mothers and fathers, and uncertain. Pillai’s trace indicated no significant

main effects (age: $F(1,157)=1.36$, $p=.251$; gender: $F(1,157)=1.639$, $p=.167$) or interactions (age by gender: $F(1,157)=.322$, $p=.863$). Given the exploratory nature of these analyses subsequent univariate tests were examined. Subsequent exploration of univariate tests revealed a main effect of age for the ratings of tasks assigned to fathers, $F(1,157)=4.063$, $p=.046$. Visual inspection revealed that older adolescents ($M=3.70$, $SD=2.78$) assigned more task responsibility to the father than did younger adolescents ($M=2.90$, $SD=2.05$) (see Table 9 for summary of means). Consistent with the overall comparisons the main effects for gender and the interactions of age by gender were not significant in the univariate comparisons (largest $F(1,157)=1.237$, $p=.268$ for gender and task responsibility assigned to the father).

The second set of analyses examined participants' endorsements of traditional gender role responsibilities as a function of the traditional assignment of *responsibilities*. Specifically, participants assignment of responsibilities for the 7 tasks typically designated as masculine (i.e., mowing the lawn, shoveling snow, paying bills/banking, taking out the garbage, painting the house, fixing appliances or calling someone to fix the appliances, and taking the car to mechanic) and ratings for the 7 tasks typically designated as feminine (i.e., cleaning the bathroom, taking care of the children, cleaning the house, making the bed, doing homework with the children, ironing and shopping for household items) were examined. Within each of these categories, comparisons were made across the number of tasks assigned to fathers, mothers, as well as those perceived to be true of both mothers and fathers and those for which there was uncertainty ('I don't know'). Two 2(gender) X 2(age) MANOVAs examined differences in assignment of responsibilities for each of the stereotypic masculine and stereotypic feminine task *responsibilities*. The first examined responses to the responsibilities traditionally attributed to fathers (see Table 10 for summary of means). Pillai's trace indicated only a main effect of gender

($F(1, 157)=3.187, p=.015$). No other significant main effects (age: $F(1,157)=1.119, p=.35$) or interactions (age by gender: $F(1,157)=.38, p=.823$) emerged. Subsequent univariate analyses supported the main effect for gender only for the uncertainty scale for masculine task responsibility, $F(1,157)=4.22, p=.042$. Visual inspection revealed that male participants were more likely than female participants to be uncertain regarding assignment of responsibility for masculine household tasks. No other main effects (age) or interactions (age by gender) were statistically significant. A second $2(\text{gender}) \times 2(\text{age})$ MANOVA was conducted to assess possible age and gender differences in participants' ratings of *responsibility* within the household for tasks traditionally attributed to mothers (see Table 11 for summary of means). Pillai's trace indicated no main effects (age: $F(1,157)=1.269, p=.285$; gender: $F(1,157)=1.063, p=.377$), nor any interactions (age by gender: $F(1,157)=.006, p=.924$). Subsequent exploration of univariate analyses supported these outcomes.

Authority over purchasing or deciding upon various household items was evaluated using the 'Who should have more say in purchasing items?' inventory, which was comprised of 10 forced choice questions. For each item participants could indicate mother, father, equal, or I don't know. An initial analysis was conducted to compare the *total number of decisions* assigned to each of the four possible categories (mother, father, equal and don't know) (see Table 12 for summary of means).

A $2(\text{gender}) \times 2(\text{age})$ MANOVA was conducted to determine differences in participants' ratings of overall household *authority over decisions* (see Table 12 for summary of means). Dependent variables included the total number of decisions assigned to each of the four categories described above. Pillai's trace indicated no main effects of age ($F(1,157)=.979,$

$p=.421$) or of gender ($F(1,157)=2.04$, $p=.092$), nor any interactions (age by gender: $F(1,157)=.539$, $p=.708$).

Subsequent analyses examined the *authority* for a number of decisions traditionally associated as feminine areas of authority (decisions about groceries, what movies/theatres or concerts to attend, what the family should have for dinner, what household cleaning products to buy, and what children's clothing to buy) and to traditionally masculine areas of authority (decisions about the car/vehicle, insurance, what bank to do business with, where to go on vacation, and where to have the car/vehicle fixed) within the household. Within each of these two categories participants responses could indicate authority by fathers, mothers, both equally and uncertainty ('I don't know').

Two $2(\text{gender}) \times 2(\text{age})$ MANOVAs were conducted one assessing responses for the masculine *authority* items and one for the feminine *authority* items. Dependent variables included the number of items participants rated for each of the four authority categories (Mother, father, both equally and don't know). The first MANOVA for masculine authority items indicated no main effects of age (Pillai's trace: $F(1,157)=.164$, $p=.956$) or gender ($F(1,157)=1.571$, $p=.185$), nor any significant interactions (age by gender: $F(1,157)=.595$, $p=.667$). Subsequent univariate analyses supported these outcomes (see Table 13 for summary of means). The $2(\text{gender}) \times 2(\text{age})$ MANOVA conducted to assess possible age and gender differences in participants' ratings of *authority* within the household for traditionally 'feminine' decisions indicated a trend for the main effect of gender $F(1,157)=2.412$, $p=.052$, but no main effect for age ($F(1,157)=.77$, $p=.547$) nor was the interaction significant ($F(1,157)=.757$, $p=.555$). Subsequent univariate analyses only revealed a main effect of gender for the category 'I don't know', $F(1,157)=5.824$, $p=.017$, such that males were more likely to indicate not knowing

who should have authority for these traditionally feminine decisions relative to female participants (see Table 14 for summary of means).

Overall, in terms of views regarding gender roles both gender and age were important factors for pre-and young adolescents. For instance, females were more likely than males to endorse feminine statements about themselves. Also, males were more likely than females to endorse general female stereotypes about females. Additionally, a main effect for gender suggested that males were more likely to show uncertainty in assigning authority for traditionally ‘masculine’ household decisions and were also more likely to be uncertain about the assignment of authority for traditionally ‘feminine’ household decisions.

Survey: Views of Money

Current attitudes about money and its value were evaluated through the use of the Money Attitude scale (Yamauchi & Templer, 1982). This 23 item scale employs questions that ascertain participants’ beliefs about their use and valuing of money. This scale utilizes three embedded subscales and they are named as follows: Power-Prestige ($M_{\text{male}}=25.20$, $SD_{\text{male}}=11.51$; $M_{\text{female}}=21.70$, $SD_{\text{female}}=8.06$), Distrust ($M_{\text{male}}=28.03$, $SD_{\text{male}}=8.08$; $M_{\text{female}}=25.82$, $SD_{\text{female}}=7.63$), and Retention-Time ($M_{\text{male}}=29.28$, $SD_{\text{male}}=9.66$; $M_{\text{female}}=29.40$, $SD_{\text{female}}=9.61$). Maximum total score for subscales equal 63, 35, 63 for power-prestige, distrust and retention-time respectively. To permit comparisons across these scales a proportion scale was created for each by dividing the total subscale scores by their corresponding number of items. Thus, maximum scores for each scale was 7 (see Table 15 for proportionate summary of means).

Relationships among these three scales were explored using Pearson correlations. Overall, Power-Prestige and Distrust ($r(143) = .35$, $p < .001$), and Distrust and Retention Time (r

(143) $=-.347$, $p=.011$) showed a small but significant correlation. Power-prestige and Retention-time were not significantly correlated ($r(140)=.152$, $p=.074$).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) MANOVA was conducted to assess potential age and gender differences in participants' attitudes about money for these three proportionate subscales (Power-Prestige, Distrust and Retention-Time; see Table 15 for summary of means). Pillai's trace indicated no significant main effects $F(1,137)=1.743$ $p=.161$ and $F(1,137)=1.889$, $p=.135$ for age and gender respectively, nor any interactions (age by gender: $F(1,137)=2.171$, $p=.094$). Given the exploratory nature of this study univariate comparisons were examined. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated two trends in terms of gender for the Power-Prestige subscale, $F(1,137)=3.872$, $p=.051$, and for the Distrust subscale, $F(1,137)=3.633$, $p=.059$. Visual inspection indicated that males scored significantly higher ($M_{\text{power-prestige}}=2.80$, $SD_{\text{power-prestige}}=1.28$; $M_{\text{distrust}}=5.61$; $SD_{\text{distrust}}=1.62$) than females ($M=2.41_{\text{power-prestige}}$, $SD_{\text{power-prestige}}=.89$; $M_{\text{distrust}}=5.16$, $SD_{\text{distrust}}=1.53$) on both the Power-prestige and Distrust subscales. No significant interactions were present, largest $F(1,137)=2.997$ $p=.087$ for the Distrust subscale.

Survey: Current Understanding of Negotiation Practices and Past Attempts

Implicit negotiation beliefs (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007) as a function of age and gender were assessed using a 7 question measure. These questions were used to gauge participant beliefs about the nature of negotiator qualities (innate versus. learned). Higher scores indicated that negotiation ability was believed to be innate. Overall, participants seemed to endorse the idea that negotiation skill can be learned to some degree ($M_{\text{overall}}=24.98$, $SD_{\text{overall}}=4.80$; maximum=49) (see Table 16 for summary of means). Although the current sample yielded a Cronbach's $\alpha=.50$

previous research yielded good reliability ratings and hence this measure was investigated further below.

A 2(gender) X 2(age) ANOVA was conducted to assess potential age and gender differences in participants' beliefs about negotiation ability as reported on the Implicit Negotiation Belief Scale. A significant main effect of age was found, $F(1,143)=4.90$, $p=.028$, however no other main effects or interactions were significant (largest $F(1,143)=.689$, $p=.408$ for the main effect of gender). It appears that younger adolescents ($M=26.02$, $SD=4.58$) more readily endorse beliefs that negotiation ability is innate rather than a skill that can be learned, while older adolescents ($M=26.02$, $SD=4.84$) more readily endorse the latter (see Table 16 for summary of means).

Perception of the process of past negotiation attempts made by the participant were assessed using an 8 item measure called the Subjective Value Inventory (Curham et al., 2006), where the participant was instructed to answer the question set only if they had ever been able to successfully negotiate (ask for) for more money, either at home or at work. Overall, 126 of 157 (total sample) of participants completed this scale in its entirety, while an additional 10 participants completed parts of this scale. Generally, participants who had successfully negotiated for more money endorsed positive sentiments regarding the negotiation process ($M_{\text{overall}}=41.10$, $SD_{\text{overall}}=8.69$; maximum=56). A higher score indicates a more positive outlook on the negotiation process as a whole (see Table 17 for summary of means).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) ANOVA was utilized in order to assess possible age and gender differences in perception of the negotiation process. No main effects (age: $F(1,126)=1.155$,

$p=.285$; gender: $F(1,126)=.606$, $p=.438$) or interactions (age by gender: $F(1,126)=.039$, $p=.285$) were noted.

The outcome of participants' past negotiation attempts was assessed using the Past Negotiation Experience measure which involved a series of 3 forced-choice questions asking participants about a past negotiation attempt which yielded a wage change. If the participant had previously expressed success in negotiation, then they responded to questions concerning the extent of their success and their comfort in negotiating. Overall, participants reported few negotiation attempts (0-1) and for those who had made the attempt ($n=127$) they generally reported neutral comfort ($M_{\text{overall}}=2.87$, $SD_{\text{overall}}=1.24$; maximum= 5) and getting close to what they had asked for ($M_{\text{overall}}=2.55$, $SD_{\text{overall}}=.96$; maximum= 5 (a score of 3 corresponded with the response 'got what I asked for'; see Table 18 for summary of means).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) MANOVA was conducted to assess possible differences in age and gender for how successful participants were at negotiation as well as how comfortable they were with the process. Pillai's trace indicated no main effects of age ($F(1, 95)=.416$, $p=.742$) or gender ($F(1,95)=.473$, $p=.702$), nor any significant interactions (age by gender: $F(1,95)=.636$, $p=.594$). Subsequent univariate analyses support these outcomes (see Table 18 for summary of means).

Overall, the only meaningful negotiation-related finding seemed to stem from age in that, with age, participants began to endorse more sentiments in relation to negotiation as a learned skill.

Survey: Current and Past Saving Practices

Participants' saving strategies were assessed using the Saving Styles measure which included 4 questions. Overall, most participants reported that they saved regularly (61.3%, while

27.1% reported that they did not save regularly and 11.6% reported that they did not know how to answer this question). Also, most participants either had a bank account (69.2%) or intended to open one within the next 12 months (35.9%). Additionally, most of those with a bank (62.86%) account reported having had it for at least the last 2yrs.

A Crosstabs Pearson Chi-square was conducted in order to determine possible age and gender differences in participants saving strategies. Three variables were used: 1) whether the participant saved regularly, 2) whether the participant had a bank account, and 3) whether the participant intended to get a bank account ('I don't know' responses were omitted as there were few of these responses). Only significant finding was detected for the main effect of age regarding whether the participant intended to open a bank account, $\chi^2=6.019$, $df=1$, $p=.014$. Visual inspection suggests that more older than younger adolescents intended to open a bank account in the next 12 months (69.6% compared to 30.4%).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) ANOVA was conducted to assess possible age and gender differences in how long participants had held a bank account. A significant age by gender interaction emerged ($F(1,105)=4.62$, $p=.034$), in addition to a trend for the main effect of gender ($F(1,105)=3.432$, $p=.067$). Descriptively, younger males had held their bank account longer than older males ($M_{\text{young}}=2.83$, $SD_{\text{young}}=1.20$; $M_{\text{older}}=2.37$, $SD_{\text{older}}=1.00$), while the reverse was true for the females ($M_{\text{young}}=2.77$, $SD_{\text{young}}=.97$; $M_{\text{older}}=3.19$, $SD_{\text{older}}=.97$) (see Table 19 for summary of means).

Overall, gender and age seemed to impact participants' saving strategies and experiences. One trend regarded age in terms of participants' intent to open a bank account within the next 12 months; older adolescents were the most likely to do so. Also, with respect to

how long participants had reportedly had a bank account, findings suggested that older female participants were more likely to have had their bank accounts longer than males of the same age as well as younger male and female peers. Finally, females overall appeared to be more likely to have had their bank accounts for roughly 2-4 years.

Survey: Social Desirability

Social desirability was assessed as a function of gender and age through the use of a 14 individual items (Blake et al., 2006), plus one overall item (maximum score=21). This scale asked participants to respond to a list of socially undesirable statements, such as “I sometimes litter” with either ‘true’ or ‘false’, in order to ascertain the degree to which each participant responded in a socially favourable manner throughout the completion of the survey. Overall, participants tended to respond in a somewhat socially favourable manner as indicated by their mean scores ($M_{\text{male}}=15.13$, $SD_{\text{male}}=3.38$; $M_{\text{female}}=15.32$, $SD_{\text{female}}=2.92$; maximum total score for the overall scale is 21) (see Table 20 for summary of means).

A 2(gender) X 2(age) ANOVA assessed scores on the measure. A significant main effect was found for age, $F(1,134)=6.435$, $p=.012$. No other significant main effects or interactions were found. Younger adolescents ($M=16.10$, $SD=2.75$) responded in a more pro-social manner than older adolescents ($M=14.68$, $SD=3.25$) (see Table 20 for summary of means). This measure was not included in regression analyses, as age was not a critical variable for the regressions.

Examination of Predictor Variables

A series of 45 regression analyses were conducted to assess predictors for work expected (i.e., number of chores), remuneration, negotiation and negotiation success, and attitudes toward money.

Predictors of number of chores

On average, participants were noted as having approximately 4 chores to complete. Six linear regressions were conducted to better understand what impacts the number of chores youth are required to complete. The first regression was an exploratory examination which examined whether frequency for completion of chores (calculated by total frequency of chores by the number of chores reported) and frequency of payment for chores predicted the overall number of chores that were required. The model was significant ($F(2, 81) = 31.63, p < .001; R^2 = .445$). Payment frequency did not predict number of chores, but frequency of completion of chores did predict the number of chores participants indicated they were responsible for completing ($\beta = 1.162, p < .001$). To examine potential differences in number of chores as a function of gender, two additional regressions were conducted (using the same predictor variables) to examine males and females separately. The pattern of outcomes did not change as a function of gender (males: $F(2, 43) = 6.36, p = .004; R^2 = .20$; females: $F(2, 37) = 36.096, p < .001; R^2 = .655$).

The fourth linear regression analysis examined whether the impact of gender role information and attitudes predicted the number of chores that were required. Specifically, gender attitudes were assessed through the Children's Sex-role Inventory subscales (masculine traits and feminine traits) and the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale. Gender role information was assessed through the Individual Parental Stereotypy scales (separate mother job and father job stereotypy scales), the *Responsibility* for Completion of Household Tasks scores (for Masculine Tasks and for Feminine Tasks - each type of task was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and both), the *Authority* over Decisions scores (for Masculine Decisions and for Feminine Decisions - each type of decision was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and equally for mothers and fathers). The model approached significance,

$F(17,126)=1.64$, $p=.066$; $R^2=.204$. Examination of predictor variables indicated that the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale predicted the number of chores that were required of children ($\beta=-.121$, $p=.014$). Specifically, more chores were related to lower scores on the Adolescent Attitudes toward women scale. To further examine potential differences in number of chores as a function of gender, two additional regressions were conducted (using the same predictor variables) to examine males and females separately. The pattern of outcomes did not change as a function of gender (males: $F(17,59)=.834$, $p=.647$; $R^2=.05$; females: $F(17,66)=1.461$, $p=.15$; $R^2=.106$).

Remuneration

A series of 15 linear regressions were conducted to assess potential predictors for remuneration. Four of the regressions assessed actual monetary gains or monetary remuneration (i.e., the likelihood of receiving money when asking a parent or guardian for it, likelihood of receiving an increase in allowance after asking for an increase, weekly allowance, and money received for a part-time job) while the fifth regression assessed variables that impacted on the frequency of payment for chores. Each regression examined the impact of gender role information and attitudes. Specifically, gender attitudes were assessed through the Children's Sex-role Inventory subscales (masculine traits and feminine traits) and the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale. Gender role information was assessed through the Individual Parental Stereotypy scales (separate mother job and father job stereotypy scales), the *Responsibility* for Completion of Household Tasks scores (for Masculine Tasks and for Feminine Tasks - each type of task was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and both), the *Authority* over Decisions scores (for Masculine Decisions and for Feminine Decisions - each type of decision was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and equally for mothers and fathers).

Only one model was significant. The likelihood of receiving money when asking a parent or guardian for it, ($F(17,123) = 1.881, p = .027; R^2 = .232$) had two significant predictors: the feminine traits subscale of the Children's Sex-role Inventory ($\beta = .058, p = .016$) and the Mother's Job Stereotypy scale ($\beta = .519, p = .023$). Therefore, frequent receipt of money from a parent or guardian, when asking for it, was related to identification as highly feminine and/or when their mother held a gender stereotypic job.

To examine potential differences in remuneration as a function of gender, each regression described above was re-run for males and females separately (10 additional regressions in total). The pattern of outcomes did not change as a function of gender in any of the analyses (e.g. how frequently money was received when asking a parent or guardian for it: $F(17,58) = 1.007, p = .471, R^2 = .002$ and $F(17,64) = .993, p = .482, R^2 = -.002$ for males and females respectively).

Predictors of negotiation and negotiation success

Overall, 15 linear regressions were conducted to assess potential predictors of negotiation and negotiation success. Three analyses examined participants past experiences with respect to negotiating an increase in wages, using items from the Past Negotiation Measure. Specifically, the items assessed: how often participants indicated negotiating for a wage increase, how much participants received after negotiation, and participants level of comfort in asking for an increase in wages. A fourth analysis examined participants' perceptions of a past negotiation attempt (i.e., Subjective Value Inventory score) and a final analysis examined participants' beliefs regarding negotiator qualities (Implicit Belief Scale). In each regression the impact of gender role information and gender-based attitudes were assessed through the Children's Sex-role Inventory subscales (masculine traits and feminine traits) and the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women

scale. Gender role information was assessed through the Individual Parental Stereotypy scales (separate mother job and father job stereotypy scales), the *Responsibility* over Completion of Household Tasks scores (for Masculine Tasks and for Feminine Tasks - each type of task was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and both), the *Authority* over Decisions scores (for Masculine Decisions and for Feminine Decisions - each type of decision was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and equally for mothers and fathers). Only one model was significant. Specifically, scores on the Subjective Value Inventory ($F(17, 104) = 2.77, p = .001; R^2 = .351$) were predicted by the measure of Equality in the *Authority* over Masculine Decisions scale ($\beta = 3.64, p = .007$), the 'Father' *Authority* over Masculine Decisions scale ($\beta = -.38, p = .037$) and the Adolescent Attitudes towards Women scale ($\beta = 3.17, p = .042$). Thus, higher scores on the Subjective Value Inventory were related to high scores on the measure of Equality in the *Authority* over Masculine Decisions scale and/or on the Adolescent Attitudes towards Women scale. Furthermore, higher scores on the Subjective Value Inventory were related to low scores on the 'Father' *Authority* over Masculine Decisions scale.

To examine potential differences in negotiation and negotiation success as a function of gender, each regression described above was re-run for males and females separately (10 additional regressions in total). Only two items yielded gender differences in terms of their pattern of outcomes. The first involved how often participants negotiated for a wage increase, as males yielded a significant outcome ($F(17, 53) = 2.201, p = .023; R^2 = .278$) and females did not ($F(17, 65) = .497, p = .942; R^2 = -.152$). Specifically, male responses regarding frequency of negotiation for an increase were predicted by the Mother's Stereotypic Job score ($\beta = -.652, p = .02$) and the 'Both Parents' Responsibility over Household Tasks scale ($\beta = -.309, p = .043$). Thus, lower frequency of negotiation in males was related to their mother holding a gender

stereotypic job and/or the increased endorsement of ‘both parents’ as having responsibility over completing household tasks. The second gender difference related to participants’ perceptions of a past negotiation attempt (Subjective Value Inventory), as males yielded a significant outcome ($F(17,45) = 2.01, p = .049; R^2 = .276$) and females did not ($F(17,58) = 1.393, p = .19; R^2 = .103$). Specifically, male responses regarding their perception of a past negotiation attempt was predicted by their scores on the ‘Mother’ Responsibility over Masculine Household Tasks scale ($\beta = -3.414, p = .031$), such that increased (or more positive) perceptions of a past negotiation attempt were related to lower endorsement of Mother’s as agents of Masculine Household Tasks.

Predictors of money attitudes

Overall, 9 linear regressions were conducted to assess potential predictors for attitudes toward money. The first analysis examined participants’ Power-prestige beliefs in regards to the use of money, the second examined beliefs about Retention-time and the third examined beliefs of Distrust. In each regression the impact of gender role information and gender-based attitudes were assessed through the Children’s Sex-role Inventory subscales (masculine traits and feminine traits) and the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale. Gender role information was assessed through the Individual Parental Stereotypy scales (separate mother job and father job stereotypy scales), the *Responsibility* over Completion of Household Tasks scores (for Masculine Tasks and for Feminine Tasks - each type of task was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and both), the *Authority* over Decisions scores (for Masculine Decisions and for Feminine Decisions - each type of decision was evaluated for assignment to each the father, mother and equally for mothers and fathers). The models for both Power-prestige and Retention-time were significant, ($F(17,120) = 2.685, p = .001; R^2 = .307$ and $F(17,120) = 1.722, p = .050; R^2 = .221$ respectively). The Adolescent Attitudes towards Women scale predicted scores on the

Power-prestige subscale of the Money Attitudes measure ($\beta=.119$, $p<.001$) and the masculine traits subscale of the Children's Sex-role Inventory predicted scores on the Retention-time subscale of the Money Attitudes measure ($\beta=.054$, $p=.008$). Specifically, high scores on the Power-prestige subscale of the Money Attitudes measure were related to high scores on the Adolescent Attitudes towards Women scale. Additionally, high endorsement of masculine traits was related to children highly endorsing Retention-time beliefs about money.

To examine potential differences in attitudes towards money as a function of gender, each regression described above was re-run for males and females separately (6 additional regressions in total). Only participants' Power-prestige beliefs revealed gender differences in terms of the pattern of its outcomes, as males yielded a significant outcome ($F(17,55) = 4.155$, $p<.001$; $R^2 = .494$) and females did not ($F(17,63) = 1.115$, $p=.37$; $R^2 = .03$). Specifically, male Power-prestige scores were predicted by their score on the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale ($\beta=.177$, $p<.001$) and by their endorsement of 'Equal' Authority over Masculine Decisions ($\beta=.529$, $p=.02$). Therefore, increased Power-prestige beliefs about money were related to increased endorsement of female stereotypes and/or increased endorsement of equal parental authority over traditionally masculine household decisions.

Reassessing survey data predictors: Number of Chores, Remuneration, Negotiation and Money Attitudes

Due to the exploratory nature of this study, 42 additional regression analyses were conducted. In each of these analyses the impact of gender role information and gender-based attitudes were assessed through the Children's Sex-role Inventory subscales (masculine traits and feminine traits) and the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale. Also, gender role

information was assessed *only* through the Individual Parental Stereotypy scales (separate mother job and father job stereotypy scales). Only findings that depart from those already stated previously are noted below.

Number of chores

When reassessing the impact of gender role information and attitudes on the number of chores participants reported, the model was no longer found to be significant $F(5,126)=1.872$, $p=.104$; $R^2=.033$.

Remuneration

In reassessing potential predictors of remuneration overall a number of differences were found. First, the model for the item 'receiving money when asking a parent for it' was significant overall, $F(5,123)=3.756$, $p=.003$; $R^2=.101$ and this time contained a third significant predictor which was the Father's job stereotypy score ($\beta=.45$, $p=.042$). Thus, high instances of receiving money when asking a parent for it were also related to a father holding a stereotypic masculine job. Second, the model for the item 'receiving money for part-time job(s)' was now significant $F(5,124)=2.722$ $p=.023$; $R^2=.065$ and its significant predictor variable was the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale ($\beta=.073$, $p=.008$), such that increased frequency of receiving money for a part-time job was related to increased endorsement of general female stereotypes. Now, when analyzing each of the items for differences as a function for gender, more differences emerged. The first involved receipt of money when asking for it, as males yielded a significant outcome ($F(5,58)=3.147$, $p=.015$; $R^2=.156$) and females did not ($F(5,64)=1.475$, $p=.212$; $R^2=.036$). Specifically, remuneration on this item for males was predicted by their score on the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale ($\beta=.079$, $p=.005$) and their Mother job stereotypy

score ($\beta=.625$, $p=.03$). Thus, increased receipt of money when asking for it was related to increased endorsement of female stereotypes about girls and their mother holding a gender-stereotypic job. Finally, females ($F(5,64) = 2.423$, $p=.046$; $R^2 = .10$) yielded a significant outcome for the item, 'receipt of money for part-time job', while males ($F(5,59) = 1.643$, $p=.165$; $R^2 = .052$) did not. Specifically, girls receipt of money for part-time jobs was predicted by their scores on the Adolescent Attitudes toward Women scale ($\beta=.098$, $p=.039$), such that increased receipt of money for part-time jobs was related to increased endorsement of female stereotypes.

Negotiation

Only one difference was noted in terms of predicting negotiation. Specifically, the overall model concerning the Subjective Value Inventory was found to only have one predictor variable, instead of the three noted above. Again the overall model was significant, $F(5,104)=2.391$, $p=.043$; $R^2 = .063$, however only the Attitudes toward Women scale ($\beta=.292$, $p=.093$) revealed a trend as a predictor for the model. Therefore, increased endorsement of female stereotypes was related to heightened scores of the Subjective Value Inventory.

Attitudes about money

In reassessing predictors for attitudes about money only one finding was of note. Specifically, males ($F(5,56) = 2.402$, $p=.05$; $R^2 = .111$) yielded a significant outcome on the retention-time subscale while females ($F(5,63) = 1.776$, $p=.132$; $R^2 = .058$) did not. Particularly, male endorsement of Retention-time statements was predicted by scores on the feminine traits subscale of the Children's Sex-role Inventory ($\beta=.07$, $p=.028$). This means that increased male endorsement of Retention-time attitudes about money were related to increased endorsement of feminine statements about themselves.

In summary, although there were some variations from the overall analysis, when the two measures of parental role were removed there were no consistent and obvious changes noted. Discussion and interpretation therefore was based on the analyses where these two measures were included (i.e. the first set of regression analyses presented above).

Interview Data

Inter-rater Reliability

Thematic analysis of students' responses to the interview questions were coded using an open-coding method (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Two raters read one randomly selected interview independently then met together to discuss the themes that they identified in that interview. A list of themes was created along with subthemes. A second interview was then read and again coded independently by each of the two raters; followed by a discussion regarding the previously identified themes and the presence of any new themes/subthemes. After discussion, the previous interview was re-evaluated to determine whether any new or more developed themes/subthemes from the second interview could be applied to the first interview information. After these initial two interviews were examined, the raters coded four interviews independently. This coding was followed by a discussion to ensure that new themes were agreed upon by the two raters and that coding of themes was consistent across these and previous interviews. This iterative process was used to code the remaining 16 interviews such that the interviews were coded independently first and discussion followed to ensure ongoing consistency. Any disagreements were resolved by discussion and previous interviews were reviewed to ensure any new or revised analyses were applied equally across all existing interview data. Inter-rater reliability for the two raters was calculated for the 20 independently scored interviews. This

sample of interviews represents approximately 12.7% of the total sample of participants in the study and 23% of participants who completed the interview portion. Inter-rater reliability was high (91%) before discussion for each of the themes/subthemes identified. The remaining data was coded by one of the two coders.

Interview Findings

Overall 21 themes and 73 subthemes were identified. The themes captured general ideas related to remuneration, negotiation strategies and experience, current and hypothetical employment, and social comparison. After themes were identified qualitatively, they were analyzed quantitatively to assess potential age and gender differences in their prevalence.

A 2 (gender) X 2 (present/not present in the interview) Crosstabs analysis was conducted on each interview subtheme (see Table 21 for a list of all subthemes) in order to determine whether possible gender differences existed in relation to each subtheme. A two-tailed Pearson chi-square test with a cut off of .05 was utilized as the data is exploratory in nature (see Table 22 for a list of all gender related interview findings).

Findings revealed 2 subthemes where females provided responses that indicated they were more advantaged than males and 2 subthemes where males were more advantaged than females. Additionally, 4 subthemes indicated that females were at a significant disadvantage by engaging in specific behaviours that males did not. Finally, comparisons revealed 2 neutral subthemes that involved only females. Again these findings are based on Pearson Chi-square analyses.

Specifically, females were advantaged in that they were more likely to receive monetary compensation ($\chi^2=3.875$, $df=1$ $p<.05$; 55.77%) and were more likely to have been offered their

current job ($\chi^2=4.925$, $df=1$ $p<.05$; 60%). Thus females were more likely than males to receive money from their parent/guardian in exchange for chore work. Also, females were more likely than males to have received their current employment (outside of chore work) through an offer from either a parent (for example a parent could have offered them a job in their organization or in a friend's or relative's place of employment) or via another adult.

Gender comparisons also revealed that males were advantaged in a few specific work-related aspects. It was found that males were more likely than females to hold 'traditional male jobs' ($\chi^2=7.369$, $df=1$ $p=.007$; 82.35%), meaning that males were more likely to currently hold jobs that took place outside of the home such as landscaping and construction. As these types of jobs have a greater capacity for promotion and promotion-related wage increases than cleaning or babysitting jobs, a strong argument could be made for the advantages that they hold.

Additionally, males were more likely than females to compare their earnings to 'males only' ($\chi^2=8.307$, $df=1$ $p=.004$; 86.67%). Given the arguments for the effects of social comparison upon wage determination, this would be an advantage for males.

Interestingly, there were a few areas where females fell at a disadvantage through methods of interaction that males did not employ. One such method was the increased use of the negotiation strategy 'simply asking for more' ($\chi^2=4.174$, $df=1$ $p<.05$; 75%), in which participants asked for remuneration without providing a rationale or offering to exchange work of any kind for the increase. Although any attempt at negotiation increases the likelihood of receipt of an increase, this strategy lacks maturational qualities that would aid in its success rate. Additionally, females reported receiving remuneration on a 'variable' schedule ($\chi^2=3.878$, $df=1$, $p<.05$; 61.29%). This means that they would only receive compensation when their parent deemed it necessary, instead of on a fixed timeline that participants could come to expect.

Furthermore, females were more likely than males to currently hold a ‘traditional female job’ ($\chi^2=22.758$, $df=1$ $p<.001$; 85.19%). Therefore, much like the argument suggested above, females would be at a disadvantage as these types of jobs don’t often carry with them opportunities for advancement. Also, females were more likely to expect their employer to determine their wage in a hypothetical babysitting scenario ($\chi^2=3.877$, $df=1$ $p<.05$; 60.61%). This would suggest that although females were likely to negotiate with a parent, they would not attempt the same with an employer. Finally, females were more likely than males to compare themselves to ‘only females’ ($\chi^2=8.335$, $df=1$ $p=.004$; 90%), which as described previously, can create a host of disadvantages (wage loss) both in the short term as well as over the length of one’s career.

Finally, gender comparisons revealed some relatively neutral findings concerning females. For example, females were more likely to have an average overall knowledge of wages ($\chi^2=4.376$, $df=1$ $p<.05$; 59.46%). Furthermore, females were more likely than males to respond neutrally to their level of comfort with their knowledge of wages ($\chi^2=4.424$, $df=1$ $p<.05$; 68.42%), such that they did not appear overly confident, yet at the same time did not appear to be in doubt either. Thus, males would be more likely to respond with either low comfort or high comfort (more valences in response) in describing their level of comfort with their own knowledge of wages.

A 2 (age) X 2 (present/not present in the interview) Crosstabs analysis was conducted on each interview subtheme (see Table 21 for a list of all themes and subthemes) in order to determine whether possible age differences existed in relation to each subtheme (see Table 23 for a list of all age related interview findings) . Again a two-tailed Pearson chi-square test with a cut off of .05 was utilized for conservatively identifying significance in the exploratory data set.

The interview findings revealed 4 significant comparisons where younger adolescents indicated that they were more advantaged than the older adolescent age group. Findings also suggested that 2 significant comparisons indicated that older adolescents were more advantaged than the younger adolescents. 1 significant comparison indicated that older adolescents were more disadvantaged than the younger age group. Specific areas of advantage and disadvantage will be explored in the following paragraphs.

Age comparisons revealed that younger adolescents were advantaged in a few areas of remuneration. Specifically, younger adolescents were the most likely to receive an allowance ($\chi^2=5.75$, $df=1$, $p=.016$; 60.5%). Additionally, they were the most likely to complete household chores for allowance ($\chi^2=9.308$, $df=1$, $p=.002$; 60%). Also, they were the most likely to receive allowance on a weekly schedule ($\chi^2=6.034$, $df=1$, $p=.014$; 70%). Finally, younger adolescents were the most likely to receive a fixed amount of remuneration ($\chi^2=3.615$, $df=1$, $p=.057$; 61.5%), although this was only a trend. All of these variables would allow one to have a stable as well as consistent flow of income.

Furthermore, age comparisons indicated that older adolescents were advantaged in terms of negotiation strategies and their social comparison group. For example, older adolescents were more likely to attempt negotiation with a parent or employer ($\chi^2=8.073$, $df=1$, $p=.004$; 63.9%). Older adolescents were also most likely to compare themselves to 'a mixture of males and females' when determining how much money they made in relation to their friends and classmates ($\chi^2=7.889$, $df=1$, $p=.005$; 74.2%). This type of social comparison would help one to avoid the pitfalls of comparing oneself to a same-sex peer group, especially for the females at this age.

Fortunately, age comparisons yielded only one disadvantage. This disadvantage was that older adolescents were the least likely to receive allowance ($\chi^2=6.892$, $df=1$, $p=.009$; 66.7%).

Discussion

Two key issues were examined in this exploratory study of adolescents understanding of remuneration. First, the development of wage expectations and negotiation for remuneration was examined through an exploration of work and chores done by pre- and young adolescents. Second, the impact of gender roles evidenced through the home and through general attitudes and beliefs was examined as a contributor to expectations. Both survey and interview methodologies were employed. This permitted information from a wider sample of participants as well as greater depth of understanding from a smaller sub-sample of the boys and girls aged 12-15 that participated. Overall, the study provides partial support for some expected outcomes outlined at the outset of the study, but also introduces some key new information that helps to clarify contributors to students' understandings regarding pay, remuneration and work.

Reviewing the Hypotheses

The hypotheses explored in the present thesis examined three broad concerns rooted in previous research with adults. First, both age and gender are factors known to impact wage equity in adults (Lintonen et al., 2007), therefore, two of the hypotheses examined the impact of age and gender in this pre- and young adolescent sample for the key issues pertaining to remuneration and work context. Traditionally, adult males earn higher incomes than adult females (Desmarais & Curtis, 1997; Lintonen et al., 2007). These findings have been consistently demonstrated in both related research (Desmarais & Curtis, 1997; Lintonen et al., 2007) as well as statistical comparisons provided through government data (Statistics Canada,

2013). In the present study, this pattern of outcomes was measured for a younger population. Specifically, the first hypothesis examined whether, similar to adult populations, young males would make more money than girls. In addition, this comparison was examined as a function of age across early adolescence to examine whether older children made more money than their younger peers.

Second, traditionally, the context for work also has differed for men and women with men engaged in work outside of the home and women engaged more often in work inside the home (Cross & Bagilhole, 2002). Again, similar to the adult population, the second hypothesis examined whether boys would be more likely to pursue work outside of their home, while girls would be more likely to pursue paid work inside the home.

Finally, the impact of gender-role stereotyping in early years on subsequent development has been demonstrated consistently in the literature. Parents serve as an important source of information about gender roles (Poulin-Dubois, Serbin, Eichstedt, Sen, & Beissel, 2002; Serbin, Poulin-Dubois, & Eichstedt, 2002) as well as providing explicit guidance about gender appropriate activities (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Peters, 1994; McHale, Crouter, & Whiteman, 2003). The impact of parental gender role modelling was examined through the third hypothesis where parental adherence to gender-based roles (e.g., in their occupations, household responsibilities, and authority over household decisions) was examined as a factor that contributes to differences in outcomes as a function of age and gender but also as a factor in what predicts beliefs and attitudes in this population.

Examining Age and Gender Differences in Remuneration

Examination of gender differences yielded mixed outcomes that did not support a robust benefit for males over female participants. Specifically, among the larger sample completing the survey, only one main effect for gender was found among the 9 items that assessed remuneration and, in that instance, the direction favoured girls over boys. Girls reported being more likely to receive money by just asking for it, than did their male peers. With regards to differences across age findings were more complex. For example, younger adolescents were more likely to receive regular remuneration in the home whether for completion of chores or in the form of a weekly allowance, however older adolescents were more likely to receive money just by asking for it. Thus, expectations for remuneration seem to differ as a function of gender, age and source. Overall, however, the key findings were that there was no consistent bias toward males receiving more remuneration than girls, nor were older adolescents receiving more remuneration than their younger peers.

Interestingly, the interview outcomes suggested that girls were more likely to report receiving monetary compensation for chore work performed relative to boys. Again, this finding suggests that robust gender differences in remuneration were not evident in the present study as would be expected based on traditional gender based reports of compensation in adult populations. The second important finding is that girls, especially younger girls, are receiving monetary assistance at home and remuneration for their chore work. Thus it would seem that parents are more willing to compensate young girls for this type of work. This may be due to the fact that girls perform these duties more readily than males, as it was also found that males are less likely to complete any chores at all and when they were assigned chores they were often assigned fewer chores than female peers. These findings together explain why it is more likely that females would receive monetary compensation more readily for this type of work. A more

important question that follows from these findings would be to determine why young girls are more likely to do chores.

The interactions with age support the importance of examining age differences within the adolescent populations as developmental differences appear to be a contributing factor to decisions made by parents, attitudes held by youth and also remuneration outcomes. Specifically, from the interview data, it was found that younger adolescents were more likely than older adolescents to complete household chores for an allowance, as well as to receive compensation for their chore work on a weekly schedule. Moreover, older adolescents were less likely, than younger adolescents, to receive an allowance. This suggests that at younger ages parents are providing monetary support for adolescents through the children demonstrating responsibility for assigned tasks, but as children become older, parents are less likely to compensate youth for household work. Perhaps this reflects a parental shift in beliefs about adolescents' functioning in adult roles. For example, parents may expect older adolescents to assume adult responsibilities for chores and no longer provide them with remuneration. In addition, it is possible that parents perceive it their responsibility to teach their children about the connection between work and compensation and use chores as a mechanism to communicate this important connection. This might be especially true for younger pre-adolescents as they may have fewer opportunities to gain work in other contexts. Further exploration would be required in order to determine whether pre-adolescents *actually* have fewer work-related opportunities and parental perceptions about the links between work and compensation.

Overall, participants reported little discussion about wages and wage increases with parents. Interestingly, in Ontario, high school students are required to complete a credit in a careers course, however, according to the Ontario Curriculum (2011) negotiation is not listed as

a necessary component of the Careers course. The curriculum covers the creation of personal career plans, developing job search skills, the investigation of current job trends and the management of major life transitions. If negotiation is not discussed in school, and minimally discussed in the home, young adolescents are most likely under-prepared when entering the work force and when engaged in informal work experiences (occasional positions such as baby sitting, mowing lawns etc.) prior to being able to hold a regular job. This is a particular concern because many young females reported gaining knowledge about wages through discussion with same-sex peers. Given the persistent inequities that can result from social comparison with an already disadvantaged group (Bylsma & Major, 1994; Keaveny & Inderrieden, 2000), young girls in particular may be at risk for receiving inaccurate messages regarding fair wages.

Overall, both gender and age provide some explanation about differences in remuneration but the messages are not simple. Other key variables need to be examined in order to better understand remuneration. Also, age clearly influenced remuneration however it did not do so in the linear fashion that was expected (increasing with age). Therefore, the question of the effects of age and gender on remuneration remains much more complex than was originally hypothesized and suggests that more careful developmental examination may be warranted to more fully understand the preliminary findings explored in the present research.

Assessing Age and Gender Differences in Employment and Chore Type

Overall, there was partial support for the second hypothesis indicating that boys were more likely to pursue work outside of the home while girls were more likely to pursue work inside of the home. As mentioned previously, survey data indicated that males were less likely to have to complete chores than females and when they did report having chores, the number of

chores was less than the number reported by females. In general then, chores seem to be a more salient aspect of young female adolescents' lives.

Additionally, females were more likely to complete chores that took place 'inside the home', while males were more likely to complete a combination of chores that included both those 'inside' in the home as well as those that took place 'outside' the home. The interview data indicated that the most common jobs girls reported were babysitting, house-sitting and cleaning. Conversely, males were significantly more likely to have jobs such as landscaping and construction-type jobs. In the adult population these same trends were found in 2013 as many more men than women were employed in traditionally masculine jobs such as Agriculture (71%), Forestry/Fishing/Mining (82%), Construction (88%), Manufacturing (73%), and Professional/Scientific/Technical Services (57%) (Statistics Canada, 2014). Unfortunately rates for employment in child care services were unavailable, however rates for Health Care and Social Assistance, and Educational Services revealed that females are employed more readily than males in each of these sectors (82% and 67% respectively) (Statistics Canada, 2014). It appears that the context for employment may be established early on in development. This has implications for encouraging girls and boys to seek out careers that are less typical and suggests that interventions may need to target early development even before formal employment opportunities are available.

In summary, hypothesis 2 was supported by both participants' employment-type and work experiences, as well as by their chore experiences. Overall, these findings suggest that parents and community members hiring young adolescents tend to readily assign males and females gender-stereotypical work. This early assignment could potentially affect the types of jobs youth select both later in adolescence as well as in adulthood. Although these findings

suggest that early experiences may be important for later choices, confirmation would require further longitudinal study.

Examination of Age and Gender Differences in Parental Employment

Hypothesis three examined pre-and young adolescents' adherence to gender-based roles as modelled by their parents' employment decisions. This was assessed by comparing parents' employment-type (gender-stereotypic versus. non-gender-stereotypic) individually, as a function of the child's age and gender. However, no age or gender differences appeared as a function of parental employment-type. Thus, despite a participant's parents modeling either a gender-stereotypic role or a counter-gender-stereotypic role through their own work-related choices, this alone did not impact their children to the extent that they would mirror this in their own work-related choices. Interestingly, it seems that some parents model non-traditional roles, yet expect their children to engage in traditional roles or that children select chores/work that are consistent with gender role stereotypes even when their parents present non-traditional role models. This is an interesting paradox. To explore this more deeply it might be beneficial in future research to survey the participants' parents in order to inquire further regarding their work-related attitudes and choices, as adolescents may have characterized their parents' jobs differently than the parents would have done themselves. For example, a mother on maternity leave from her job would most likely describe her employment by her job title (if she plans to return to this position), while her child may simply characterize her as unemployed or a stay-at home mom. This characterization would therefore not be accurate as she may be gainfully employed and planning to return to work. She might also work in a non-stereotypical field which would also deepen our understanding of work-related decisions, however due to the simplicity of the child's response this important detail might be lost. Additionally, a child may report that their parent

works in a stereotypical environment, yet fail to distinguish which role they play at that workplace. For example, a child may indicate that their parent works at a law firm or mechanics shop without going into detail that their parent is the secretary or legal assistant of the business. Further clarification from parents would facilitate interpretation of this variable in the context of the present study but also more generally in the context of adolescents expectations and categorization relative to parents. It would be interesting to explore whether parents and children share common understandings of the traditional or non-traditionality of parents' occupations.

Further Age and Gender Differences in Developing Wage Expectancies

In addition to the specific hypotheses outlined above, several other important issues were explored in order enhance understanding of the development of wage expectancies. Specifically, young and pre-adolescent beliefs and experiences with respect to negotiation tactics, social comparison (sources of information), attitudes about money, gender stereotypes and stereotyped work, were explored with respect to the existence of possible age and gender differences.

Negotiation Tactics

Overall, 5 negotiation strategies that participants utilized with parents to receive more money were identified. The strategies included simply asking for more money (40% of participants that utilized strategies used this type of negotiation), providing a rationale but not offering to exchange anything for a monetary increase (13.33%), accepting/offering to accept a deduction in monetary compensation in exchange for a privilege or non-monetary reward (10%), working/offering to work for a privilege or non-monetary reward (23.34%), or working/offering to work for increased monetary compensation (13.33%). Specifically, findings from the present study supported gender difference expectations in negotiation strategies. Specifically females

were more likely than males to employ the negotiation tactic ‘simply asking for more’ when negotiating with a parent/guardian (75% of those who used the strategy were female). Thus it appears that females *do* utilize negotiation strategies, sometimes even more often than males, however they appear to primarily use these tactics with parents, not employers. For example, although non-significant, more females than males described their current wage as being set by their employer (55.3%). Also, more females (60.6%) than males described expecting their hypothetical employer to set their wage. Perhaps these differences represent a level of comfort that females have with their parents, which would allow them to negotiate for what they want, that is not present with their employers. Moreover, females may feel more comfortable negotiating with a parent because of the types of negotiation strategies they employ. Females may feel that their negotiation strategies are simply not appropriate in the workplace. Furthermore, females might feel more entitled to negotiate with a parent due to the fact that they more readily complete household chores.

In regards to negotiation with an employer participants were asked to describe how their current job’s wage was determined. Strategies for wage determination included simply expecting the employer to set the wage (no negotiation) (88.68%), setting the wage him/herself (the adolescent) (5.66%), negotiating with an employer after they set an initial wage (1.89%), and finally negotiating over wages without defining who initially set the wage (3.77%). Furthermore, in a hypothetical wage determination scenario participants were asked how much compensation they would expect from an employer and how they would ask for it (the interview question read: ‘if you were asked to babysit a neighbour’s two children, how much would you expect to be paid for that work and how would you go about asking for that?’). Strategies for wage determination in this hypothetical scenario included each of the same strategies as those employed in

negotiation with an employer, however with the substitution of negotiating with the employer after having set the initial wage him/herself (the adolescent sets the wage and expects negotiation from the employer), instead of negotiation without clear definition of initially who set it. In the hypothetical scenario the most popular wage determination strategy was expecting the employer to set the wage (40.24%) and the least popular strategy was negotiating with an employer after the employer had set an initial wage (8.54%). As mentioned previously, females were more likely than males to expect their employer to determine their wage in the hypothetical wage determination scenario. These findings are important and may have implications for future wage discrepancies between men and women. Typically, employers initially set a wage in the adult workplace and then prospective employees have an opportunity to negotiate at various stages for a wage increase. Therefore, if adolescents are not utilizing this skill or even entertaining that they *should* use this skill then there may be significant difficulties that emerge later in more formal workplaces. The passivity evidenced in the present sample of adolescents, especially among the girls, suggests that training in negotiation is necessary to ensure fair and informed remuneration.

These gender-related differences in negotiation strategies, particularly the differences found between what takes place inside and outside of the home may be important contributors to subsequent wage disparities later in life. Specifically, if the transition from negotiation in the home to outside of the home does not occur then considerable deficits in negotiation skill or confidence may inhibit individuals from engaging in negotiation at all, or to engage in negotiation but only to find minimal success. One clear message from the present study is where adolescents could 'fall through the cracks' in terms of learning negotiation, particularly if they are not being taught about it in school, nor spoken to about it at home.

Social Comparison

Sources of information about appropriate earnings indicated a same-sex preference for information gathering. Females in this study were much more likely to compare their earnings to ‘just other girls’ than males, while males compared their earnings with ‘just other boys’ more often than females. Social comparisons regarding wages and gauging their own satisfaction by what others in their same-sex peer group had reportedly earned, may support ongoing inequities in remuneration. Bylsma and Major (1994) as well as Keaveny and Inderrieden (2000) indicated how this type of gender-specific social comparison can be problematic when the comparison group is one that is earning less than another. Ideally, cross-gender comparisons might be more advantageous both for adults and, as seen in this study, for adolescents. This is especially critical for adolescents as they have few other employment-related skills and experiences that would help them in determining an appropriate wage.

Interestingly, older participants of both genders were more likely to compare themselves to a ‘mixed’ peer group of both males and females, than younger adolescents. This is a positive shift that coincides with the transition from elementary to high school. One possible source of this social comparison change could be that social peer groups widen in order to allow for the inclusion of possible dating partners. Thus, due to the inclusion of the opposite gender, participants now have more knowledge of the earnings of those outside of the same-sex peers. This shift also gives adolescents access to a broader base of wage knowledge which may be important in the determination of their own wages.

Attitudes about Money

When rating their attitudes about money there was no overall effect for the MANOVA analysis, however subsequent exploratory analysis suggested some interesting possibilities. For

example, males were more likely to endorse money-related power-prestige statements than females. This means that males reported more judgements of others based solely upon their economic status. Also, it means that males more readily expressed the need to achieve their own power or prestige through economic means. These beliefs and attitudes could easily translate into the differing workplace priorities that adult males and females describe. That is, adult males report personal achievement and success (Iverson, 2000) as important priorities while adult females stress flexible schedules and pleasant work environments (Jackson et al., 1992; Weisgram et al., 2011). Additionally, males expressed more money-related distrust statements. This means that males were more suspicious of pricing and more evaluative of their spending. This could account for differences in negotiation attempts and success, as males might be more preoccupied with how much money they have and therefore how much they need to earn in order to maintain a particular lifestyle.

These traits of Agency were also found in related research regarding personality in the workplace (Roberts, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2003) such that, at ages 18 and 26 traits regarding leadership and status seeking remained fairly consistent. In fact, traits evident at age 18 successfully predicted workplace behaviour at age 26. Therefore, it is possible that the gender differences reported among these early adolescents might also persist into adulthood. It must be noted however, that little research exists specific to young-to mid-adolescents in terms of workplace priorities. As development and change occurs quite rapidly at these stages it would be an important period of life to assess in order to more fully understand workplace expectancies and beliefs.

Gender Stereotypes and Stereotyped Work

As described earlier, gender stereotypes are evident very early on in life and often persist over the life span. Gender stereotypes not only affect how individuals are viewed in the workplace, but how individuals view his/her work (Callahan-Levy & Messe, 1979; Babcock, Laschever, Gelfand, & Small, 2003). Additionally, even the threat of a stereotype is known to affect not only the outcome of a negotiation (Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002; Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2001) but also the liking of and confidence in one's work performance (Bridges, 1988; Oswald, 2008; DiDonato & Strough, 2013).

With regards to the current study, males were found to endorse female stereotypes about females much more readily than did females themselves. However, females were more likely than males to endorse feminine statements about themselves. Therefore, despite categorizing themselves as highly feminine, females were still less likely to endorse general female stereotypes. Additionally, interview data suggested that females were more likely than males to have been offered their current job. Despite seeming unrelated at first glance, these two findings together with the earlier finding that females more readily hold gender-stereotypical jobs, suggest that despite females' lack of endorsement of female stereotypes they are still readily accepting stereotypical female work from others. One possible interpretation of these findings could be that parents readily encourage preparation for these roles, in the same manner that they encourage gendered activities, play and behaviour (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Blakemore & Hill, 2007). An alternative could be that female participants simply are more likely to be offered more traditional tasks, and given relatively few options other than to gladly accept them. Girls clearly are comfortable in identifying their feminine qualities which may predispose them to expect to be better at traditional jobs than non-traditional jobs. Further research into the issue of employment-related motivation is required though in order to more clearly identify how girls and

boys come to have chores and work and how they feel about the chores and work they are offered.

Putting Remuneration into Context

Several regression analyses were conducted regarding predictors of number of chores, remuneration, negotiation and negotiation success, and money attitudes. These analyses revealed important information regarding the context in which remuneration can be understood.

Predicting Number of Chores

In terms of the variable number of chores, a model including payment frequency and frequency of completion of chores revealed that only frequency of completion predicted the number of chores participants indicated they were responsible for completing. Specifically, the greater the number of chores the more frequently chores were required to be completed. Young adolescents who are required to do many chores, therefore, are not engaged in irregular, unusual, or seasonal work. Rather when many chores are given, adolescents are working hard but when few chores are given, they also tend to be required less often. Moreover, a higher number of chores were associated with low scores on the Adolescent Attitudes Toward Women scale (measured female stereotypes) suggesting that adolescents doing the most chores were those who did not endorse female stereotypes. Perhaps those adolescents having fewer stereotypes permits adolescents to more readily accept chores. Alternatively, given that many participants were financially compensated for their chore work, this may in fact be a strength.

Predicting Remuneration

In terms of remuneration, when females self-identified as highly feminine and/or when their mother held a gender stereotypic job, receipt of money from a parent or guardian when asking for it, increased. An explanation for this could be that in these instances where gender roles are highly endorsed, parents feel the need to provide financially for their daughters as they may feel that they should not have to seek outside employment or if they do already earn money elsewhere, that what they earn is for more important items. The important message to take away from this finding is that gender roles within the home can not only impact the amount and type of remuneration that adolescents receive while still in the home, but more importantly could potentially affect their future earning potential. For example, if an adolescent is able to meet all of their needs through funds received from a parent, what incentive would be present that would propel the child to seek outside employment/remuneration? Thus without the necessity of gaining outside employment a child could potentially miss out of valuable years of employment preparation and skill development.

Predicting Negotiation

For negotiation and negotiation success, higher scores on the Subjective Value Inventory (measured the participants' perception of a past negotiation attempt) were noted when scores on the measure of Equality in the Authority over Masculine Decisions scale ('equal authority' assigned to typically masculine household decisions) and/or scores on the Adolescent Attitudes towards Women scale increased. Furthermore, higher scores on the Subjective Value Inventory were expected when scores on the 'Father' Authority over Masculine Decisions scale were low. Therefore, when participants assigned both the mother and father as having equal authority over traditionally masculine decisions, endorsed female stereotypes more readily and failed to assign masculine decisions to fathers, participants were more likely to view their past negotiation

attempt positively. Although these may seem like unrelated findings, they actually each involve aspects of gender role stereotypy. Specifically, males would be most likely to endorse female stereotypes. Also, perhaps it is not socially favourable to openly state that fathers should have authority over traditionally masculine decisions, so instead in order to soften the stereotypy they state that both mothers and fathers *could* have authority in these areas. The strongest support for this finding is that mothers alone were not assigned authority over these decisions, while they were readily assigned authority over traditionally feminine decisions.

With regards to the pattern of outcomes for male and female negotiation attempts and successes, differences as a function of gender were evident. Specifically, frequency of negotiation in males was related to the stereotypic nature of their mother's job as well as the level of endorsement of 'both parents' as having responsibility over completing household tasks. Therefore, males were more likely to negotiate if their mothers held a non-stereotypic job and/or if they did not readily endorse 'both parents' as having responsibility over completion of household tasks. Additionally, participants' perceptions of a past negotiation attempt (Subjective Value Inventory) were more positive if they also didn't readily endorse of Mothers as having responsibility of typically Masculine Household Tasks. It appears as if both frequency of negotiation and perception of past attempts are strongly tied to gender, particularly for males, such that increased stereotypy not only increases negotiation attempts, but also enhances the negotiation experience all together. It would also seem intuitive that if one has a positive experience with negotiation, that this would only motivate future attempts as the attempt itself would be positively reinforced. So it could be hypothesized that males that have had these positive experiences would be more apt than their female peers to engage in negotiation with their future employers.

Predicting Attitudes about Money

In terms of attitudes about money heightened scores on the Power-prestige subscale of the Money Attitudes measure were related to high scores on the Adolescent Attitudes towards Women scale. This means that participants who endorsed female stereotypes also endorsed greater Power-prestige beliefs regarding money. This finding was expected as gender differences were found for each of these measures, such that males were more likely to endorse each of these types of sentiments. Also, high endorsement of masculine traits was expected when adolescents strongly endorsed Retention-time beliefs about money. This finding was also expected as Retention-time beliefs surround the theme of saving and financial planning. As Furnham (1999) described, both genders report saving their money (females in fact report doing so more often than males) however males were found to have more sophisticated saving methods (using a bank account). One possible explanation for this may be differing parental encouragement regarding the handling of money and differing discussion regarding the maximization of one's earnings. It would be valuable to explore the topic of wage discussion beyond the scope of what was addressed in the present study, to include discussion about saving, bank accounts and financial planning for the future. This would help to ascertain whether parents do encourage their children differently or even if they view the information as pertinent to their child's current understanding of wages.

With regards to the pattern of outcomes for male and female attitudes about money, differences as a function of gender were evident. Specifically, increased Power-prestige attitudes for males were related to increased endorsement of female stereotypes and/or increased endorsement of equal parental authority over traditionally masculine household decisions. These

findings mirror those described earlier in the examination of predictor variables for negotiation and only lend further support to the arguments described therein.

Limitations

Unfortunately, there were limitations to the present study which may have impacted the scope of its findings. For example, sometimes adolescents chose not to respond to all questions, which limited the quantity of responses collected. Perhaps the most salient limitations however, involved two of the questions designed for the present study. Specifically, the question in which participants were asked to list payment for all current jobs ('how much do you get paid for each of the job(s) you listed') was not sufficiently precise to yield comparable responses. Responses differed greatly with some participants indicating how much they received per hour, others how much they received per season (i.e. at the end of a summer's work), and a diversity of other payment schedules (weekly, monthly, etc.) often without specifying clearly which schedule they were using to answer the question. As a consequence, responses to this question could not be analyzed. Three related questions were used as a proxy in order to gain some understanding of remuneration for work (work in this instance included both chores and outside employment). The three items which served as the proxy were 1) 'how often do you receive the following: money for part-time job(s)', 2) 'are you paid for doing any of the chores you listed', and 3) 'how often are you paid for doing the chore(s)'. Although these questions provided some information about remuneration, the omission of the direct question is still a concern. This item may have added significantly to the results of the study by providing direct evidence as to whether males and females at various ages were equally or differentially compensated for their work. Furthermore, this item would have allowed for further comparisons regarding specific types of work (inside home versus outside of home), so as to help determine whether males and females are

equivalently compensated when completing the same type of work. Simple revisions establishing a common scale would make this item more reliable across participants and would provide valuable comparative data in future research.

Another measure, the Home Gender-role Inventory, may have been too restrictive in the number of responses it allowed. During implementation of the survey several participants commented that they (rather than their parents) were the one responsible for the household chore listed. Given that the available responses only included mother, father, both or I don't know, some participants selected I don't know (n=3) but also indicated that they were responsible for that task. This became evident at data entry when it was observed that participants had either made a note beside the item stating that they were the one responsible, or in some cases, had created their own option box at the end of the row labelled 'me'. Therefore, interpretation of this measure is difficult, particularly because it creates doubt as to the accuracy of the measure as a whole. It would be important to revise the measure to include a 'me' category, so that the accuracy of responses can be ensured. This limitation also reflects some built-in biases of the experimenters who designed the measure. For example it assumes that parents rather than their children would be responsible for some or all important household responsibilities. Broadening the scope of responses would provide valuable information both regarding specific questions in the present study but also with respect to activities among today's youth in general.

In addition, it is important to note that many, if not all, of this study's measures favour two parent families. Again this is another built-in bias as it does not take into account the various family configurations that exist today, such as adolescents that live with grandparents, an aunt and/or uncle, older sibling, single parent or that rotates between two parents. These differing configurations could greatly impact the pattern of responses for some adolescents, especially for

those that rotate between two households as they may tend to blend the experience of each household together in their responses. This could neutralize possible age and gender differences for these respondents.

Lastly, one concern in the present study is that the presentation of the survey items was held constant across all participants. It is possible that the ordering of these survey items may have impacted responding in a particular direction. Ideally future studies would randomize the presentation of at least some of the scales.

Future Directions

The cross-sectional design employed in the present study provides an initial examination of age differences related to remuneration, work/chores and attitudes and beliefs related to gender stereotypes and other variables that could impact development of expectations regarding remuneration and work. However, the variations in experiences noted at different age levels might also be better understood through a longitudinal design in order to ensure that the changes noted reflect development changes rather than individual or cohort differences. In addition, it would be advantageous to follow pre-adolescents through their first few years of paid work experience to see if early attitudes and beliefs remain important predictors after direct experience. If these strategies were found to remain consistent, then they could possibly account for major wage losses over the course of the female population's life span. This longitudinal perspective would help to identify if and when changes in negotiation, attitudes and work experiences occur, as well as indicating key points where interventions might be appropriate.

Another interesting aspect of pay equity that still requires elaboration would be the evaluation of the child's motivation for accepting or seeking specific types of work. This type of

research may be best suited to a structured interview format in which the interviewer can ascertain specifics regarding, for example, what types of jobs children have versus what types of jobs children would like to have, or what children feel are barriers to obtaining their desired job versus what children feel are supports to obtaining their desired job, etc. This type of study would help to further explore the reasons for why males and females of various ages hold the types of jobs that they do, while identifying both internal and external factors that influence these types of decisions.

By focussing on both the immediate experiences of youth and their long-term experiences future research can build a more robust understanding of factors that impact pay equity as well as developmental differences. The present study, and others related to the topic, can be used as preliminary indicators of key points for future investigation.

Closing Comments

Finally, further exploration of gender and age issues in relation to remuneration would help to outline defining characteristics of development that contribute to children's decisions regarding work and wages, which in turn affects their future work and wage decisions. In a society that espouses equality in roles for both men and women in and outside of the home, it is important to understand what obstacles inhibit realization of ideals. The present study provides a demonstration of several key issues. First, gender issues in workplace/remuneration contexts are evident, however, expression in adolescent populations is complex. Understanding these complexities requires further investigation. As these issues seem to have a lifelong impact, this additional exploration is necessary if effective interventions are to be developed to ensure appropriate wage compensation for work.

Table 1. Summary of Participant Information for the Survey and Interview Data as a Function of Age and Gender

	Age	Number Male Participants	Number Female Participants
Survey	12	16	16
	13	20	17
	14	25	21
	15	17	25
		N=78	N=79
Interview	12	11	9
	13	10	10
	14	14	9
	15	10	16
		N=45	N=44

Table 2. Descriptive Summary of Responses to Questions about Sources of Remuneration as a Function of Age and Gender

	Age	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pocket Money From Parents	Young	Male	3.10	1.071	20
		Female	2.86	1.108	21
		Total	2.98	1.084	41
	Old	Male	2.85	1.089	20
		Female	3.33	.900	15
		Total	3.06	1.027	35
	Total	Male	2.97	1.074	40
		Female	3.06	1.040	36
		Total	3.01	1.052	76
Money For Part-time Job(s)	Young	Male	2.35	1.348	20
		Female	2.67	1.426	21
		Total	2.51	1.381	41
	Old	Male	2.25	1.517	20
		Female	2.33	1.397	15
		Total	2.29	1.447	35
	Total	Male	2.30	1.418	40
		Female	2.53	1.404	36
		Total	2.41	1.406	76
Money for Doing Odd Jobs Around the House	Young	Male	3.05	1.234	20
		Female	2.81	1.167	21
		Total	2.93	1.191	41

	Old	Male	2.65	1.387	20	
		Female	2.73	1.335	15	
		Total	2.69	1.345	35	
	Total	Male	2.85	1.312	40	
		Female	2.78	1.222	36	
		Total	2.82	1.262	76	
Money for Birthday	Young	Male	4.50	.761	20	
		Female	4.14	1.352	21	
		Total	4.32	1.105	41	
	Old	Male	4.60	.598	20	
		Female	4.27	1.223	15	
		Total	4.46	.919	35	
	Total	Male	4.55	.677	40	
		Female	4.19	1.283	36	
		Total	4.38	1.019	76	
	Money for Special Holidays eg. Christmas, Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, etc.	Young	Male	4.10	1.119	20
			Female	3.57	1.469	21
			Total	3.83	1.321	41
Old		Male	3.85	1.226	20	
		Female	4.00	1.414	15	
		Total	3.91	1.292	35	
Total		Male	3.98	1.165	40	
		Female	3.75	1.442	36	
		Total	3.87	1.300	76	

A Weekly Allowance	Young	Male	2.40	1.667	20
		Female	2.67	1.623	21
		Total	2.54	1.629	41
	Old	Male	2.30	1.418	20
		Female	1.33	.617	15
		Total	1.89	1.231	35
	Total	Male	2.35	1.528	40
		Female	2.11	1.450	36
		Total	2.24	1.487	76
Money when Asking Parents or Guardian for Money	Young	Male	2.40	1.142	20
		Female	2.86	1.315	21
		Total	2.63	1.240	41
	Old	Male	2.95	1.276	20
		Female	3.73	1.163	15
		Total	3.29	1.274	35
	Total	Male	2.68	1.228	40
		Female	3.22	1.312	36
		Total	2.93	1.289	76
How Often Paid for Chores	Young	Male	3.40	1.465	20
		Female	3.38	1.359	21
		Total	3.39	1.394	41
	Old	Male	3.10	1.210	20
		Female	2.07	1.280	15
		Total	2.66	1.327	35

Total	Male	3.25	1.335	40
	Female	2.83	1.464	36
	Total	3.05	1.404	76

Note. Responses scored on a 5 point likert type scale. The 5 point likert type scale were anchored with 1 never and 5 always.

Table 3. Descriptive Summary of Responses to Questions about Wage Increases as a Function of Age

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
How Often Parents Talk about Wage Increases	Male	younger	1.96	1.216	26
		older	1.74	1.039	35
		Total	1.84	1.113	61
	Female	younger	2.03	.999	32
		older	1.61	.802	41
		Total	1.79	.912	73
	Total	younger	2.00	1.092	58
		older	1.67	.915	76
		Total	1.81	1.005	134
How Often Others Talk about Wage Increases	Male	younger	1.62	.983	26
		older	1.66	.938	35
		Total	1.64	.949	61
	Female	younger	1.59	.665	32
		older	1.68	1.011	41
		Total	1.64	.872	73
	Total	younger	1.60	.815	58
		older	1.67	.971	76
		Total	1.64	.904	134
How Often Asks for a Wage Increase	Male	younger	1.65	1.093	26
		older	1.66	.968	35
		Total	1.66	1.015	61

	Female	younger	1.69	1.061	32
		older	1.76	1.090	41
		Total	1.73	1.071	73
	Total	younger	1.67	1.066	58
		older	1.71	1.030	76
		Total	1.69	1.042	134
How Often Allowance is Increased After Asks	Male	younger	1.69	1.011	26
		older	1.63	.973	35
		Total	1.66	.981	61
	Female	younger	1.75	1.107	32
		older	1.68	.986	41
		Total	1.71	1.034	73
	Total	younger	1.72	1.056	58
		older	1.66	.974	76
		Total	1.69	1.007	134

Note. Responses scored on a 5 point likert type scale, with anchors of 1 never and 5 always.

Table 4. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Reported Total Number of Chores Completed

Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	younger	3.97	2.380	34
	older	3.67	2.091	42
	Total	3.80	2.215	76
Female	younger	4.69	2.410	35
	older	5.07	2.164	46
	Total	4.90	2.267	81
Total	younger	4.33	2.405	69
	older	4.40	2.231	88
	Total	4.37	2.302	157

Note. Max number of chores is 8.

Table 5. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Average Frequency of Chores, Average Enjoyment of Chores and Frequency of Remuneration for Chores

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Average Frequency of Chores	Male	young	4.5000	.	1
		old	2.5625	2.20971	2
		Total	3.2083	1.92164	3
	Female	young	4.2500	.38528	5
		old	4.4167	.34157	6
		Total	4.3409	.35395	11
	Total	young	4.2917	.35940	6
		old	3.9531	1.23190	8
		Total	4.0982	.94713	14
Average Enjoyment of Chores	Male	young	3.3750	.	1
		old	3.9286	1.31320	2
		Total	3.7440	.98203	3
	Female	young	3.0000	.45928	5
		old	3.0833	.49160	6
		Total	3.0455	.45508	11
	Total	young	3.0625	.43839	6
		old	3.2946	.75635	8
		Total	3.1952	.62942	14
How Often Paid for Chores	Male	young	5.00	.	1
		old	3.00	.000	2
		Total	3.67	1.155	3

Female	young	3.60	.894	5
	old	2.00	1.673	6
	Total	2.73	1.555	11
Total	young	3.83	.983	6
	old	2.25	1.488	8
	Total	2.93	1.492	14

Note. Maximum score is 5 for each scale. Anchors for these scales are: 1 Never and 5 Once a Day for chores frequency, 1 Hate it and 5 Love it for enjoyment and finally 1 Never and 5 Always for frequency of remuneration.

Table 6. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Beliefs about Own Work as a Function of Age

Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	young	48.1111	11.09169	27
	old	52.1471	8.04206	34
	Total	50.3607	9.64198	61
Female	young	50.3871	8.63974	31
	old	50.0465	6.94178	43
	Total	50.1892	7.64392	74
Total	young	49.3276	9.83440	58
	old	50.9740	7.47095	77
	Total	50.2667	8.57121	135

Note. Maximum score for the overall scale is 70. Responses scored on a 7 point likert type scale anchoring with 1 strongly disagree and 7 strongly agree; 10 items in scale.

Table 7. Descriptive Summary of Means for the Children's Sex Role Identification as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Masculine Scale	Male	young	28.4815	6.79576	27
		old	28.4324	3.76047	37
		Total	28.4531	5.20967	64
	Female	young	28.5556	5.09399	27
		old	27.6364	5.17638	44
		Total	27.9859	5.12833	71
	Total	young	28.5185	5.94865	54
		old	28.0000	4.57439	81
		Total	28.2074	5.15303	135
Feminine Scale	Male	young	27.7037	4.43600	27
		old	28.1351	5.86497	37
		Total	27.9531	5.27477	64
	Female	young	33.5556	3.71414	27
		old	32.0909	4.69942	44
		Total	32.6479	4.38210	71
	Total	young	30.6296	5.01431	54
		old	30.2840	5.59293	81
		Total	30.4222	5.35245	135

Note. Maximum total score for subscales equal 40 and 40 for masculine and feminine respectively (maximum total score for androgyny is also 40 – omitted from this table). Maximum score for the overall scale is 120.

Table 8. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Endorsement of Female Stereotypes as a Function of Age and Gender

Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	young	3.05	.87	30
	old	3.10	.82	38
	Total	3.08	.84	68
Female	young	2.83	.53	33
	old	2.52	.49	42
	Total	2.66	.53	75
Total	young	2.93	.72	63
	old	2.79	.72	80
	Total	2.86	.73	143

Note. Maximum total score for overall scale is 48.

Table 9. Descriptive Summary of Means for *Overall Participant Ratings of Responsibility Over Completion of Household Tasks* as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Overall Father's Responsibility	Male	young	2.53	2.107	34
		old	3.62	2.347	42
		Total	3.13	2.294	76
	Female	young	3.26	1.961	35
		old	3.78	3.148	46
		Total	3.56	2.697	81
	Total	young	2.90	2.052	69
		old	3.70	2.780	88
		Total	3.35	2.511	157
Overall Mother's Responsibility	Male	young	3.59	3.201	34
		old	3.38	2.641	42
		Total	3.47	2.887	76
	Female	young	3.71	3.268	35
		old	4.28	4.009	46
		Total	4.04	3.696	81
	Total	young	3.65	3.212	69
		old	3.85	3.436	88
		Total	3.76	3.330	157
Overall 'Both' Parents' Responsibility	Male	young	5.32	3.715	34
		old	4.88	3.164	42
		Total	5.08	3.405	76

	Female	young	4.97	3.249	35
		old	4.46	3.417	46
		Total	4.68	3.335	81
	Total	young	5.14	3.465	69
		old	4.66	3.287	88
		Total	4.87	3.364	157
Overall 'I Don't Know/Unsure' Responsibility	Male	young	2.18	2.492	34
		old	1.69	1.787	42
		Total	1.91	2.130	76
	Female	young	1.83	2.905	35
		old	1.37	1.806	46
		Total	1.57	2.340	81
	Total	young	2.00	2.695	69
		old	1.52	1.794	88
		Total	1.73	2.240	157

Note. Maximum score for each of the four scales is 14.

Table 10. Descriptive Summary of Means for the *Responsibility* of Completion of 'Masculine' Household Tasks as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Father Responsibility Over Masculine Tasks	Male	young	2.29	1.801	34
		old	3.12	1.837	42
		Total	2.75	1.856	76
	Female	young	3.06	1.924	35
		old	3.26	2.389	46
		Total	3.17	2.190	81
	Total	young	2.68	1.890	69
		old	3.19	2.133	88
		Total	2.97	2.039	157
Mother Responsibility Over Masculine Tasks	Male	young	.79	1.719	34
		old	.62	1.229	42
		Total	.70	1.461	76
	Female	young	.89	1.623	35
		old	1.15	2.211	46
		Total	1.04	1.971	81
	Total	young	.84	1.659	69
		old	.90	1.820	88
		Total	.87	1.746	157
Both Parents Responsibility Over Masculine Tasks	Male	young	2.26	1.959	34
		old	2.02	1.600	42
		Total	2.13	1.761	76

	Female	young	2.17	1.855	35
		old	1.91	1.723	46
		Total	2.02	1.775	81
	Total	young	2.22	1.893	69
		old	1.97	1.657	88
		Total	2.08	1.763	157
'I Don't Know/Unsure' Responsibility Over Masculine Tasks	Male	young	1.38	1.518	34
		old	.90	1.206	42
		Total	1.12	1.366	76
	Female	young	.80	1.605	35
		old	.61	1.022	46
		Total	.69	1.300	81
	Total	young	1.09	1.579	69
		old	.75	1.117	88
		Total	.90	1.345	157

Note. Maximum score for each scale is 7.

Table 11. Descriptive Summary of Means for the *Responsibility* of Completion of 'Feminine' Household Tasks as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Father Responsibility Over Feminine Tasks	Male	young	.21	.479	34
		old	.48	1.174	42
		Total	.36	.934	76
	Female	young	.20	.473	35
		old	.48	1.243	46
		Total	.36	.991	81
	Total	young	.20	.472	69
		old	.48	1.203	88
		Total	.36	.961	157
Mother Responsibility Over Feminine Tasks	Male	young	2.76	1.986	34
		old	2.76	1.973	42
		Total	2.76	1.965	76
	Female	young	2.83	1.948	35
		old	3.13	2.156	46
		Total	3.00	2.062	81
	Total	young	2.80	1.952	69
		old	2.95	2.067	88
		Total	2.89	2.013	157
Both Parents' Responsibility Over Feminine Tasks	Male	young	3.09	2.123	34
		old	2.86	1.920	42
		Total	2.96	2.003	76

	Female	young	2.83	1.932	35
		old	2.63	2.059	46
		Total	2.72	1.995	81
	Total	young	2.96	2.018	69
		old	2.74	1.986	88
		Total	2.83	1.996	157
'I Don't Know/Unsure' Responsibility Over Feminine Tasks	Male	young	.76	1.208	34
		old	.76	.821	42
		Total	.76	1.005	76
	Female	young	1.06	1.533	35
		old	.78	1.009	46
		Total	.90	1.261	81
	Total	young	.91	1.380	69
		old	.77	.919	88
		Total	.83	1.143	157

Note. Maximum score for each scale is 7.

Table 12. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Ratings of *Decision Authority* Overall as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Overall Husband's Decision Authority	Male	young	1.09	1.311	34
		old	1.24	1.246	42
		Total	1.17	1.269	76
	Female	young	1.23	1.087	35
		old	.96	1.173	46
		Total	1.07	1.138	81
	Total	young	1.16	1.196	69
		old	1.09	1.210	88
		Total	1.12	1.200	157
Overall Wife's Decision Authority	Male	young	1.65	1.390	34
		old	1.76	1.872	42
		Total	1.71	1.664	76
	Female	young	2.29	1.673	35
		old	1.65	1.969	46
		Total	1.93	1.863	81
	Total	young	1.97	1.562	69
		old	1.70	1.913	88
		Total	1.82	1.767	157
Overall Both Parents' Decision Authority	Male	young	6.53	2.788	34
		old	6.36	3.122	42
		Total	6.43	2.959	76

	Female	young	6.31	2.494	35
		old	7.13	2.455	46
		Total	6.78	2.490	81
	Total	young	6.42	2.626	69
		old	6.76	2.804	88
		Total	6.61	2.724	157
Overall 'I Don't Know/Unsure' Decision Authority	Male	young	.71	1.867	34
		old	.52	1.756	42
		Total	.61	1.797	76
	Female	young	.20	.632	35
		old	.24	.565	46
		Total	.22	.592	81
	Total	young	.45	1.399	69
		old	.37	1.280	88
		Total	.41	1.330	157

Note. Maximum score for each scale is 10.

Table 13. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Ratings of Household *Authority* for 'Masculine' Decisions as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Father Authority Over Masculine Decisions	Male	young	.88	.977	34
		old	1.12	1.173	42
		Total	1.01	1.089	76
	Female	young	1.14	1.004	35
		old	.87	1.024	46
		Total	.99	1.019	81
	Total	young	1.01	.993	69
		old	.99	1.099	88
		Total	1.00	1.050	157
Mother Authority Over Masculine Decisions	Male	young	.15	.359	34
		old	.24	.617	42
		Total	.20	.517	76
	Female	young	.23	.547	35
		old	.24	.874	46
		Total	.23	.746	81
	Total	young	.19	.463	69
		old	.24	.758	88
		Total	.22	.644	157
Equal Authority Over Masculine Decisions	Male	young	3.50	1.398	34
		old	3.31	1.615	42
		Total	3.39	1.515	76

	Female	young	3.46	1.358	35
		old	3.74	1.357	46
		Total	3.62	1.356	81
	Total	young	3.48	1.368	69
		old	3.53	1.493	88
		Total	3.51	1.435	157
'I Don't Know/Unsure' Authority Over Masculine Decisions	Male	young	.41	1.104	34
		old	.29	.944	42
		Total	.34	1.014	76
	Female	young	.17	.618	35
		old	.15	.420	46
		Total	.16	.511	81
	Total	young	.29	.893	69
		old	.22	.718	88
		Total	.25	.798	157

Note. Maximum score for each scale is 5.

Table 14. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participant Ratings of Household *Authority* for 'Feminine' Decisions as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Father's Authority Over Feminine Decisions	Male	young	.21	.538	34
		old	.14	.472	42
		Total	.17	.500	76
	Female	young	.09	.284	35
		old	.09	.463	46
		Total	.09	.394	81
	Total	young	.14	.430	69
		old	.11	.466	88
		Total	.13	.449	157
Mother's Authority Over Feminine Decisions	Male	young	1.47	1.308	34
		old	1.52	1.550	42
		Total	1.50	1.438	76
	Female	young	2.03	1.562	35
		old	1.41	1.376	46
		Total	1.68	1.482	81
	Total	young	1.75	1.459	69
		old	1.47	1.454	88
		Total	1.59	1.459	157
Equal Authority Over Feminine Decisions	Male	young	2.97	1.586	34
		old	3.02	1.746	42
		Total	3.00	1.665	76

	Female	young	2.97	1.618	35
		old	3.41	1.392	46
		Total	3.22	1.500	81
	Total	young	2.97	1.590	69
		old	3.23	1.574	88
		Total	3.11	1.581	157
'I Don't Know/Unsure' Authority Over Feminine Decisions	Male	young	.32	.912	34
		old	.26	.857	42
		Total	.29	.877	76
	Female	young	.03	.169	35
		old	.07	.250	46
		Total	.05	.218	81
	Total	young	.17	.663	69
		old	.16	.623	88
		Total	.17	.639	157

Note. Maximum score for each scale is 5.

Table 15. Descriptive Summary of Means for Proportionate Money Attitude Subscales as a Function of Age and Gender

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Proportionate Retention Time	Male	young	3.2262	1.04253	28
		old	3.2747	1.11000	36
		Total	3.2535	1.07279	64
	Female	young	3.0143	.87852	31
		old	3.4524	1.16312	42
		Total	3.2664	1.06747	73
	Total	young	3.1149	.95736	59
		old	3.3704	1.13505	78
		Total	3.2603	1.06603	137
Proportionate Distrust	Male	young	5.6500	1.77274	28
		old	5.5722	1.50743	36
		Total	5.6062	1.61578	64
	Female	young	4.6774	1.25505	31
		old	5.5238	1.61937	42
		Total	5.1644	1.52547	73
	Total	young	5.1390	1.58669	59
		old	5.5462	1.55878	78
		Total	5.3708	1.57807	137
Proportionate Power Prestige	Male	young	2.4881	1.24661	28
		old	3.0432	1.26777	36
		Total	2.8003	1.27905	64

Female	young	2.3118	.94168	31
	old	2.4841	.86305	42
	Total	2.4110	.89498	73
Total	young	2.3955	1.09086	59
	old	2.7422	1.09812	78
	Total	2.5929	1.10450	137

Note. Maximum score for each scale is 7.

Table 16. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses Regarding the Implicit Negotiation Beliefs Scale as a Function of Age and Gender

Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	young	25.52	4.874	29
	old	24.03	5.294	38
	Total	24.67	5.133	67
Female	young	26.48	4.312	31
	old	24.40	4.484	45
	Total	25.25	4.505	76
Total	young	26.02	4.579	60
	old	24.23	4.845	83
	Total	24.98	4.801	143

Note. Maximum total score for the overall scale is 49. Responses scored on a 7 point likert type scale anchoring with 1 strongly disagree and 7 strongly agree.

Table 17. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses Regarding Perception of the Process of Past Negotiation Attempts (Subjective Value Inventory)

Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	young	39.5417	12.03971	24
	old	40.9355	8.39816	31
	Total	40.3273	10.07022	55
Female	young	40.4643	8.06218	28
	old	42.4884	7.04196	43
	Total	41.6901	7.47107	71
Total	young	40.0385	9.99992	52
	old	41.8378	7.62301	74
	Total	41.0952	8.69062	126

Note. Maximum total score for the overall scale is 56. Responses scored on a 7 point likert type scale anchoring with 1 not at all and 7 perfectly.

Table 18. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses to Questions of Successful Negotiation Outcomes

	Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
How Often Successfully Negotiated Increase	Male	young	2.14	1.246	22
		old	2.00	1.155	22
		Total	2.07	1.189	44
	Female	young	2.00	1.140	21
		old	2.47	1.008	30
		Total	2.27	1.078	51
	Total	young	2.07	1.183	43
		old	2.27	1.087	52
		Total	2.18	1.130	95
How Much Received After Negotiated	Male	young	2.50	1.012	22
		old	2.36	.953	22
		Total	2.43	.974	44
	Female	young	2.57	1.028	21
		old	2.70	.915	30
		Total	2.65	.955	51
	Total	young	2.53	1.008	43
		old	2.56	.938	52
		Total	2.55	.965	95
Comfort Asking for Money	Male	young	2.91	1.065	22
		old	3.18	1.220	22
		Total	3.05	1.140	44

Female	young	2.86	1.153	21
	old	2.97	1.129	30
	Total	2.92	1.129	51
Total	young ones	2.88	1.096	43
	old ones	3.06	1.162	52
	Total	2.98	1.130	95

Note. All three were standalone forced choice questions. 'How often negotiated increase' was anchored with 1 '0 times' and 4 'more than 4 times'. 'How much received after negotiation' was anchored with 1 a lot less than what I asked for and 5 a lot more than I asked. 'Comfort level in asking for money' was anchored with 1 very uncomfortable and 5 very comfortable.

Table 19. Summary of Means for Length of Time Owning a Personal Bank Account by Age and Gender

Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	young	2.83	1.204	24
	old	2.37	1.006	27
	Total	2.59	1.117	51
Female	young	2.77	.973	22
	old	3.19	.965	32
	Total	3.02	.981	54
Total	young	2.80	1.088	46
	old	2.81	1.058	59
	Total	2.81	1.066	105

Note. Maximum total score is 4. Scoring for this item is as follows: 1 represents having owned a bank account for less than 1 year, 2 represents having owned a bank account for 1-2 years, 3 represents having owned an account for 2-4 years and 4 represents having owned an account for 4+ years.

Table 20. Descriptive Summary of Means for Participants' Responses on a Social Desirability Scale as a Function of Age and Gender

Gender	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	young	15.7917	3.06423	24
	old	14.7179	3.53143	39
	Total	15.1270	3.37683	63
Female	young	16.3571	2.46778	28
	old	14.6512	3.01491	43
	Total	15.3239	2.91682	71
Total	young	16.0962	2.74583	52
	old	14.6829	3.25037	82
	Total	15.2313	3.13101	134

Note. Maximum total score for the overall scale is 21.

Table 21. Summary of Thematic Analysis of Student Responses to Interview Questions

Theme – Sub-Theme	Theme Description	Example	% of Students Expressing Theme
A) Allowance			
1) Receives Allowance	Student receives an allowance from their parent(s)/guardian(s)	“Umm, well we do like chores around the house and we get paid every week.”	43.7
2) No Allowance	Student doesn't receive an allowance from their parent(s)/guardian(s)	“Basically I do the chores and they let me live there.”	55.2
B) Conditions of Allowance			
1) Gets Allowance If Completes More Chores Than Sibling	Student only receives an allowance from their parent(s)/guardian(s) <i>if</i> they complete more chores than their sibling in a specified amount of time	“Well I do chores and my sister does chores... and the one gets the most chores done that week gets \$5.”	1.2
2) Household Chores For Allowance	Student receives an allowance from their parent(s)/guardian(s) for completing specified household chores (includes lawn care and snow shoveling)	“I do chores and I get money”	57.5
3) Other Tasks For Allowance	Student receives an allowance from their parent(s)/guardian(s) for completing tasks other than household chores	“I have to be nice to my brother... that's basically it.”	4.6
C) Remuneration Types			
1) Is Given Money	Student receives monetary compensation.	“\$40 a month...”	59.8

	They could receive it as an allowance with or without the completion of household chores or other tasks, or they could simply receive it on an occasional basis (whenever parent deems it necessary – again with or without completion of chores)		
2)Bill Payment	Student receives monetary support in the form of bill payment, with or without the completion of household chores or other tasks.	“...like when I do my chores it goes to my phone bill...”	3.5
3)Non-Monetary Reward	Student receives non-monetary compensation. They could receive it as an allowance with or without the completion of household chores or other tasks, or they could simply receive it on an occasional basis (whenever parent deems it necessary – again with or without completion of chores)	“I do chores and I get like a game or something. Whatever I like. Like after doing so many chores I’ll get it. I choose what I get.”	5.7
4)Parents Invest in Savings For Child	Parent saves the student’s monetary compensation instead of giving it to the student for use. They could receive it as an allowance with or without the completion of household chores or other tasks, or they could simply receive it on an occasional basis (whenever parent deems it necessary – again with	“...my parents are going to pay for my college so I don’t mind. They had it in mind already; they started a bank account for me when I was young.”	1.1

	or without completion of chores).		
D)Value of Allowance/Remuneration			
1)Receives Fixed Amount	Student's compensation schedule is fixed (same bill paid, same amount given or saved, or same non-monetary reward).	"...if we do every single one we get \$10 a week, but if we don't, if we [only] finish about half of them we get \$5..."	29.9
2)Receives Variable Amount	Student's compensation schedule is variable (different bill paid, different amount given or saved, or different non-monetary reward).	"I usually just ask for money to go to the store, like pocket money."	35.6
E)Frequency of Compensation			
1)Weekly Compensation	Student is compensated weekly.	"I get paid per week..."	23.0
2)Bi-Weekly Compensation	Student is compensated bi-weekly.	"...like once every two weeks, just \$10 goes to a debit account."	2.3
3)Monthly Compensation	Student is compensated monthly.	"About every month I get maybe \$20."	9.2
4)Occasional Compensation	Student is compensated occasionally (whenever parent(s) or guardian(s) deems it necessary).	"No, I don't really get an allowance, but every once in a while my mom or dad will give me money..."	23.0
5)Compensation Every Time Task Done	Student is compensated only after a task is completed.	"Well every time I do a chore, my mom pays me roughly \$1-2 dollars a chore."	9.2
F)Negotiation			

1)Attempt Negotiation	Student has attempted negotiation with either a parent/guardian (for either monetary or non-monetary rewards), or an employer (monetary).	“I definitely negotiate for a [new] phone... just trying to upgrade it... I end up winning the negotiation.”	70.1
2)Doesn't Attempt Negotiation	Student has not attempted negotiation with either a parent/guardian (for either monetary or non-monetary rewards), or an employer (monetary).	‘No, because the answer would be straight out no. I [would] get grounded or get my iPod taken away.’”	17.2
G)Negotiation Type/Strategy			
1)Exchanging Work For Money	Student negotiates by exchanging work for money; or at least by offering work for money.	“I just do chores to help out around the house... I say what I've done throughout the day, and just say ‘Can I have money for what I want?’ and sometimes it's a yes and sometimes it's a no.”	4.7
2)Exchanging Work For Privilege/Non-monetary Reward	Student negotiates by exchanging work for privilege/non-monetary reward; or at least by offering work for privilege/non-monetary reward.	“Sometimes I trade-off for chores...”	8.1
3)Receiving Deduction In Monetary Compensation For Privilege/Non-Monetary Reward	Student negotiates by exchanging deduction in their monetary compensation for privilege/non-monetary reward; or at least by offering monetary deduction for privilege/non-monetary	“I'll just ask them, ‘Maybe can I go to my friend's a little bit later?’ and [I'll] get paid less that week.”	3.5

	reward.		
4)Reasoning with No Exchange	Student negotiates by providing reasoning for why he/she should receive a higher pay or a privilege/non-monetary reward, but does not exchange anything or offer to exchange anything for this raise or privilege.	“I state why I think I should be able to, then they state why they shouldn’t... I try.”	4.7
5)Simply Asking For More	Student simply asks for a raise or privilege without providing reasoning nor exchanging or promising to exchange anything for it.	“...when I ask my parents for money they don’t mind giving it to me.”	14.0
H)Negotiation Outcome			
1)Negotiation Success	Student has had success in the past when negotiating (does not mean that he/she is always successful, only that they have been at some point). Student received exactly what they negotiated for.	“When negotiating with my parents, I’m usually allowed to do what I want, as long as I complete extra chores.”	40.7
2)Negotiation Success With Modification	Student has had success in the past when negotiating (does not mean that he/she is always successful, only that they have been at some point). However, student did not receive exactly what they had negotiated for (some alteration was made by parent/employer).	“I’ll say ‘Mom can I have some money to go to Mac’s Mart’ and she’ll say ‘Yes’ and give me money to go to Mac’s Mart, but I have to walk the dog or bring my brother.”	3.5
3)No Negotiation	Student has not had	“I’ve tried a few times	9.3

Success	success in the past when negotiating.	with my parents, but it doesn't really work."	
I)Employment			
1)No Job	Student does not currently have a job, nor have they held one in the recent past.	"No, I don't do anything."	23.0
2)Offered Job	Student currently or recently held a job that was offered to them.	"The tenant in the apartment building I live in asked me if I wanted to work there for \$10 an hour, so..."	46.0
3)Sought Out Job	Student currently or recently held a job that they sought out on their own.	"I applied for the job."	24.1
4)Got Job Other	Student currently or recently held a job that they received through unknown means or through means that involved both an employer offer and individual seeking.	"He [my neighbour] was asking around the neighbourhood to see if anyone was interested and I said okay."	12.6
5)Actively Seeking Work	Student does not currently or has not recently held a job; however they are taking clear active steps to obtain one.	"Not right now, but in a month or so I'm going to take my babysitting course. So I'll be babysitting people on my street and my cousins."	2.3
J)Employment Type			
1)Traditional Male Job	Student's current or recent job(s) fits the stereotype of a traditionally male role.	"In the summer I usually mow people's lawns... and I shovel the driveway in the winter."	19.5

2)Traditional Female Job	Student's current or recent job(s) fits the stereotype of a traditionally female role.	"I'm a wedding decorator's assistant."	31.0
3)Traditional Male and Female Jobs	Student holds more than one job, one fits the stereotype of a traditionally male role and one fits the stereotype of a traditionally female role.	"Sometimes like ya I'll babysit or like I remember the other day I shovelled my neighbour's driveway"	10.3
4)Gender Neutral Job	Student's current or recent job(s) does not fit the stereotype of either a traditionally male or female role.	"I referee soccer games..."	19.5
K)How Wage was Determined			
1)Whatever/Employer Set	Student's wage at their job was determined by their employer or the student did not know how wage was determined, so it was assumed that it had been determined by the employer. This category includes minimum wage and student wage (government set).	"They said that they'd pay me that much."	54.0
2)Employer Set With Negotiation	Student's wage was determined in tandem by the employer setting a wage and the student negotiating for what they deemed fair.	"...because for bagpiping they just say, 'well we can pay you this' and if I need more I'll be like, 'okay well that's kind of low so maybe a bit more'."	1.2
3)Negotiation Unknown Antecedent	Student's wage was determined through negotiation; however the antecedent of the	"We haven't overly settled on it, but we're looking at \$3-4 dollars an hour."	2.3

	negotiation is unknown.		
L)Necessity of Wage			
1)Wage Required Job	Student expresses need to be paid for work; not willing to volunteer.	“She said ‘Do you want to get paid?’ and I said ‘Ya...’.”	45.3
2)Willing To Volunteer Job	Student expresses that pay is not necessary for work; willing to volunteer.	“I don’t think I needed \$5.00 because it took me about 2mins, and I was just handing out flyers.”	15.1
M)Overall Knowledge of Wages			
1)No Knowledge of Wages	Overall student expresses no tangible knowledge of wages.	“I don’t know what most people get paid for, so maybe I wish I knew more about that, but other than that not really.”	2.3
2)Minimal Knowledge of Wages	Overall student expresses minimal tangible knowledge of wages (mentions only one appropriate topic or strategy that determines wages).	“...minimum wage, but I’m not sure what that is...”	45.3
3)Average Knowledge of Wages	Overall student expresses average tangible knowledge of wages (mentions two appropriate topics or strategies that determine wages).	“I think I’m good. Like when I did the babysitting course it said what was a reasonable amount [to be paid]... and for refereeing everyone gets the same amount, depending on what level you’re refereeing.”	43.0
4)Above Average Knowledge of Wages	Overall student expresses above average tangible	“...you have your base rate and then you add	7.0

	knowledge of wages (mentions three or more appropriate topics or strategies that determine wages).	15% gratuities to it..."	
N)Wage Determining Topics			
1)Time	Student mentions that amount of time working effects wages or that pay is given per hour.	"The amount of pay would differ depending on the hours."	72.4
2)Effort/Difficulty	Student mentions that effort or level of difficulty in a job will effect wages (more work deserves greater pay).	"Do either of the kids have ADHD? Cause if either of them have it then I'd say a dollar more for every kid who has ADHD..."	26.4
3)Skills/Level of Experience	Student mentions that their skills or level of experience effect wages.	"At this stage my work isn't fast... (like) a professional... so I don't make what they would..."	3.5
4)Type Of Job	Student mentions that the type of job one has effects their wage.	"I guess it depends on what your job is..."	6.9
5)Number Of Jobs	Student mentions that the number of jobs one has effects overall pay.	"I guess it depends on... how many jobs you have. Like one of my friends he has a lot of jobs so he's obviously going to have more."	3.4
O)Level of Comfort: Own Knowledge of Wages			
1)High Comfort With Knowledge	Student reports a high level of comfort with	"I think I'm pretty well informed."	65.5

	their level of knowledge pertaining to wages.		
2)Neutral Comfort With Knowledge	Student reports a neutral level of comfort with their level of knowledge pertaining to wages.	“I guess it’d be good to know more, so that like in the future like when you do get a job, like at Tim Horton’s or wherever... to know about money and what’s like fair salaries...”	21.8
3)Low Comfort With Knowledge	Student reports a low level of comfort with their level of knowledge pertaining to wages.	“I feel like I could learn a bit more, cause I’m not very good at discussing it.”	9.2
P)Level of Satisfaction with Earnings			
1)Not Satisfied With Earnings	Student reports that they are unsatisfied with what they earn, whether in the form of an allowance, occasional pay, or earnings from an outside job.	“I think it’s a little too low. Cause my old babysitter used to get about \$30...”	2.3
2)Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied With Earnings	Student reports that they are neither satisfied nor unsatisfied (no negative or positive affect) with what they earn, whether in the form of an allowance, occasional pay, or earnings from an outside job.	“It’s good.”	11.6
3)Satisfied With Earnings	Student reports that they are satisfied with what they earn, whether in the form of an allowance, occasional pay, or earnings from an outside job.	“I feel comfortable with the amount of money I get, so I’ve never wanted any more, and I don’t need any more.”	61.6

4)More Than Satisfied With Earnings	Student reports that they are more than satisfied with what they earn, whether in the form of an allowance, occasional pay, or earnings from an outside job.	“For [watching] the cats I think I make too much...”	7.0
Q)Social Comparison of Earnings			
1)I Make More	Student reports that they believe that they make more money than their friends or classmates (from allowance, occasional pay or employment).	“I don’t know as many kids who do as much work as me... I think that if they did do as much as me they might get paid a little more.”	18.4
2)I Make the Same	Student reports that they believe that they make the same amount of money as their friends or classmates (from allowance, occasional pay or employment).	“I think I make the same”	33.3
3)I Make Less	Student reports that they believe that they make less money than their friends or classmates (from allowance, occasional pay or employment).	“I think they would make a lot more than me, but I’m not like selfish, it doesn’t really matter to me.”	29.9
4)Unknown Placement	Student reports that they are either unsure of their earning placement compared to friends/classmates or student expresses several earning placements compared to friends/classmates.	“About less or maybe the same... maybe they make more.”	8.0

 R)Social Comparison:

 Who are you Comparing
 Self to

1)Mix of Boys and Girls	Student compares him/herself to both boys and girls, when raking their earning placement.	“A mix, like everyone in my class really.”	35.6
2)Just Girls	Student compares him/herself to girls only, when raking their earning placement.	“I think I make less than them, because my friend Anna, she goes to babysitting every single night.”	11.5
3)Just Boys	Student compares him/herself to boys only, when raking their earning placement.	“Guys really, I mostly hang out with my friends that are guys.”	17.2

 S)Who do you Discuss
 Wages With

1)Family	Student discusses/has discussed their earnings with family member(s).	“...it’s just usually between me and my parents... it’s more of a personal thing.”	18.4
2)Friends	Student discusses/has discussed their earnings with friend(s).	“...not really other than like my best friend.”	18.4
3)Other(s)	Student discusses/has discussed their earnings with an unspecified individual.	“...ya people ask me how much money I make...”	3.4
4)Nobody	Student does not discuss/has not discussed their earnings with anyone.	“I don’t talk to my friends about the money I make because I don’t think that the money a person makes should be anyone’s business.”	52.9

T) Babysitting Scenario:
Necessity of Wage

1) Wage Needed	Student states the necessity of a wage for work in a hypothetical babysitting scenario (not willing to volunteer).	“I would at least expect \$20... for the night.”	86.2
2) Will Volunteer	Student states that a wage is not necessary for work, in a hypothetical babysitting scenario (willing to volunteer).	“Whatever they just gave me, I’m not big on asking people for much. I’m basically the type of guy who will say I’ll do whatever you want, it doesn’t really have to be paid, but if you want to I’m fine with that too.”	12.6

U) Babysitting Scenario:
How Wage was
Determined

1) Whatever/Employer Set	Student would expect the employer to set the wage (hypothetical babysitting scenario).	“Well I usually get paid \$5.00 an hour, but I’d go and the parents would give me whatever they deem appropriate.”	37.9
2) Child Set	Student would expect to set the wage (hypothetical babysitting scenario).	“So I guess I’d just tell them that I expect to get paid that much.”	24.1
3) Employer Set With Negotiation	Student would expect the employer to set a wage and then the student would negotiate with them for a wage they deem is more fair (hypothetical babysitting scenario).	“I’d ask ‘How much would you think would be enough per hour?’, and if they said ‘\$10’, then I’d say around ‘\$12?’”	8.0

4)Child Set With Negotiation	Student would expect to set a wage and then the employer would negotiate with them for a wage they deem is more fair (hypothetical babysitting scenario).	“I’d just say ‘you have two kids, so it’s kind of harder that way, and I don’t think \$15 is very expensive’. And try to talk (with) the person to get around that.”	24.1
------------------------------	---	--	------

Table 22. Significant Gender-Related Findings for Participant Interview Data

Subtheme	Directional Advantage	Pearson Chi-square
Receiving monetary compensation	Female advantage	$\chi^2=3.875$, df=1 p<.05
Offered their current job	Female advantage	$\chi^2=4.925$, df=1 p<.05
Hold 'traditional male job'	Male advantage	$\chi^2=7.369$, df=1 p=.007
Compare their earnings to 'males only'	Male advantage	$\chi^2=8.307$, df=1 p=.004
Use of the negotiation strategy 'simply asking for more'	Females higher (disadvantage)	$\chi^2=4.174$, df=1 p<.05
Receiving remuneration on a 'variable' schedule	Females higher (disadvantage)	$\chi^2=3.878$, df=1, p<.05
Currently hold a 'traditional female job'	Females higher (disadvantage)	$\chi^2=22.758$, df=1 p<.001
Expect their employer to determine their wage in a hypothetical babysitting scenario	Females higher (disadvantage)	$\chi^2=3.877$, df=1 p<.05
Compare their earnings to 'only females'	Females higher (disadvantage)	$\chi^2=8.335$, df=1 p=.004
Have an average overall knowledge of wages	Females higher (no advantage)	$\chi^2=4.376$, df=1 p<.05
Neutral level of comfort with their knowledge of wages	Females higher (no advantage)	$\chi^2=4.424$, df=1 p<.05

Note. See results section for explanation of directional advantage.

Table 23. Significant Age-Related Findings for Participant Interview Data

Subtheme	Directional Advantage	Pearson Chi-square
Do chores for allowance	Younger adolescents advantaged	$\chi^2=9.308$, $df=1$, $p=.002$; 60%
Receive allowance	Younger adolescents advantaged	$\chi^2=5.75$, $df=1$, $p=.016$; 60.5%
Receive allowance on a weekly schedule	Younger adolescents advantaged	$\chi^2=6.034$, $df=1$, $p=.014$; 70%
Receive a fixed amount of remuneration	Younger adolescents advantaged	$\chi^2=3.615$, $df=1$, $p=.057$; 61.5%
Attempt negotiation with either a parent or employer	Older adolescents advantaged	$\chi^2=8.073$, $df=1$, $p=.004$; 63.9%
Compare themselves to 'a mixture of males and females'	Older adolescents advantaged	$\chi^2=7.889$, $df=1$, $p=.005$; 74.2%
Receive allowance	Older adolescents disadvantaged	$\chi^2=6.892$, $df=1$, $p=.009$; 66.7%

Note. See results section for explanation of directional advantage.

Appendices

Appendix A: Parental Information and Consent Forms

Letter head

An invitation and consent form for your child to participate in a research study called: Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent
Researchers: Dr. Eileen Wood & Mélanie Saari in the Department of Psychology of Wilfrid Laurier University

Dear Parent or Guardian,

We would like to invite your child to participate in a research study that will take place at your child's school (for those coming to the University: in a research lab at Wilfrid Laurier University, for those at home: brought to your home: for those in a recreation program: at the recreation center), that examines boys and girls experiences with earning money both inside the home and outside of the home (e.g., mowing someone's lawn, taking care of pets). This study is part of an ongoing research program that looks at how males and females are paid and how they feel about the pay they receive. The research is being conducted by Mélanie Saari, a Master's student, under the supervision of Dr. Eileen Wood in the Psychology Department at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo Ontario.

In total we are asking 200 children (100 boys and 100 girls) between the ages of 12 and 15 to participate. Children who participate in the study will be asked to complete one survey. The survey will ask questions about money, the kinds of chores they do, and their thoughts and feelings about money, and their chores. Children will also be asked questions about themselves (such as their age) as well as whether they have asked for a pay increase and about their attitudes toward adult jobs. In total, the survey should take about 25 to 30 minutes to complete. Your child will complete the survey on a computer at school, during regular school hours or before or after school depending on what works for your child, you and the school together (for those coming to the University: in a research lab at Wilfrid Laurier University, or for those at home: brought to your home). If your child is not able to use a computer or prefers not to use one, your child can complete a paper copy.

In order to make sure we have a good understanding of how children understand pay issues and the things they say to try to get pay increases, we would like to ask a small group of children (about 10 girls and 10 boys) to participate in an additional short 15 minute interview. We will be asking 10 girls and 10 boys to do the interview. These children will be selected based on parental and individual consent. The interview will take place right after the survey, with just one child and one of the researchers or research assistants. In the interview, children will be asked similar questions to those in the survey but will be able to provide their views in their own words and with more detail. We will audio-tape the answers to make sure we have the children's answers accurately. Once we write out what each child has said, we will destroy the tapes.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can choose to allow your child to participate in just the survey, or the survey and the interview. You can also decide whether or not

you would allow quotes from your child's interview to be used in later publications by the researchers. If you give permission for your child to participate, your child will then be asked whether they would like to participate

in the study. Also, your child will be told that they can skip any questions that they do not want to answer. The data collected from this study will be completely anonymous. Neither your name nor your child's name or any identifying piece of information will be used for any data collected. The surveys and interviews are coded with a number (e.g., 001).

You or your child can decide not to participate at any time and for any reason. If you or your child decide you would like to stop at any point, you will still be able to receive any benefits that are part of this study and there will be no penalties of any type. Although we can destroy hard copies of the survey and erase tapes, we will not be able to destroy any electronic copies because there will be no way to track your child's survey from the other surveys that have been completed. Consent forms and hard copies of the survey are stored in a locked cabinet in a locked research lab belonging to Dr. Wood at the University. Electronic survey data will be stored in a password-protected computer which is also in Dr. Wood's research lab. Only the researcher (Mélanie Saari), supervisor (Eileen Wood), and research assistants (Lucia Dillon, Amanda Nosko, Domenica DesPasquales, and Karin Archer) will have access to the data. When the research findings of this project are reported only group scores will be provided. Some quotes from the interviews might also be used but these quotes will not contain any names or any information that could be used to identify a particular child. All information collected will be kept until September 30, 2018 and then it will be erased by Dr. Eileen Wood.

At the end of your child's participation in this study you can decide whether you would like your child to receive \$3.00 for their participation or whether you would like to receive the \$3.00 as reimbursement for travel costs (or the school will receive \$3.00 for each child participating in the study up to \$100)

The information collected will contribute greatly to our understanding of children's development regarding pay and economic knowledge. We know that some children sometimes feel shy or embarrassed when filling our surveys or doing interviews. We will try to make sure your child is as comfortable as possible and will remind them that they can, stop, leave out questions if they are uncomfortable, and that anything they say will be anonymous. These feelings are normal and should only be temporary. Also, this research asks your child to think about pay and negotiation which may make them want to talk to you about this or think about these issues for their future.

When the study is finished, the researchers hope to share their findings with you, the school and other researchers through reports, presentations and academic papers. Mélanie Saari will include the findings in her Master's thesis. A summary of our findings will be given to the principal of your child's school. We will write a first report by September 30, 2013. If you would like a personal copy of the report sent to you, please fill in the section of the consent form where you can ask for a personal copy.

If you have questions at any time about this research study or the procedures, or your child's experience related to their participation in this study, you may contact the researcher Mélanie Saari fedo0460@mylaurier.ca by email or contact Dr. Eileen Wood at Wilfrid Laurier University at (519) 884-1970 extension 3738 or at ewood@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB #3525) and the WRDSB research review committee. You can also contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884 -1970, extension 4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca if you have further concerns or if you feel that you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form.

We appreciate your time in considering this invitation to participate in our research project. If you would be willing to let your child participate in either the survey or interview, or both, please complete the attached consent page.

Eileen Wood Ph.D.

Mélanie Saari, BA

Consent Form for Participants Recruited from a School

Research study: Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent

I have read and understand the contents of the consent form. I have received a copy of the consent form.

Permission to allow your child to participate in the SURVEY (at school):

I agree to allow my child (print child's name)

_____ to participate in the survey conducted by
Mélanie Saari and Dr. Eileen Wood in the Department of Psychology at Wilfrid Laurier
University.

Please check one: ___ YES ___ NO

Permission to allow your child to participate in the INTERVIEW (at school):

I agree to allow my child to participate in the short interview after completing the survey. Please
check one: ____ YES ____ NO

If my child participates in the interview, I agree to allow quotes to be used in a research
report as long as the quotes do not contain any names or identifying information. Please
check one: YES _____ NO _____

Parent's Signature: _____

Date _____

A summary of the results based on all of the participants from this research project will be given
to the principal of my child's school. The written report will be available by September 30, 2013.
If you would like a copy of the summary sent to you, please fill in the information below.

Name (Please Print): _____

Address: _____

Consent Form for Participants Recruited Individually or from Recreational Programs

Research study: Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent
 Researchers: Dr. Eileen Wood and Mélanie Saari

I received a copy of the letter telling me about the research study and I understand what the study is about.

Permission to allow your child to participate in the SURVEY (in a research lab at Wilfrid Laurier University or at home):

I agree to allow my child (print child's name)

_____ to participate in the survey conducted by
 Mélanie Saari and Dr. Eileen Wood in the Department of Psychology at Wilfrid Laurier
 University.

Please check one: YES NO

Permission to allow your child to participate in the INTERVIEW (in a research lab at Wilfrid Laurier University or at home):

I agree to allow my child to participate in the short interview after completing the survey. Please
 check one: YES NO

If my child participates in the interview, I agree to allow quotes to be used in a research
 report as long as the quotes do not contain any names or identifying information. Please
 check one: YES _____ NO _____

Parent's Signature: _____

Date _____

Would you like the \$3.00 for participation to go toward you child, or would you prefer to receive
 the \$3.00 as compensation for travel costs? Please put a check mark beside your answer.

Yes, give the \$3.00 to my child OR

Yes, give the \$3.00 to me to cover travel costs

The written report will be available by September 30, 2013.

I would like to request that a summary of the results of this study be sent to me directly at the
 address provided below

Name (Please Print): _____

Address: _____

Information for Directors/Leaders of Community Programs

Letter head

An invitation to participate in a research study called: Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent
Researchers: Dr. Eileen Wood & Mélanie Saari (Wilfrid Laurier University)

Dear (Name),

We would like to ask your permission to invite children who attend your (program name), aged 12-15, to participate in a research study that will take place in a research lab at Wilfrid Laurier University (or for those at home: brought to your home), that examines boys and girls experiences with earning money both inside the home and outside of the home (e.g., mowing someone's lawn, taking care of pets). This study is part of an ongoing research program that looks at how males and females are paid and how they feel about the pay they receive. The research is being conducted by Mélanie Saari, a Master's student, under the supervision of Dr. Eileen Wood in the Psychology Department at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo Ontario.

In total, we are hoping to recruit 200 children from recreation centers and schools. Children who participate in the study will be asked to complete one survey. The survey will ask questions about their attitudes and beliefs regarding earning money, the kinds of chores they do, and how they feel about money and their chores. Children will be asked basic demographic questions as well as whether they have negotiated for a pay increase and about their attitudes toward adult occupations. In total, the survey should take about 25 to 30 minutes to complete. If you allow us permission to invite children attending your (name of program), a research assistant will approach parents individually and will distribute the attached information and consent letter.

In order to make sure we have a good understanding of how children understand pay issues and the kinds of negotiation strategies they might use for pay increases, we would like to ask a small group of children to participate in an additional short 15 minute interview. Participants for the interview (about 10 girls and 10 boys) will be selected randomly from those completing the survey. The interview will take place immediately following the survey, and will be conducted in a one-on-one fashion by the researcher or a research assistant. In the interview, children will be asked similar questions to those in the survey but will be able to provide their views in their own words and with more detail. Dr. Wood, Mélanie Saari or one of the research assistants (Lucia Dillon, Amanda Nosko or Domenica DesPasquales) will conduct the interview. We will audio-tape the answers so that we can capture children's answers accurately. Once we write out what each child has said, we will destroy the tapes. Additional information about this study is provided through the attached formal consent form for your information.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Parents can choose to allow their child to participate in just the survey, or the survey and the interview. If parents give permission for their child to participate, the child will then be asked whether they would like to participate in the study. Additionally, if parents choose to allow their child to participate in the interview, they may choose to not have their child's quotes used (i.e., published or presented) by the researchers.

Parents and their children can decide not to participate at any time and for any reason, without penalty and without loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled. If a child withdraws from the study after completing the survey, data cannot be destroyed because there will be no way to track the child's survey from the other surveys that have been completed. However, if the child completes a hard copy of the survey it can be destroyed and the taped interview can be erased. Children have the right to omit any question(s)/procedure(s) they choose. Also, children will be told that they can skip any questions that they do not want to answer.

The data collected from this study will be completely anonymous. No names or identifying information will be used for any data collected. All hardcopy data, including consent forms, will be coded with a number and stored in a locked cabinet within a locked research lab belonging to Dr. Wood at the University. Also, all electronic data will be stored in a password-protected computer which is also in Dr. Wood's research lab. When the research findings of this project are reported only group scores will be provided. Some quotes from the interviews might also be used but these quotes will not contain any names or any information that could be used to identify a particular child. Dr. Wood will destroy all forms of data by September 30, 2018. At the end of each child's participation in this study they or their parents will receive \$3.00 for their participation.

Upon completion of the data being gathered, Mélanie Saari will prepare the information for her Master's thesis. We also will prepare the information for presentation at academic conferences and in academic journals. A summary of the results based on all of the participants from this research project will be given to the director of your organization. We are hoping to have the study finished and a first report written by September 30, 2013. Parents who would like a personal copy of the summary sent to them may request this on the consent form.

The information collected will contribute greatly to our understanding of children's development regarding pay and economic knowledge. If you have questions at any time about this research study or the procedures, please feel free to contact the researcher Mélanie Saari at fedo0460@mylaurier.ca by email or contact Dr. Eileen Wood at Wilfrid Laurier University at (519) 884-1970 extension 3738 or email ewood@wlu.ca. This study has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB #3525) and the WRDSB research review committee. You can also contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884 -1970, extension 4994.

We appreciate your time in considering this request and we hope you are willing to let us invite children and their parents attending your (program) to participate in our study.

Eileen Wood Ph.D.

Mélanie Saari, BA

I have read and understand the letter outlining the study to be conducted by Dr. Eileen Wood and Mélanie Saari and I have received and read the formal consent letter accompanying this letter of introduction. I agree to allow the researchers to conduct their study in (program/recreation center).

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix B: Oral Invitation to the Child

Introduction by Researchers:

Hello my name is _____. I work at Wilfrid Laurier University. Recently, we asked your Mother/Father if they would allow us to ask you to participate in our research study. Your parent said we could ask you. We are conducting a survey to find out what kinds of jobs teenagers do for pay and what they think about the pay they have received for work. This survey asks about jobs and chores you might have been asked or volunteered to do. It also asks about money you have earned and how you feel about the pay you were given for the jobs you did. It is going to take about 25-30 minutes to complete. You can skip questions or stop at any time. You or your parent will receive \$3.00 for participating (version for school: Your school will receive \$3.00 for your participation). Do you understand what the survey is about? Would you be willing to complete this survey?

Answer of Child*

*If no, thank the child for their time and accompany them back to class (if recruited in school system).

After Survey/Interview Invitation:

We would like to ask you if you would be willing to answer some more questions in a short interview that will take about 15 minutes. We will be asking about 10 boys and 10 girls who range from 12 years to 15 years of age to see if there are differences in what they think about jobs and getting paid. Selection of boys and girls is randomly drawn from all the consent forms we received from parents. We picked you because your parent/guardian said we could ask you and because you are a boy/girl.

Remember that you can stop at any time and you can choose to not answer any questions that you do not want to answer. The interview will be audio-taped and later we will write out what was said and only keep the tapes as a back-up. Tapes will be destroyed about 5 years after we publish our study. Nothing that reveals who you are will ever be shared. Would you be willing to participate in the interview?

Answer of Child*

*If no, thank child for their time (debrief the child if not already done) and accompany them back to class (if recruited in school system).

If we are writing up what children have said can we use quotes from you? Remember that nothing that reveals who you are will ever be shared.

Appendix C: Debriefing Form

Letter head

A brief summary of the research study called: Gender Differences in Pay Equity: An Examination of the Working Adolescent
Researchers: Dr. Eileen Wood & Mélanie Saari (Department of Psychology: Wilfrid Laurier University)

You might already know this, but for many years men have been making more money than women for the same work or work that is similar. There have been a lot of programs designed to change this. As researchers, we are interested in why this would occur at all. Previous researchers have identified several things that account for some of the pay differences noted in adult populations. These include a greater burden for women regarding childcare, family and other social obligations, as well as differences between men and women in how they value the pay they receive for work. Differences have also been noted in how men and women negotiate pay increases and expectations in the work world. It is also possible that differences in pay in adulthood are a product of earlier developmental experiences. The purpose of the study you participated in is to explore potential developmental factors that may lead to differences in pay expectations and satisfaction of pay in adulthood. The study examines adolescent experiences with employment and negotiation for payment for chores/jobs. Adolescents aged 12-15 were asked to participate. We will check to see whether boys and girls are being paid a different amount of money for the work they do and factors that might influence the amount of pay that boys and girls receive. The factors include gender socialization within the family, the extent to which individuals conform to gender stereotypes, understanding and valuing of money, and self-efficacy (a person's belief in their ability to do well) and awareness of and/or use of negotiation strategies for pay increases. Your participation is important in helping us to answer these questions. Our results will be prepared for publication in scientific journals and parts of the research will also appear in Mélanie Saari's thesis.

There are minimal foreseeable risks involved in the present research. You might have felt uncomfortable or embarrassed to fill out the survey or answer interview questions, however these feelings are normal and they should only be temporary.

If you have questions at any time about this research study or the procedures, or your experience related to this study, you can contact the researcher Mélanie Saari at fedo0460@mylaurier.ca by email or contact Dr. Eileen Wood at Wilfrid Laurier University at (519) 884-1970 extension 3738 or at ewood@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB #3525) and the WRDSB research review committee. You can also contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884 -1970, extension 4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca if you have further concerns. (For schools: Your school guidance counselor is also a person you can talk to about the things we covered in this study.) Our results will be ready by September 30, 2013 and we will leave a copy with (program/recreation center/school principal) –or you may have a copy sent home to your house if your parents completed the request for a personal copy.

Thank you for your participation,

Eileen Wood & Mélanie Saari

(Verbal prompt to take this note home)

Appendix D: Online Survey

Demographic InformationCode

How old are you?*

What is your sex?*

- Male
- Female
- Prefer Not to Answer

What ethnicity are you?

- White
- Black
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Other

Do you live with:

- Two parents (mother(s)/father(s))
- A single parent (mother)
- A single parent (father)
- A parent and an adult who is not a family member
- Rotate between my parents
- Other

Do you have older brothers and/or sisters?

- Yes
- No

Do you have younger brothers and/or sisters?

- Yes
- No

Does your mother work outside of the home?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Does your father work outside of the home?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

What does your mother do for a job?

What does your father do for a job?

Running head: AN EXAMINATION OF THE WORKING ADOLESCENT

Children's Sex-Role Inventory (Boldizar, 1991)	Not at all true of me	A little true of me	Mostly true of me	Very true of me
I can control a lot of the kids in my class	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I care about what happens to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
People like me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When a decision has to be made, it's easy for me to take a stand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When someone's feelings have been hurt, I try to make them feel better	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have many friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am a leader among my friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am a warm person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It's easy for me to fit into new places	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I play games, I really like to win	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am a kind and caring person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I'm always losing things	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am sure of my abilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like babies and small children a lot	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like to do things that other people do	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I stand up for what I believe in	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am gentle person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am a moody person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am good at sports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Children's Sex-Role Inventory (Boldizar, 1991)	Not at all true of me	A little true of me	Mostly true of me	Very true of me
I am a cheerful person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like acting in front of other people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It's easy for me to tell people what I think, even when I know they will probably disagree with me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I like someone, I do nice things for them to show them how I feel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I never know what I'm going to do from one minute to the next	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I make a strong impression on most people I meet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like to do things that girls and women do	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I always do what I say I will do	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am good at taking charge of things	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It makes me feel bad when someone else is feeling bad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel bad when other people have something that I don't have	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Adolescent's Attitudes Towards Women Scale for Adolescents (Galambos et al., 1985)	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Swearing is worse for a girl than for a boy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On a date, the boy should be expected to pay for all of the expenses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On average, girls are as smart as boys	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More encouragement in a family should be given to sons than daughters to go to college or university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is alright for a girl to want to play rough sports like football	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Adolescent's Attitudes Towards Women Scale for Adolescents (Galambos et al., 1985)	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in making family decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is alright for a girl to ask a boy out on a date	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is more important for boys than girls to do well in school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If both husband and wife have jobs, the husband should do a share of the household work such as washing dishes and doing the laundry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boys are better leaders than girls	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Girls should be more concerned with becoming good wives and mothers than desiring a professional or business career	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Girls should have the same freedom as boys	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In your home, whose responsibility is it for completing the following household tasks?

Home Gender-role Inventory	Mother	Father	Both	I don't know
Cleaning bathroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Taking care of children	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mowing lawn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shoveling Snow	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Paying bills/banking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Taking out the garbage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cleaning the house	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Making the bed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doing homework with the children	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Who should have the most say for purchasing/deciding the following items?

Who Should Have More Say Inventory

	Husband	Wife	Equal	I don't know
Groceries	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Car/Vehicle	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insurance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What bank to do business with	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Where to go on vacation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What movies, theatres, or concerts to attend	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What the family should have for dinner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What household cleaning products to buy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Where to have the car/vehicle fixed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What children's clothing to buy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How often do you receive the following:

Money Inventory

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Pocket money from your parents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Money for a part time job(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Money for doing odd jobs around the house	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Money for your birthday	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Money for special holidays (e. g. Christmas, Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, Ramadan. Other)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A weekly allowance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Money Inventory	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Money when asking parent(s)/guardian for money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Saving Styles Measure	Yes	No	I don't know
Do you save regularly?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do you personally have a bank account?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If no, do you intend to open a new bank account in the next 12 months or so?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If yes (you do have a personal bank account), how long have you had the account for?

- Less than 1 year
- 1-2 years
- 2-4 years
- More than 4 years

Experiences with Chores Measure

What household chores are you responsible for? (Please list all)

- 1) _____ 2) _____ 3) _____
 4) _____ 5) _____ 6) _____
 7) _____ 8) _____

For each chore you listed above (in the same order you listed them), how often are you responsible for doing that chore?

	Once a Day	Once or Twice a Week	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Year	Never
First Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Second Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Third Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fourth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Once a Day	Once or Twice a Week	Once or Twice a Month	Once or Twice a Year	Never
Fifth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sixth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seventh Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eighth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For each of the chores you listed above (in the same order as listed) indicate how much you enjoy doing that chore:

	Love it	Like it	Don't Mind Doing it	Dislike it	Hate it
First Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Second Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Third Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fourth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fifth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sixth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seventh Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eighth Chore Listed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Are you paid for doing any of the chores you listed?

- Yes
- No

If yes (you are paid for one or more of your chores), how often are you paid for doing the chores(s)?

	Not at all	Almost not at all	Not very much	Somewhat	Fairly well	Really well	Perfectly
How satisfied were you with the balance between your outcome and your negotiating partner's (e. g. your parent or boss) outcome?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did you feel like you 'lost' in this negotiation process?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do you feel like your negotiating partner listened to your concerns?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Would you say that the negotiation process was fair?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How satisfied were you with the ease of reaching an agreement?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did your negotiating partner consider your wishes, opinions, or needs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did the negotiation build a good foundation for a future relationship with your negotiating partner?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Wage Increase Inventory

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
How often do your parents talk to you about negotiating for a wage increase?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do other people you know talk to you about negotiating for a wage increase (e. g. siblings, peers)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How often do you ask for an allowance increase?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
How often is your allowance increased after you have asked for an increase?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Past Negotiation Experience Measure

If you have successfully negotiated for a wage increase, how many times have you been able to do so?

- 0 times
- 1 time
- 2-4 times
- More than 4 times

If you have successfully negotiated for a wage increase, how much more money did you get?

- A lot less than what I asked for
- Less than what I asked for
- What I asked for
- A little more than I asked for
- A lot more than I asked for

How comfortable do you feel with asking for more money?

- Very comfortable
- Somewhat comfortable
- Neutral
- Somewhat uncomfortable
- Very uncomfortable

Pay Self Efficacy scale (Kim et al., 2008; Riggs & Knight, 1994)

If you have a job, please answer the following set of questions about your job. If you do not have a job please answer the following set of questions about your chore(s). Please indicate whether which one you will be answering about (job, or chore(s):*

- Job
- Chore(s)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	-------------------	---------	----------------	-------	----------------

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The best workers get the highest pay raises.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
High performers and low performers seem to get the same pay raises.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Children and Pay Equity Measure

Have you ever been paid for doing a job by someone other than your parents?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Do you currently have a job outside of your house?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

Were you working last year outside of the house?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

What is your current job (please list all jobs)?

- 1) _____ 2) _____ 3) _____
- 4) _____ 5) _____ 6) _____
- 7) _____ 8) _____

How much do you get paid for each of the job(s) you listed (please put them in the order that you listed them in the last question)?

- 1) _____ 2) _____ 3) _____
- 4) _____ 5) _____ 6) _____

7) _____ 8) _____

How many hours a week do you work?

For how many weeks in a year do you work?

Brief Social Desirability scale (Blake et al., 2006)

Below you find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and decide if that statement describes you or not. If it describes you, check the box for 'True'; if not, check 'False'

	True	False
I sometimes litter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I always admit my mistakes openly and face potential negative consequences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I always accept others' opinions, even when they don't agree with my own	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I take out my bad moods on others now and then	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In conversations I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I never hesitate to help someone in case of emergency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I have made a promise, I keep it - no matter what	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I occasionally speak badly about others behind their back	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
During arguments I always stay objective and matter-of-fact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix E: Interview Questions

We are interested in finding out more about jobs and payment for jobs among people your age. This interview will ask questions about work that you have done, how much you get paid, and how salary is decided when you accept a job. Okay?

I'm going to turn on the tape recorder now.

1. First, let's start with money you might make in your own home. Do you get an allowance?
 - a. (if yes)- can you tell me more about how allowance works in your family
 - b. (prompt) For example, who gives you your allowance, do you have to do anything to get an allowance, how often do you get it, does the amount change (who decides/how does that happen)?
 - c. Do you ever negotiate for things other than your allowance, such as a new phone or iPod, more computer time, to have friends over, or for a later curfew?

Now let's look at money that you make in addition to an allowance/ instead of an allowance, and especially money that you make somewhere other than in your home.

2. Do you do any other jobs – ones that are not part of your allowance or household expectations - to make money? (If participant does not respond, clarify by identifying common chores like snow shovelling for a neighbour, babysitting, cutting grass, etc.)
 - a. (if yes)- Can you tell me about those jobs (how long have you done it/ how often do you do it; do you like it)
 - i. What jobs do you do?
 - ii. Who hires you? Who pays you?
 - iii. How did you get these jobs, how was the salary decided?
 - iv. How much did you/do you get paid?
 - v. How do you feel about the job and the amount you get paid?
 - 2b. Let's pretend a neighbour came to you to ask you if you would babysit the neighbours two children (who are 5 and 6 years old). Tell me about what you would expect to get paid and how you would go about asking for that.

(If participant does not do chores for an allowance and does not have work outside of family expectations, interview stops here)

3. How much money do you think you make in comparison to your friends or classmates?
 - a. Who were you thinking of when you answered the last question? (prompt: girl, boy?)
4. Overall, across all your jobs, how do you feel about what you are getting paid?
 - a. Have you ever talked to anyone else about the amount you get paid for your jobs? Who have you talked to or would you talk to?
 - a. Have you tried to get more money?
 - b. (if not)- Why not? What stops you from trying to get more money?
 - c. (if yes)- What do you do to try and get more money?

- d. Do you and your friends ever talk about how to get paid more? Tell me about that.
Your parents/family member?
5. How well informed do you feel about getting paid? Is there anything you wish you could find out more about?

Thank you for participating. I am going to turn off the tape recorder now. Is there anything you would like to say with the tape recorder off?

References

- Babcock, L., Laschever, S., Gelfand, M., & Small, D. (2003). Nice girls don't ask. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-3. Retrieved from http://peopleedge.mindtouch.us/@api/deki/files/285/Nice_girls_dont_ask.pdf
- Blake, B., Valdiserri, J., Neuendorf, K., & Nemeth, J. (2006). Validity of the SDS-17 measure of social desirability in the American context. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 1625-1636.
- Blakemore, J. & Hill, C. (2008). The child gender socialization scale: A measure to compare traditional and feminist parents. *Sex Roles*, 58, 192-207.
- Boldizar, J. (1991). Assessing sex typing and androgyny in children: The Children's Sex Role Inventory. *Developmental Psychology*, 27 (3), 505-515.
- Bridges, J. (1988). Sex differences in occupational performance expectations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 12, 75-90.
- Bussey, K. & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106 (4), 676-713.
- Bylsma, W. & Major, B. (1994). Social comparisons and contentment: Exploring psychological costs of the gender wage gap. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 241-249.
- Callahan-Levy, C. & Messe, L. (1979). Sex differences in the allocation of pay. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37 (3), 433-446.
- Calvert, S. (2008). Children as consumers: Advertising and marketing. *The Future of Children*, 18 (1), 205-234. Retrieved from http://www.futureofchildren.org/futureofchildren/publications/docs/18_01_09.pdf.

- Corbin, J. & Strauss A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons and evaluative criteria. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 19* (6), 418-427.
- Cross, S. & Bagilhole, B. (2002). Girls' jobs for boys? Men, masculinity and non-traditional occupations. *Gender, Work and Organization, 9* (2), 204-226.
- Curhan, J., Elfenbein, H., & Xu, H. (2006). What do people value when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91* (3), 493-512.
- Desmarais, S. & Curtis, J. (1997). Gender differences in pay histories and views on pay entitlement among university students. *Sex Roles, 37*, 623-642.
- Desmarais, S. & Curtis, J. (1999). Gender differences in employment and income experiences among young people. In J. Barling & E.K. Kelloway (Eds.), *Young Workers: Varieties of experience* (pp. 59-88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- DiDonato, L., & Strough, J. (2013). Do college students' gender-typed attitudes about occupations predict their real-world decisions? *Sex Roles, 68*, 536-549.
- Furnham, A. (1999). The saving and spending habits of young people. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 20*, 677-697.
- Furnham, A. & Cleare, A. (1988). School children's conception of economics: Prices, wages, investments and strikes. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 9*(4), 467-479.
- Galambos, N., Petersen, A., Richards, M., & Gitelson, I. (1985). The attitudes towards women scale for adolescents (AWSA): A study of reliability and validity. *Sex Roles, 13*, 343-356.
- Gerhart, B & Rynes, S. (1991). Determinants and consequences of salary negotiations by male and female MBA graduates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76* (2), 256-262.

- Heneman, R., Greenberger, D., & Strasser, D. (1988). The relationship between pay-for-performance perceptions and pay satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 41* (4), 745-759.
- Hirschman, C., & Voloshin, I. (2007). The structure of teenage employment: Social background and the jobs held by high school seniors. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 25*, 189-203. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2790180/pdf/nihms39602.pdf>
- Iverson, K. (2000). The paradox of the contented female manager: An empirical investigation of gender differences in pay expectations in the hospitality industry. *Hospitality Management, 19*, 33-51.
- Jackson, L., Sullivan, L., & Gardner, P. (1992). Explaining gender differences in self-pay expectations: social comparison standards and perceptions of fair pay. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77* (5), 651-663.
- Keaveny, T., & Inderrieden, E. (2000). Gender differences in pay satisfaction and pay expectations. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 12*, 363-379.
- Kim, S., Mone, M., & Kim, S. (2008). Relationships among self-efficacy, pay-for-performance perceptions, and pay satisfaction: A Korean examination. *Human Performance, 21*, 158-179.
- Kray, L., Galinsky, A., & Thompson, L. (2002). Reversing the gender gap in negotiations: An exploration of stereotype regeneration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 87* (2), 386-409.

- Kray, L., Galinsky, A. & Thompson, L. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80* (6), 942-958.
- Kray, L., & Haselhuhn, M. (2007). Implicit negotiation beliefs and performance: Experimental and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93* (1), 49-64.
- Lintonen, T., Wilska, T., Koivusilta, L. & Konu, A. (2007). Trends in disposable income among teenage boys and girls in Finland from 1977 to 2003. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 31*, 340-348.
- Major, B. & Konar, E. (1984). An investigation of sex differences in pay expectations and their possible causes. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 777-792.
- Martell, R., Lane, D., & Emrich, C. (1996). Male-female differences: A computer simulation. *American Psychologist, 51*, 157-158.
- Martin, C., Wood, C. & Little, J. (1990). The development of gender stereotype components. *Child Development, 61*, 1891-1904.
- McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Whiteman, S. D. (2003). The family contexts of gender development in childhood and adolescence. *Social Development, 12*, 125-148.
doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00225.
- Ministry of Education. (2011). The Ontario curriculum, grades 9-12: Course descriptions and pre-requisites. Retrieved from
<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/curricul/secondary/descript/descri9e.pdf>.
- Mortimer, J., Finch, M., Owens, T., & Shanahan, M. (1990). Gender and work in adolescence. *Youth and Society, 22* (2), 201-224.

- Moschis, G., & Moore, R. (1979). Decision making among the young: A socialization perspective. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 6 (2), 101-112.
- Murnighan, J., & Saxon, M. (1998). Ultimatum bargaining by children and adults. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 19, 415-445.
- Oswald, D. (2008). Gender stereotypes and women's reports of liking and ability in traditional masculine and feminine occupations. *Psychology of Women's Quarterly*, 32, 196-203.
- Peters, J. (1994). Gender socialization of adolescents in the home: Research and discussion. *Adolescence*, 29 (116), 913-934.
- Poulin-Dubois, D., Serbin, L., Eichstedt, J., Sen, M. & Beissel, C. (2002). Men don't put on make-up: Knowledge of the gender stereotyping of Household activities. *Social Development*, 11 (2), 166 – 181.
- Riggs, M. & Knight, P. (1994). The impact of perceived group success-failure on motivational beliefs and attitudes: A causal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79 (5), 755-766.
- Roberts, B., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. (2003). Work experiences and personality development in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84 (3), 582-593.
- Serbin, L., Poulin-Dubois, D. & Eichstedt, J. (2002). Infants' responses to gender-inconsistent events. *Infancy*, 3 (4), 531-542.
- Sneed, J., Johnson, J., Cohen, P., Gilligan, C., Chen, H., Crawford, T., & Kasen, S. (2006). Gender differences in the age-changing relationship between instrumentality and family contact in emerging adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 42 (5), 787-797.
- Statistics Canada, 2014. Employment by industry and sex (number in thousands). Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/101/cst01/labor10a-eng.htm>.

- Statistics Canada. 2013. Average hourly wages of employees by selected characteristics and profession, unadjusted data, by province (monthly) (Canada). Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/labr69a-eng.htm>.
- Turcotte, M. (2011). Women and education. *Statistics Canada Catalogue*, 6, 5-26. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/2010001/article/11542-eng.pdf>.
- Weisgram, E., Dinella, L., & Fulcher, M. (2011). The role of masculinity/femininity, values, and occupational value affordances in shaping young men's and women's occupational choices. *Sex Roles*, 65, 243-258.
- Yamauchi, K., & Templer, D. (1982). The development of a money attitude scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 46 (5), 522-528.