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KENTUCKY WOMEN TEACHERS’ EDUCATION AND CAREER CHOICE DECISIONS:
AN APPLICATION OF SOCIAL COGNITIVE CAREER THEORY

Career opportunities for women were limited until the 1970s. Teaching is a profession women have long pursued. The purpose of the study was to determine if differences exist in Kentucky women teachers’ demographic characteristics and career choice outcomes by age cohort/era. The population consisted of women who lived in the state of Kentucky and the teacher sample consisted of 110 females, ranging in age from 25-74.

Findings from this study were examined through the Social Cognitive Career Theory’s (SCCT) three constructs: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals. Five key influences were reviewed from literature: age, resources, educational attainment, teaching responsibilities, and motherhood. The educational level of all women in this sample consisted of respondents earning a bachelor’s degree or higher, with the majority having obtained a master’s degree. It was found that the teacher sample of the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study was highly influenced by their educational and occupational decisions. They were influenced by their personal values and family in their marriage and parenting decisions. Personal goals, outcome expectations, and self-efficacy were being met for these teachers by accomplishing their education and career goals while balancing their parenting choices.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Background Setting

The intent of the proposed research study is to examine Kentucky women’s attitudes and experiences regarding postsecondary education. By analyzing the various factors associated with the decisions involved, there will be a better understanding of the process of pursuing higher education and the various challenges that women face when determining this important life choice. Women in the past mainly pursued a career in nursing, teaching elementary education, or library science until the 1970s when more career opportunities became available to women (Farmer, 1977). Now that there are many different occupations to choose from, women are moving away from the traditional career choices.

Theoretical Framework

Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1996) developed the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) which has three constructs regarding career decision making and career change. The three constructs of this theory are self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals (Lent, 2005). Social Cognitive Career Theory is an applicable theory to use when looking at women’s career choices. All three of the constructs are factors women consider when deciding on a career.

Problem Statement

Women in the United States have the luxury of pursuing any career they would like. This was not possible until the 1970s. Before the 1970’s women had very few job options and teaching was one of those. What influences Kentucky women’s choice to become teachers?

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to determine if differences exist in Kentucky women teachers’ demographic characteristics and career choice outcomes by age cohort/era.


**Research Objectives**

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Describe selected demographic characteristics of the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.

2. Determine if differences exist in demographic characteristics by age cohort within the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.

3. Determine the factors that influence career choice based on age cohort of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.

4. Examine the career choice outcomes of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Study using the three constructs of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT): self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals.

**Definition of Terms**

**Career Choice** – Choices made and the reasons for deciding to choose a particular profession or occupation.

**Cohort Effect** – A general group as defined in demographics, statistics, or market research (Company, 1993).

**Outcome Expectations** – An “individual's imagined consequences of performing particular behaviors” (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994).

**Personal Value** – Personal satisfaction relative to an outcome of choice which holds a level of value that guides future decisions (Mimbs, 1996).

**Personal Goals** – The will to perform a particular activity or achieve a particular outcome (Bandura, 1986).

**Self-Efficacy** – A person’s “judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, 391).
Limitation of the Study

This study was limited to Kentucky women ages 25-74 who participated in the study and were identified as teachers. It cannot be assumed that it is applicable to all Kentucky women, all Kentucky teachers, women outside of Kentucky, or teachers outside of Kentucky.

Basic Assumptions

This study is based on the career choices of women 25-75 years of age in Kentucky who are or have at some point been teachers. It can be assumed that women today have more career opportunities than women 50 years ago. It can also be understood that over those years women have had more educational opportunities to excel and obtain occupations which only men were able to hold in the past. It can be assumed that the women who participated in the survey gave honest answers to the survey questions.

Need for Study

The relationship between demographic characteristics and career choice is important. Because teaching is a common profession for women and women have multiple roles to balance work and family, it is important to examine their career choice decisions. This is relative to the Social Cognitive Career Theory’s (SCCT) three constructs of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals. We are looking at age, resources, educational attainment, teaching responsibilities, and motherhood. Through this study we intend to examine these specific factors to gain a better understanding of career choice decisions which influence women to become teachers.
Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to determine if differences exist in Kentucky women teachers’ demographic characteristics and career choice decisions by their age cohort (era).

Introduction

Over the last few decades more women have had the opportunity to obtain an education and a profession they desire. Today the job opportunities are almost limitless. Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1996), the Social Cognitive Career Theorists purported that women would look at three particular constructs before beginning an occupation. The three constructs are self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals. Women consider what they need for themselves based on their beliefs and personal strengths. Before starting a job or even applying for a new occupation it is wise to look into the possible outcomes for that career path and how that meets one’s individual needs. Lastly, the individual’s personal goals are considered. This is a factor women consider when choosing a career. Some women with a college education are choosing to stay at home because their spouse’s income is enough to support the family. Some women who do not have a college education chose to work to help support the family (Ammons & Kelly, 2008). In addition to literature regarding self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals discussed in SCCT there are five key influences on women’s career choice decisions when choosing a career in teaching. These five influences also reviewed from the literature are age, resources, educational attainment, teaching responsibilities, and motherhood.

Social Cognitive Career Theory

The Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) has three constructs: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals. SCCT is adopted from Bandura’s (1986) general social cognitive theory. Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) took a closer look at Bandura’s (1986)
general social cognitive theory and modified the aspects of Bandura’s (1986) theory to develop the SCCT (Lent et al., 1994). The three constructs: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals are important to understand the SCCT and how it relates to career and educational decisions.

The first construct of SCCT is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is best defined as a person's "judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). An individual’s perception of their capabilities is judged by their past experiences, however not their past emotional experiences (i.e. self-esteem) (Lent, 2005). Self-efficacy helps determine an individual’s thought patterns, choice in activities, and environment, as well as “emotional reactions when confronted by obstacles” (Lent et al., 1994, p. 83). There are four types of learning which Lent (2005) cited from Bandura that are identified as factors in self-efficacy. The four types of learning Lent refers to are 1) personal performance accomplishments, 2) vicarious learning, 3) social persuasion, and 4) physiological and effective states. These four types of learning depend on how the individual perceives them for the true type of learning to occur.

The second construct of SCCT is outcome expectations. Outcome expectations are best defined as an “individual's imagined consequences of performing particular behaviors” (Lent et al., 1994, p. 83). It is when an individual wants to do something to get a certain outcome. Sometimes it is opposite and the individual wants to do something but curious what the outcome will be. Lent et al. (1994) cited Bandura (1986) to describe several classes of outcome expectations. Those classes are anticipation of “physical (e.g., monetary), social (e.g., approval), and self-evaluative (e.g., self-satisfaction) outcomes” (Lent et al., 1994, p. 83). These behaviors may affect career and educational behavior.

The third construct of SCCT is personal goals. Personal goals can be defined as the will to perform a particular activity or achieve a particular outcome (Bandura, 1986). Setting goals is an important part of the three constructs. When an individual sets a goal they are “organizing and
guiding” the individual’s behavior for the particular outcome the individual desires. (Lent et al., 1994, p. 84). There are two factors of personal goals: choice-content goals and performance goals (Lent et al., 2005). A choice-content goal is the type of activity, career, or educational decision an individual would like to pursue. A performance goal is the level or quality the individual would like to reach in the particular activity (Lent, 2005). These two types of goals are a factor for personal goal setting for individual decision making.

The three constructs of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) interlock when an individual makes career or educational decisions. The three constructs have something in common and that becomes the outcome. Not to be mistaken with outcome expectations. Self-efficacy is basing decisions on previous outcomes, an outcome expectation is expecting a particular outcome, and an individual’s personal goals are based on their anticipated outcome. Five influences are related to women’s career choice decisions relative to the SCCT may be examined through the three constructs. The five influences are age, resources, educational attainment, teaching responsibilities, and motherhood. The three constructs of the SCCT; self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals are related to the five influences mentioned. These are examined in related literature.

**Influences of Age**

In this study age cohorts is of interest because considering the different expectations women have based on their age is important when looking at the reasons women choose to be a teacher. Age cohorts for the purpose of this study are defined as age eras. Goldin (2004) conducted a research study on the career outcomes of college educated women in the United States and how the twentieth century contained five distinct cohorts. The first cohort focuses on those graduating from college from 1900 to 1920. The first cohort was classified as those women who chose either having a family or a job. The second cohort, where women graduated from college in 1920 to 1945, are described as those women who chose having a job and then having a family. The third cohort, women graduating college from 1946 to 1960s was described those
women who chose having a family and then a job. The fourth cohort, women graduating from the late 1960s to 1980, consisted of women who chose a career and then a family. The fifth cohort, women who graduated from college in 1980 to 1990, consisted of women who wanted both a career and family simultaneously. These five cohorts are characterized by different wants and desires women had regardless of the effort they put forth toward their education. In 1993, Jones and Peck wrote about age cohorts related to human capital and stated that more women are supporting their families or working because their income contribution is crucial to family well-being.

Aside from the cohorts classified by Goldin (2004), Coomes and DeBard (2004) describe cohorts as four distinct generations. This assists in understanding differences in the upbringing of women from the different generations. These four generations are silents, boomers, thirteeners, and millenials. The silents were people who were born in the years from 1925 to 1942. They were the recessive generation. Strauss and Howe (1991) classified these individuals to be born between the GI generation and the baby boomer generation. The boomer generation was those who were born between the years of 1943 to 1960. This generation would have attended college and there were a larger number who returned to college as adult learners. The boomers caused a considerable rise in enrollment throughout college campuses from 1980 to 1990. The people classified as being in the thirteener generation were born from 1961 to 1981. This generation was known as Generation X. It was called the thirteener generation because it was the thirteenth generation since the Puritan generation which founded our nation (Strauss & Howe, 1991). People considered the thirteener generation as those eager to build a career, with 18 percent of all full-time and part-time faculty employed in 1998 were members of the thirteener generation. Lastly, the millenial generation is for individuals born between the years 1982 and 2002. So far this is the largest cohort, with over eighty million Americans born after 1981. Surprisingly, the millennial generation is larger than the boomer generation. This generation is the most educated
generation. Three out of four college freshmen are working on earning a graduate degree (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Women have not always had the choice to have a career in a field they were interested in. When women were able to pursue a career, their choices consisted of being in the fields of “nursing, elementary teaching, or library science” (Farmer, 1977, p. 12). During the 1970s career options became broader and fewer women chose to work in their traditional fields. During this time laws changed regarding discrimination in education, training and employment. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 says that no college, university or vocational school can discriminate against women if it receives any federal support money. Title VII and Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act states basically the same thing (Farmer, 1977). Once these laws were established women started to pursue a higher education and more training for the occupation they desired.

Influences of Resources

Just like family and work, resources are just as important to the decision of attending higher educational programs. Financial situations are a major influence on whether college is in the near future for women. Women who have higher socioeconomic status and human capital are those who attend college and graduate with a degree (Ammons & Kelly, 2008). Women who are without a college education, work more so they can financially be stable and help support their family. Women who have a dual income family usually do not have a college education (Ammons & Kelly, 2008). The low income families are due to the low educational level of the married couple. The low educational level results in the need for a married couple to both are working to have an income to survive.

Tuition often increases at colleges and universities. When there is a tuition increase, more spending occurs within that college or university (Presidency, 2009). Community colleges are trying to cut expenses and yet keep tuition costs low. People trying to receive a higher education run into issues with the available resources. There are resources available to pay for a
college education, but it depends on the person. Available resources are: parents, full-time work, part-time work, financial aid, grants, spouse, personal funds, scholarships, grandparents or other relatives, and many more. The problem is that there are women out there who have low socioeconomic status and so do their parents. It has been found that people choose a college and major depending on the financial aid given and cost of the institution (Rowan-Kenyon, 2007). Depending on the major chosen, women may not make enough money to pay off all the loans they receive. Women who have families struggle to find the time, money, and energy to attend college (Bradburn, Moen, & Dempster-McClain, 1995). Resources are essential for women to attend college. The type of resources that would help pay for college include childcare (if the woman has a child), and living expenses to help pay the bills so the woman could go to college without having to work full time. Younger children require more attention while more children require more financial investments (Bradburn et al., 1995).

**Influences of Educational Attainment**

As teenagers start to go through high school they are faced with the decision to choose the career they would like to pursue. In most cases a certain educational level must be met for that career. The decision of a teenager’s educational level is influenced by their parents’ educational background and their expectations for their teenagers. Parents can have either a negative or positive influence on their teenager’s educational attainment. Some parents disagree with their teenager’s career choice and advise them to pursue something else (Farmer, 1997). Most parents want their children to do better in achieving a higher education than they did. Teenagers are “less likely to opt for 10th grade if parents have a further or higher education” (Davies, Heinesen, & Holm, 2002, pp. 699-700). Then there are the parents that give praise to their child’s career decision. Farmer (1997) pointed out that many students would rather not pursue a career if it meant having to go to college for 12 years. The idea of going to college for a long period of time is a major factor in the decision to pursue an occupation.
Parents are not the only ones who influence their teen’s career choices or educational attainment. Friends and family members are sometimes the most important influence to some teens in whether they choose to do certain careers or even deciding how long they want to be in school. If a sibling sets the bar at a certain educational level, the teen feels the need to do the same level of education or higher (Farmer, 1997). Women were not always able to work in nontraditional fields. This limited their educational attainment until the 1970’s when the career options became broader (Farmer, 1977). When the career options became broader there were more women pursuing higher levels of education or training to meet the criteria for the job (Farmer, 1997).

Based on the U.S. Census Bureau (2000), in comparing Kentucky to the United States, Kentucky’s citizens are less educated than the national average. In 1960 4.9% of Kentuckians and 7.7% of people throughout the U.S. received their bachelors’ degree. In 1970 7.2% of Kentuckians and 10.7% of U.S. citizens received their bachelors’ degree, in 1980 11.1% of Kentuckians and 16.2% of U.S. citizens, and in 1990, 13.6% of Kentuckians and 20.3% of US citizens received their bachelors’ degree. In 2000, there were 17.1% of Kentuckians and 24.4% of U.S. citizens who received their bachelors. Of those in Kentucky who earned a bachelor’s degree, there were more men than women with a bachelor’s degree throughout the five eras (U.S. Census, 2000). Since the 1970s women are more likely to enroll in college than men after graduating high school, and more likely to have a plan before graduating high school (Hebel, 2000). The percentage of Kentucky women in the different eras who earned their bachelors degree or higher are: 1960 (3.9%), 1970 (5.9%), 1980 (9.2%), 1990 (12.2%), and 2000 (16.4%) (U.S. Census, 2000). As these statistics show, there is considerable growth over the decades in Kentucky women earning their bachelors degree. From the 1960’s to 2000 the percentage of women in Kentucky to earn a bachelors degree or higher increased 12.5%. In the 1970’s, 39% of women were in graduate school, and by 2000 it increased to 56%. Women who choose to graduate from college with or without a bachelor’s degree mostly choose a career in education.
(Hebel, 2000). There are several influences that effect a women’s decision to further their education and select a career like teaching.

**Influences of Teaching Responsibilities**

A lot of people underestimate what a teacher does. Elementary school teaching and special education teaching are two of the most demanding fields (Farmer, 1977). Teachers work very hard long hours to complete what needs to be done and to prepare for the next day. Teaching is a job that requires a lot of time and effort. Teachers are given three months off for the summer, but some are still working during those months off preparing for the school year to come. During school season, about 9-10 months, many teachers are working thirty-five hours a week at the school teaching from the hours of 7am to 2pm. Then the teachers will stay after school or go home to grade assignments, develop lesson plans, or perform other tasks to prepare for future lessons (Krantz-Kent, 2008). Some teachers also participate in extracurricular activities for school which requires even more time.

It was found that teachers in their forties and fifties work more hours in a week than teachers in their thirties. In addition, Kranz-Kent (2008) found that thirty percent of teachers also worked at home on an average day, compared with 20 percent of other full-time professionals. Teachers were more likely to hold more than one job simultaneously than other full-time professionals. These findings indicate that teachers work extremely hard to educate our students. Teachers’ responsibilities are different than other professional occupations. It is becoming more difficult to attract, support, and retain new teachers today (Johnson & Birkeland, 2003). The job requires a lot of work with very little support.

Studies have shown that there are negative factors to being a teacher. A study was done by Mau, Ellsworth, and Hawley (2008) on job satisfaction using the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT). Teachers who had a teaching license were considerably more satisfied with their career than people with non-teaching careers (Mau et al., 2008). It was also shown that these teachers were highly influenced by their race, socioeconomic status, teaching license, parents’
education, and occupation (Mau et al., 2008). Teaching is a tough career to pursue. However, most teachers are significantly satisfied with their occupational choice.

**Influences of Motherhood**

Decisions regarding balancing work and family roles is a factor for women. Choosing one or the other is not the only choice today (Rowan-Kenyon, 2007). Women who have a college education tend to become mothers later in life than those who do not have a college education (Ammons & Kelly, 2008). Women struggle with staying at home with their children and going to work. Over the last several years it has become more socially acceptable and economically necessary to be a working mother. According to Cohany and Sok (2007), in 1948 there were 17% of married mothers in the labor force. In the 1980s, a working mother was the norm with 61% either working or looking for work. The highest rate was 70% of working mothers in the year 1995. In 2005 the rate dropped to 60% for mothers who worked and had preschool age children.

Part of the reason for the drop is that women are becoming more educated and marrying educated men where there is no need for two incomes. Women started to stay at home more with children and become homemakers. Cohany and Sok (2007) pointed out that married women that had children chose to not work for two particular reasons. The first one was women with an education married a man with an education where they could live off one income, mainly the husbands’ income. The second potential factor was that the women with a bachelors degree who worked full time would have a lengthy workweek, averaging 42.2 hours in 2005 (Kranz-Kent, 2008). Women were able to have the choice of staying at home instead of working these hours if their spouse was highly paid (Cohany & Sok, 2007).

Some mothers choose not to go to school immediately following high school. It is difficult to juggle work, school, and caring for children. Those who successfully return to school are influenced by factors such as “socioeconomic status, parental involvement, high school support, peer encouragement, and mother’s expectations for postsecondary attainment” (Rowan-
Kenyon, 2007, p.209). Women who received this encouragement during high school or immediately following graduation from high school have a better chance of attending college. The stress of balancing family, work, and education is difficult without the support of the factors Rowan-Kenyon (2007) stated. Age at first birth is also a factor to consider, it has a negative effect on women returning or choosing to attend college (Bradburn et al., 1995).

Summary

Career choices are being considered very carefully in today’s society. The social cognitive career theory’s (SCCT) three constructs, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals are important to women’s career choice decisions. There are five key influences on decision making for a woman who chooses a career in teaching. The five influences that are examined in the literature are age, resources, educational attainment, teaching responsibilities, and motherhood. Age is a major influence because of the change in the 1970s where laws were established and more occupations became available. It is important to consider the different generations and opportunities available to women in these generations and to understand the impact of influences for different cohorts (eras).

Resources are very important as they are necessary when considering attending college. Socioeconomic status therefore is a major factor in deciding whether college is an option or not. Either it is the students or parents’ socioeconomic status that will determine the educational and career path of the student. Non-financial resources like family support (emotional, personal) are considered as well. Family support while attending college or even before attending college encourages the student to do well (Ochs & Roessler, 2004). Some do not get the support to pursue an educated occupation because of need for positive influences and the time it takes to get the education or training.

Career options for women became broader where more women began to pursue higher levels of education or training to meet the criteria needs for the job (Farmer, 1997). Today there are limitless opportunities for women. Studies have shown that influences from home life, high
school encouragement, and peers are contributing factors to pursue an education. Some women choose the teaching occupation because it is a traditional career for women or because of the more flexible work schedule and time in the summers for their families. Teachers are significantly satisfied with their career choice regardless of the hours worked (Mau et al., 2008).

Some women today find themselves able to stay at home to enjoy the motherhood period while they put their careers aside for awhile. The five cohorts Goldin (2004) researched shows how women prioritize their family and work life. The fifth cohort shows that women wanted both a career and family. That was over 18 years ago. Cohany and Sok (2007) found that women are starting to feel the need to stay at home with their children instead of being a working mother. Perhaps there will be more women following patterns of earlier cohorts (Goldin, 2004). Women have many factors to consider when they choose a career.

The Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) can be viewed through the five influences. The law change allowed women to have the opportunity to experience different careers (Farmer, 1977). When a woman is deciding what career she would like to pursue the three constructs are in effect. Outcome expectations are considered when a woman is trying to find resources for a college education. Self-efficacy, personal goals, and outcome expectations are considered when deciding on the level of educational attainment to pursue. When a women decides to be a teacher they need to consider all the teaching responsibilities personal goals and outcome expectations for that career. Choosing motherhood, career, or a balance of both requires a woman to consider the three constructs of the SCCT. The three constructs are in effect when individuals make career choices (Lent et al., 1994).
Chapter Three

Methodology

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to determine if differences exist in Kentucky women teachers’ demographic characteristics and career choice outcomes by age cohort/era.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Describe selected demographic characteristics of the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.
2. Determine if differences exist in demographic characteristics by age cohort within the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.
3. Determine the factors that influence career choice based on age cohort of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.
4. Examine the career choice outcomes of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Study using the three constructs of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT): self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals.

Research Design

All data were gathered through the use of a questionnaire, administered by a telephone interview. Computer assisted interviewing software, WinQuery, was used to assist with ease in completion of this study. All telephone interviewers were properly trained on how to use the software. Respondents were contacted through a random digit dialing technique. Participation was completely voluntary and participants could stop the interview at any time. There was neither use of deception nor any risks in participating.
Subject Selection

The population consisted of women who lived in the state of Kentucky and the sample consisted of 824 females, ranging in age from 21-75. The inclusion of solely females for the study stems from the lag in educational attainment of women in Kentucky. There are a multitude of factors that influence educational experiences that are uniquely characteristic of women. Therefore, the intention was to identify some of these factors and gain a better understanding of women’s educational experiences.

Teacher Sample Selection

The Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study consisted of 824 total respondents. The data was examined to find the teachers among the 824 respondents. The educational levels, first occupation, second occupation, and college major were examined to verify that the selected sample of women was or currently are in the teaching profession. Of the 824 respondents, 110 were identified as the teacher sample and selected as a subset for this study. Although the larger study contained women ages 21-75, these teachers ranged in age from 25-74. Of the 110 women, the oldest respondent was 74 years of age. For a person to obtain a bachelors and possibly a masters the youngest age we found was 25. Therefore, teachers sample selection ranged in age from 25-74.

Instrumentation

Random digit dialing to contact prospective subjects was used. The interviewer interacted with all individuals by telephone and adhered to a telephone script/questionnaire that appeared on the computer screen before them. The interviewer did not have access to the phone number of the respondent, therefore ensuring complete anonymity. Names of participants were not obtained to maintain anonymity and confidentiality of individual responses.

Telephone interviews were conducted with a randomly selected sample of women, ages 21-75, across Kentucky. In the initial introduction to the interview, we asked to speak to a woman and then asked the participant to identify their age. Interviews with those individuals who
did not fall within the age range of 21-75 or who were not women were terminated at that time.

If the woman was between the age of 21-75 we asked a series of questions about their educational trajectories to determine if they:

1. Did not attend high school
2. Did not graduate from high school
3. Did not graduate from high school, but completed their GED
4. Started college before age 26- having graduated or are currently enrolled
5. Started college before age 26- left without graduating and did not return
6. Started college before age 26- left without graduating, then returned to college later and have either graduated, are currently enrolled, or left without graduating
7. Started college after age 26- have graduated or are currently enrolled
8. Started college after age 26- left without graduating and did not return
9. Started college after age 26- left without graduating, then returned to college later and have either graduated, are currently enrolled, or left without graduating

There are nine different versions of the survey in order to identify varying experiences and trajectories in the women’s postsecondary educational attainment. The variables are listed in Table 1 showing the question asked of the respondents and the answers they chose from.
Table 1

Summary of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your race or ethnic background?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Or another description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following best describes your mother’s education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2 year degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professional degree or doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following best describes your father’s education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2 year degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professional degree or doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is/was your mother’s career or occupation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration/Secretary/Postal/Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farming/Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Food Service/ Manager/ Hairstylist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Homemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Owned Business/self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professional/Nurse/Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is/was your father’s career or occupation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Service/Government/Postal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construction/Electrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Professional/Engineer/Attorney/Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coal Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Farming/Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Business Owner/Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your parents’ involvement in your life, as a teenager? Would you say your parents were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Uninvolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat uninvolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which best describes your marital status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Never married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How old were you when you first married?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 24-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you been married?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you divorced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 (Continued)
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How old were you when your 1st child was born?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 16-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 20-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 24-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 30-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the timing of the birth(s) of ANY of your children influence your educational decisions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did you choose this major?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hours/time off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The love of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The love of teaching/talent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not many other choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other influences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the family support system you are referring to your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parents and siblings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spouse and children OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A combination of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the following choices, which would you say describes why you attended college?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Career Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Desire to Increase Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parents’ Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spousal Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Next Step in Your Transition to Adulthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who had the greatest impact regarding attending college?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mom/Step mom (Any mother figure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dad/Step dad (Any father figure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Both parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sibling(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guidance Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. High school teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Significant Other-Spouse/Boyfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following describes how you funded college?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full-time work                                                          1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Part-time work                                                          1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial Aid                                                           1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parents                                                                 1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scholarships                                                            1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal funds                                                          1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following influenced your educational decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your family                                                             1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your friends                                                            1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where you grew up                                                       1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal values                                                         1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Religious beliefs                                                       1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1=Yes 0=No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following influenced your occupational choices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your family</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your friends</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where you grew up</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal values</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Religious beliefs</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following influenced the age at which it was acceptable to get married?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your family</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your friends</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where you grew up</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal values</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Religious beliefs</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following influenced the age at which it was acceptable to have children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your family</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your friends</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where you grew up</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal values</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Religious beliefs</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After high school which of the following did your family encourage you to do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Get a job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Begin a career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Go to college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Start a family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Follow your own dreams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

After determining their college experience, the interviewer determined the appropriate questionnaire to administer to the participant—questionnaires were tailored to each trajectory. The telephone surveys were read directly from the computer screen and data were simultaneously entered into the computer.

Data Analysis

Research Objective One

Research objective one sought to identify selected demographic characteristics of the teacher sample from the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study. Descriptive statistics such as cross-tabs and frequencies were run to analyze the demographics. Chi-square was run to see if there were any significant differences between the age cohorts and the demographics but it was not useful as there were too many empty cells.

Research Objective Two

Research objective two sought to examine a relationship between age cohort and the respondents of the teacher sample demographic characteristics. Dummy variables were created to form five cohorts. Cross-tabs and frequencies were run using columns percents to gain a better understanding of the range of women who participated in the survey.

Research Objective Three

Research objective three sought to examine a relationship between age cohort and the respondents’ influences of career and educational decisions. Dummy variables were created to classify the five cohorts. Descriptive statistics were analyzed by age cohort and the influences of career and educational decisions. These statistics were calculated by using cross-tabs and frequencies.
Research Objective Four

Research objective four sought to determine the relationship of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) and other influences on educational and occupational decisions. The data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics with cross-tabs and frequencies.
Chapter Four

Results

Data on a subset of 110 women who were or currently are teachers from the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study have been analyzed through the guidance of four research objectives. The first research objective examines selected demographic characteristics of the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study. The second research objective examined if differences exist in demographic characteristics by age cohort of the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study. The third research objective determines the influences of career choice based on age cohort of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study. The fourth research objective examines the career choice outcomes of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study through the three constructs of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals.

Research Objective One

In research objective one the demographics examined include: characteristics of respondents, educational level, educational level of respondents’ mothers, educational level of respondents’ fathers, career of respondents’ mothers, and career of respondents’ fathers.

In Table 2 the age group 55 to 64 has the largest number of respondents in this study (29%). The age groups 25 – 34 and 65 – 74 have almost equal numbers of respondents, and the age groups 35-44 and 45-54 are all most equal. Eighteen percent of the respondents reported their annual household income of $50,000 or less. Eighty-two percent of the respondents reported an annual household income of $50,000 or more. Most of the respondents classified themselves as white.
Table 2

Characteristics of study participants (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ age (n=110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents current annual household income (n=103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above $10,000 but less than $20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 but less than $35,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 but less than $50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 but less than $75,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 but less than $100,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or higher</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnic background (n=110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 110 respondents, 87 were married or separated, 8 were never married, 5 were divorced, and 10 were widowed. Out of the 110 respondents, 102 were married at some point in their lives. Most were married for the first time in their twenties, 82% (n=80). Of the 102 women who were married, at some point 85% were never been divorced, and 12% have divorced once. Out of the 110 women from the subset of the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study, 91 had children (83%). Of those who have children (n=91), 29% have three children and 46% have two children. Of the 91 who had children, 78% (n = 70) of respondents had their first child in their twenties. There is a four year spread where half the respondents had their first child between the ages 24 – 27.

Table 3 shows the educational level of the respondents from the teacher sample from which women were selected who have obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher. The majority have a master’s degree. Table 4 shows that a majority of the mothers of the respondents had no college degree (71%), while 7% have a master’s degree or higher. Table 5 shows there were 65% of the respondents’ fathers who do not have a college degree, while 14% of respondents’ fathers have a master’s degree or higher. Therefore, respondents’ mothers are slightly less educated than respondents’ fathers overall. One respondent did not know their father’s educational level.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD or Professional degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28
### Table 4

Educational level of respondents’ mothers (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree or doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

Educational level of respondents’ fathers (n=109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree or doctorate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents shared their mother’s career. They were then compiled into categories modified from the Occupational Outlook Handbook (Statistics, 2008) and are represented in Table 6. Almost half of the respondents’ mothers were homemakers (40%). The most common career outside the home for respondents’ mothers was in education with 16%. The respondents’ fathers’ careers were determined in the same way and are represented in Table 7. Of the respondents’ fathers, 18% had a profession in engineering, law, or as a doctor. The second most common career of respondents’ fathers was in production with 15%.

Table 6

Career of respondents’ mother (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/secretary/postal/bookkeeper</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming/agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service/ manager/ hairstylist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned business/self-employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/nurse/doctor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7

Career of respondents’ father (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service/government/postal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/electrician</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/engineer/attorney/doctor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal mining</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming/agriculture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner/self-employed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Objective Two

In research objective two, the demographic characteristics by age cohort of the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study are examined. The cohorts are divided up into five categories by age: 25 – 34, 35 – 44, 45 – 54, 55 – 64, and 65 – 74. These are numbered cohorts 1-5 with the youngest Cohort 1, ages 25 – 34 and the oldest Cohort 5, ages 65 – 74. The demographics examined include the following: age cohorts, current annual household income and income status, educational level, age at first marriage, number of times married and divorced, number of children, respondents’ mothers and fathers educational level and careers. Each demographic characteristic is presented in a table by age cohorts.

In Table 8, Cohort 4 (55-64) has the largest number of respondents in this study (29%). Cohorts 1 (25-34) and 5 (65-74) have almost equal numbers of respondents and Cohorts 2 (35-44) and 3 (45-54) are almost equal. Table 9 shows that the respondents who are in Cohort 4 (55-64), (40%) reported the highest percentage of current annual household income of $100,000 or higher. With the exception of 5 persons, all respondents reported annual household incomes of at least $35,000. Table 10 shows that a majority of the respondents in all cohorts consider themselves as a middle income household (87%). Cohort 5 (65-74) had a larger number of women consider themselves as low household income status whereas in Cohort 1 (25-34) no one considered themselves as high household income status.
Table 8

Age cohorts (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Respondents’ current annual household income by age cohort (n=103)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 (n=16)</td>
<td>35-44 (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above $10,000 but less than $20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 but less than $35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 but less than $50,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 but less than $75,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 but less than $100,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or higher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Household income class by age cohort (n = 107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Class</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle income</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the respondents classified themselves as being white. The two respondents who considered themselves as Hispanic were in the two youngest Cohorts 1 (25-34) and 2 (35-44), and the two individuals who classified themselves as being African American were in Cohort 4 (55-64).

Table 11 shows that the only two respondents who earned a PhD or professional degree were in Cohort 3 (45-54). However a majority of the respondents, (77.3%) earned a master’s degree. In Table 12 out of the 110 respondents, 102 were married at some point in their lives. Cohorts 3 (45-54) and 4 (55-64) had the most who first married in their teens. There is a concentration of the first marriages between the ages of 21 and 25. Since 102 women out of the 110 respondents’ indicated that they were married, Table 13 shows that a majority of the women were married, and that 88.2% have been married once. Cohort 4 (55-64) has the highest number of women who have married twice. Table 14 shows that a total of 15 women have divorced one or more times.
Table 11

Respondents highest educational level by age cohort (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-34 (n=16)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=21)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=23)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=32)</th>
<th>65-74 (n=18)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>PhD or Professional degree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD or Professional degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD or Professional degree</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Age of first marriage by age cohort (n = 102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at first marriage</th>
<th>25-34 (n=16)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=21)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=23)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=32)</th>
<th>65-74 (n=18)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13
Number of times married by age cohort (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-34 (n=16)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=21)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=23)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=32)</th>
<th>65-74 (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of times married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
Number of times divorced by age cohort (n=15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-34 (n=16)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=21)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=23)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=32)</th>
<th>65-74 (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of times divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of the 110 women from the subset of the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study, 91 had children. Cohort 4 (55-64) had the most children (n=27), but Cohort 2 (35-44) had the highest percentage of respondents with children within the cohort (85.7%). See Table 15. Most respondents with children had their first child while in their 20’s (77%). Table 16 shows there are a higher number of respondents whose mothers had less than a high school educational level in Cohort 5 (65-74) (44.4%). Conversely 16.7% of the mothers of the oldest cohort had a bachelor’s degree. A majority of Cohort 4 (55-64) had mothers with only a high school educational level (46.9%). More respondents’ mothers had master’s degrees in the two youngest cohorts. There are a higher number of respondents whose fathers had less than high school educational level in Cohorts 4 (55-64) and 5 (65-74) (Table 17). Respondents in the two youngest cohorts (25-34) and (35-44) have a higher percentage of fathers who have a bachelor’s degree or higher with the exception of Cohort 4 (55-64) who had the highest number of fathers with professional degrees or doctorates.
Table 15

Number of children by age cohort (n=91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25-34 (n=12)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=18)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=19)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=27)</th>
<th>65-74 (n=15)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Respondents’ mothers educational level by age cohort (n = 110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s educational level</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year degree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree or doctorate</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=16) (n=21) (n=23) (n=32) (n=18)
Table 17

Respondents' fathers' educational level by age cohort (n = 109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers' educational level</th>
<th>25-34 (n=16)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=21)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=23)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=32)</th>
<th>65-74 (n=18)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year degree</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree or doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 shows that homemakers were the predominant career choice of respondents’ mothers. There were more respondents’ mothers in Cohort 1 (25-34) who had professional careers (25.0%). In Cohort 2, (35-44) there was an even split between the respondents’ mothers with education careers versus homemakers at 28.6% each. In Table 19 there were several respondents’ fathers in Cohort 1 (25-34) who are currently or were in the construction or electrician field (25.0%), while Cohorts 2 (35-44) (23.8%) and 4 (55-64) (25.0%) had more respondents’ whose fathers were in professional fields. There was an even distribution in career choice of the respondents’ fathers in Cohort 5 (65-74) of farming (22.2%) and production (22.2%).
Table 18
Career of respondents’ mothers by cohort (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin./secretary/postal/bookkeeper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming/agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service/manager/hair stylist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned Business/self-employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/nurse/doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Career of respondents' fathers by cohort (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=23)</td>
<td>(n=32)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/government/postal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/electrician</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/engineer/attorney/doctor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal mining</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming/agriculture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner/self-employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Objective Three

Research objective three determined the influences of career choice based on age cohort of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study. The cohorts are divided up into five categories: Cohort 1 (ages 25 – 34) (n=16), Cohort 2 (ages 35 – 44) (n=21), Cohort 3 (ages 45 – 54) (n=23), Cohort 4 (ages 55 – 64) (n=32), and Cohort 5 (ages 65 – 74) (n=18). The influences examined by age cohort are: educational and occupational choices, age it was acceptable to get married and have children, parent’s educational expectations for respondents and level of encouragement after high school, level of respondents’ parental involvement and likelihood to ask for advice as a teenager, and how the respondents’ education was funded.

Respondents were asked to indicate all that apply in response to the question “Which of the following influenced your educational decisions?” Personal values and family are the two most often indicated influences regarding respondents’ decision to go to college. This was fairly similar for all five cohorts. Cohort 4 (55-64) selected religious beliefs more than other cohorts, see Table 20. Table 21 represents the respondents’ love of teaching as the reason for their choice of major (58.8%). This was highest for Cohort 2 (67.7%). Cohort 5 (ages 65-74) had a higher number of respondents that reported “not many other choices” for a reason they chose a teaching major for their degree than younger cohorts. This corresponds with career choices that would have been available to those older women when they began their careers. Respondents were asked to indicate all that apply in response to the question “Which of the following influenced your occupational decisions?” Personal values are a major influence on the respondents’ occupational decisions. Family was the second most often chosen influence on occupational decisions. This is shown in Table 22.
Table 20
Influences on respondents educational choices by age cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 (n=16)</td>
<td>35-44 (n=21)</td>
<td>45-54 (n=23)</td>
<td>55-64 (n=32)</td>
<td>65-74 (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where you grew up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal values</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Why respondents chose their major by age cohort (n=101)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>25-34 (n=16)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=21)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=23)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=32)</th>
<th>65-74 (n=18)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours/time off</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The love of children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The love of teaching/talent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not many other choices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other influences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=23)</td>
<td>(n=32)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where you grew up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was found that personal values (80%) and family (67.3%) were still the two major influences indicated by respondents when asked what influenced the age at which it was acceptable to get married. Religious beliefs were indicated by all cohorts as the third most often selected influence after personal values and family except for Cohort 2 (35-44). Also, friends were a larger influence for Cohort 2 (35-44) than other cohorts. This is represented in Table 23. Respondents were asked to indicate all that apply in response to the question “Which of the following influenced the age at which it was acceptable to have children?” Personal values (84.5%) outweighed any of the other choices for the influences for when it was acceptable to have children. Again family is the next most often indicated influence. This was followed by religious beliefs. This is shown in Table 24.
Table 23

Influences of the age at which it was acceptable to get married by age cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 (n=16)</td>
<td>35-44 (n=21)</td>
<td>45-54 (n=23)</td>
<td>55-64 (n=32)</td>
<td>65-74 (n=18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where you grew up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal values</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Influences for when it is acceptable to have children by age cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where you grew up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to select only one answer when asked: “Would you describe your parents’ expectations for you as:” A majority of the respondents (68%) in all five cohorts indicated their parents had high expectations for them regarding their educational decisions. The respondents were asked to select only one answer to the question “After high school, which of the following did your family encourage you to do?” A majority of the respondents’ families encouraged them to go to college after high school (76.6%), see Table 25. Respondents were asked to select only one answer to the question “Is the family support system you are referring to your?” Parents and siblings (77.3%) were identified as being the support system of most respondents after high school during college. Those who selected “other” stated that their support systems were grandparents, parents only, and a person said they had a “mind of their own.” This is represented in Table 26.

Table 25

What respondents were encouraged to do after high school by age cohort (n=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouragement</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=23)</td>
<td>(n=32)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to college</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow you own dreams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Respondents’ family support system after high school by age cohort (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support system</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents and siblings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse and children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of both</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to select only one answer to the question “How would you describe your parents’ involvement in your life as a teenager?” There were a few respondents in Cohorts 3 (45-54) and 4 (55-64) who said their parents were uninvolved in their life as a teenager; however a majority of respondents felt their parents were very involved in their life as a teenager (74.3%). The respondents were then asked to select only one answer to the question “How likely were you to go to your parents for advice as a teenager?” A majority of respondents felt they were somewhat likely (37.3%) or very likely (48.2%) to go to their parents for advice while a teenager. This is represented in Table 27. Respondents were asked to indicate all that apply in response to the question regarding how their college education was funded. Parents were indicated most often as a way respondents indicated how their college was funded (53.6%), this was across all five cohorts. Part-time work was the second most selected form of college funding (44.9%).

There were nine people who selected “other” as a way of funding college, see Table 28.

Table 27

Respondents’ level of parental involvement as a teenager (n=109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental involvement</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 (n=16)</td>
<td>35-44 (n=21)</td>
<td>45-54 (n=23)</td>
<td>55-64 (n=32)</td>
<td>65-74 (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninvolved</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat uninvolved</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very involved</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

How college was funded by age cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College funding</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 (n=16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44 (n=21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54 (n=23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64 (n=32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-74 (n=18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Objective Four

For research objective four, the influences are examined through the three constructs of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals. Influences of educational and occupational choices, age at which it was acceptable to get married, and age at which it was acceptable to have children are examined. Reasons and impacts on attending college, timing of births by educational level, as well as other ways respondents funded college were shared as they apply to SCCT constructs.

Respondents were asked to select only one answer to the question “Of the following choices, which would you say best describes who had the greatest impact on your decisions regarding attending college?” A majority of respondents felt they themselves had the greatest impact on attending college (41.8%). The second most selected impact was ‘both parents’ (31.8%), see Table 29. In Table 30 the open responses clearly show that influences such as funding, teachers, and personal values are the influences for the 10 respondents who selected the “other” category of the question. Personal values would be a combination of all three constructs: outcome expectations, personal goals, and self-efficacy because personal values are compared to each choice associated with values. Table 31 represents respondents’ occupational decisions as largely influenced by their personal values. Personal goals, outcome expectations, as well as self-efficacy from the SCCT are all factors of the “other” category of influence from the eleven respondents.
Table 29

Greatest impact on respondents’ decisions regarding attending college (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom/Stepmom (Any mother figure)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad/Stepdad (Any father figure)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant other-spouse/boyfriend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

The "other" category of what influenced the respondents' educational decisions (n=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambitions and personal needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher influenced choice in school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job chosen required a college education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose an in-state school because of funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college offered a marching band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school chosen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The “other” category is from Table 20. More options for respondents are in Table 20.
Table 31

The "other" category of what influenced the respondents' occupational decisions (n=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to be a teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stood in wrong line at registration and decided to stay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to help children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you are suppose to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal choices and desires influenced me and environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal gift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to do something to make the world better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The “other” category is from Table 22. More options for respondents are in Table 22.
Table 32 lists how respondents felt their personal values and family were the influences for the age at which it was acceptable to get married. From the six that selected “other,” some respondents had never married, and some wanted to wait until they were ready for marriage. The respondents were asked if the timing of the births of any of their children influenced their educational decisions. A total of 22 of the 91 respondents who have children indicated it was an influence. Their responses of how they were influenced are in Table 33. The child’s birth delayed continuing education was the primary influence (40.9%). The three constructs of SCCT are shown in these responses. Outcome expectations, personal goals, and self-efficacy are all related to the balance of parenting and educational choices. Out of the 283 selections, 33% of respondents said their personal values influenced the age at which it was acceptable to have children. Of the six who selected “other,” their replies indicated 3 did not have children, and the timing of their first birth influenced the age at which it was acceptable to have children, see Table 34.
Table 32

The "other" category of what influenced the age at which it was acceptable to get married (n=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I decided when it was time and when I met the right man</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never been married</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never been married and I made that decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waited until meeting the right person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waited until out of college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The “other” category is from Table 23. More options for respondents are in Table 23.

Table 33

How timing of births influenced educational decisions (n=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needed to make money to support child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided to become a mom instead of furthering education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's birth delayed continuing education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's birth prevented continuing education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had to go back to school for a job to support child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had to go to school part time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to finish all degrees before having children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34

The “other” category for influences of the age it was acceptable to have children (n=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not have children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to finish school before having children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When felt mature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready when it happens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The “other” category is from Table 24. More options for respondents are in Table 24.

Table 35 represents respondents’ education and parenting choices. A majority of the respondents had their children in their later 20’s and completed their master’s degree. The respondents parenting choices could have been a result of the level of education they wanted to complete. Almost all the respondents who had children have obtained a masters degree. The Social Cognitive Career Theory can be seen through the personal goals, outcome expectations, and self-efficacy of the respondents by the level of education they earned while balancing their parenting choices. Career goals were the most often chosen reason for respondents to attend college which is a clear example of outcome expectations, self-efficacy, and personal goals from the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT). Respondents were allowed to indicate all that applied. Secondly, ‘increased income later in life’ and ‘next step in your transition to adulthood’ were chosen. See Table 36. There were eight respondents who indicated “other” as their way of funding college. Table 37 lists their responses. Working on campus and grants were repeated responses. Others borrowed money from either loans, or family members. One person worked within the community in return to having their college education funded. All these individuals are doing what it takes to attend college, which is another example of meeting personal goals from the SCCT constructs.
Table 35
Age first child was born by level of respondents education (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at first birth</th>
<th>Bachelor's (n=23)</th>
<th>Master's (n=85)</th>
<th>PhD professional (n=2)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36
Reasons for attending college (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social reasons-all my friends were going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income later in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next step in your transition to adulthood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37
The “other” category for ways of funding college (n=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community paid for education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked on campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The “other” category is from Table 28. More options for respondents are in Table 28.
Chapter Five

Conclusion

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study was to determine if differences exist in Kentucky women teachers’ demographic characteristics and career choice outcomes by age cohort/era.

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Describe selected demographic characteristics of the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.

2. Determine if differences exist in demographic characteristics by age cohort within the sample of teachers in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.

3. Determine the factors that influence career choice based on age cohort of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study.

4. Examine the career choice outcomes of the teachers sampled in the Kentucky Women’s Educational Study using the three constructs of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT): self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals.

Research Objective One

Data for this study included a variety of socioeconomic, life course characteristics that are relative to Kentucky teachers’ (in this sample) career choice influences and decisions in determining outcomes. There were a larger number of respondents fifty years old or older. The educational level of all women in this sample consisted of respondents earning a bachelor’s degree or higher. The majority of respondents in Cohort 4 (ages 55-64) and 5 (ages 65-74) have a master’s degree. This may be due in part to the age of the population with over half being 50 years or older, and having had the time to pursue graduate education. This may also be due to the fact that teachers are encouraged to get further education in order to increase their teaching rank level for salary; a master’s degree or higher is required in Kentucky. Cohort 4 (ages 55-64) are classified as the boomer generation. There was a considerable rise in enrollment in colleges
during the boomer generation where they were more likely to attend college, and have more individuals return to college later in life (Coombs & DeBard, 2004). In the 1970s, women were more likely than men to attend college the semester after completing high school (Hebel, 2000). Students who would have graduated from high school during this time would be in Cohort 3 (ages 44-54).

Some of the respondents’ parents were highly educated with bachelor’s degrees or higher. The mothers of the respondents who did not choose to stay home had a larger number choose to be in the educational occupation (16%). Most of the fathers of the respondents were in a professional occupation (18%). Having educated parents could be a major influence on the respondents’ decision to become a teacher and pursue a bachelor’s degree or higher.

**Research Objective Two**

The demographic characteristics in this study were examined by cohorts to gain a better understanding of the eras in which the women lived. The cohorts are divided up into five categories by age: Cohort 1 (ages 25 – 34), Cohort 2 (ages 35 – 44), Cohort 3 (ages 45 – 54), Cohort 4 (ages 55 – 64), and Cohort 5 (ages 65 – 74). Some of the same demographics examined in objective one are examined in objective two by age cohort. A person’s age, and life stages make a difference on career decisions and motivation to choose a career (Mimbs, 1996). Cohort 4 (ages 55-64) had the largest number of respondents with 29% of the teacher sample from the Kentucky Women’s Education Attainment Study. A total of 40% of Cohort 4 (ages 55-64) respondents reported an annual household income of $100,000 or higher. This may be due to how many of these respondents in Cohort 4 (ages 55-64) earned a masters degree (27.3%). Goldin (2004) would refer to this age cohort as a fifth cohort with women graduating from college from the late 1960’s to early 1980’s, and described as women who had a career and then a family. This is also the age cohort who was experiencing the change in law where there were more occupational opportunities for women (Farmer, 1997). In 1993, Jones and Peck noted that age cohorts related to human capital and that more women are supporting their families or
working because their income contribution is crucial to family well-being. This could also be in part because more women in Cohort 4 (ages 55-64) and Cohort 5 (65-74) had a higher education than most of the respondents in the teacher sample.

Cohort 4 (ages 55-64) has the highest number of women with children (29.7%), highest number who are married (30.4%), and the highest number who have been divorced at least once (33.3%). Those women who were in Cohort 1 (ages 25-34) and Cohort 2 (ages 35-44) had more highly educated parents with a 2-year degree or higher, while those women who were in Cohort 3 (ages 45-54), Cohort 4 (ages 55-64), and Cohort 5 (ages 65-74) had more parents who are less educated with ‘less than high school’ to ‘some college’.

Most of the individuals in this study identified themselves as living in the middle class (87%). The respondents are highly educated with a bachelor’s, master’s, or professional degree. This shows that women who have higher socioeconomic status and human capital potential are those who attend college and graduate with a degree (Ammons & Kelly, 2008).

**Research Objective Three**

Upon completion of the research, it was found that the teacher sample of the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study were highly influenced by their educational, occupational, major, marriage and children decisions and influenced by their personal values and family. The respondents’ personal values were a major influence, and family was the second most often chosen influence for all the decisions mentioned. A personal value is best defined as a personal satisfaction relative to an outcome of choice which holds a level of value that guides future decisions (Mimbs, 1996). Respondents’ acknowledged that it was both ‘parents and siblings’ who were their support system after high school (77.3%). This support system mostly encouraged the respondents’ to go to college (76.6%). If a sibling sets the bar at a certain educational level, the teen feels the need to do the same level of education or higher (Farmer, 1997). Family support while attending college or even before attending college encourages the student to do well (Ochs & Roessler, 2004).
When choosing a major, it was personal goals and self-efficacy that influenced their decision to become a teacher (52.8%). Influences of family members, friends, and teachers were the second most often chosen influence for selecting the respondents major (16.7%). Self-efficacy is an important factor in the decision to choose to be a teacher and the success a teacher has in her career (Guskey & Passaro, 1994). The five influences reviewed were age resources, educational attainment, teaching responsibilities, and motherhood. These five influences help relate what the data shows on the influences on educational and occupational choices.

Parents of the respondents were a large influence on the educational decisions and expectations for the respondents after high school. As a teenager a majority of the respondents’ parents were “somewhat involved” to “involved” in their lives, and respondents were somewhat likely to very likely to ask for advice from their parents. It is important for a teenager to listen to advice or follow expected goals from their parents. Encouragement and direction from family and teachers is very important to the individuals’ self-efficacy (Ochs & Roessler, 2004). After high school the respondents’ families encouraged them mostly to go to college. The respondents parents’ expectations were mostly high. Those who successfully go directly to school or return to school are influenced by factors such as “socioeconomic status, parental involvement, high school support, peer encouragement, and mother’s expectations for postsecondary attainment” (Rowan-Kenyon, 2007, p. 209). Cohort 4 had a significantly higher number of respondents encouraged by family to go to college (24.3%). The support systems that respondents felt were the most influential were their parents, and their siblings.

The love of teaching and having the talent to teach was the most likely response of the respondents to their occupational career choice. Farmer (1997) advises that a person should choose a career that they like, a career that interests them and makes them happy. Parental involvement, encouragement, and support are a major part of a child’s success in education and in making career decisions. When asked about how their college education was funded a majority of the respondents stated that their parents and working part-time were the two resources used.
often. Financial aid and scholarships were other resources used. Financial resources contribute greatly on whether or not women attend college. Women who do not have a funding resource either delay enrollment or do not attend college (Rowan-Kenyon, 2007).

**Research Objective Four**

From the findings, we can see that there are other influences and impacts on the respondents’ decisions regarding attending college, and making educational, occupational, and marital decisions. Of the choices in Table 30, 42.8% of the respondents felt they were an influence on their own decisions regarding attending college, while 31.8% felt both their parents had the largest influence. Parents, teachers, and school counselors are influences of individuals when deciding on educational and occupational choices (Eccles, 1994). Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) has three constructs: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals. The three constructs are connected to the impacts and influences of decisions made by the respondents.

Self-efficacy is a person’s “judgments’ of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). When a person has experience and can look back on that experience they are able to judge what their capabilities are and judge whether they will make the right decisions regarding going to college, having a child, getting married, or deciding on the career they would like to pursue.

Outcome expectations are an “individual’s imagined consequences of performing particular behaviors” (Lent et al., 1994, p. 83). When the respondents are deciding on educational, occupational, and career decisions they have a particular outcome that they expect. So they make the decision based on what they are expecting to happen. A personal goal is the third construct of SCCT. Personal goals are best defined as a person’s willingness to perform a particular activity or achieve a particular outcome (Bandura, 1986). This particular outcome could be the outcome that is expected.
When the respondents were asked to explain if the births of any of their children influenced their choice in educational decisions, there were twenty-two who stated that the births of their children did influence their educational decisions. Of those who stated that this was an influence, findings showed that the respondents education was influenced by delaying college continuation and the other most often mentioned was delaying having children until receiving their college education. It usually depends on the age of the children when a woman reenters college (Bradburn et al., 1995). The sample of women in this study all obtained either a bachelors, masters, or professional degree. Of those women who have earned those degrees, there were more women who earned their masters (77.3%). When looking at Table 48 it is obvious that a majority of the respondents in the teacher sample had their children in their 20’s. There were a higher number of women who had their children between the ages 20-24 and earned a bachelor’s degree (52.2%). Where there were a high number of women who had their first child between the ages of 25-29 and earned a masters degree (37.6%). As mentioned, twenty-two respondents in this study felt the birth of one of their children affected their educational decisions. Women who have a college education tend to become mothers later in life than those who do not have a college education (Ammons & Kelly, 2008). Personal goals, outcome expectations, and self-efficacy were being met by accomplishing their education and career goals while balancing their parenting choices. The women are balancing work and family by putting off having children. Goldin (2004) describes this in her fifth cohort where women want work and family. The reasons for attending college for the respondents were mostly career goals. Other reasons which were indicated were having increased income later in life and college being the next step to adulthood. The proposed research study was to examine Kentucky women’s attitudes and experiences regarding postsecondary education. By analyzing the various factors associated with the decisions involved, there is a better understanding of the process of pursuing higher education and the various challenges that women face when determining this important life choice.
Implications and Recommendations for Future Research

One of the issues that was encountered during the course of the research was the issue of diversity among women. Choosing to look at the 110 teachers from a sample of 824 from the Kentucky Women’s Educational Attainment Study limited the diversity of women to those available in the sample. It was not realistic to think women in Cohort 1 ages 25 – 34 were able to obtain a master’s degree, when half of them were just completing their bachelor’s degree. There were fewer women in Cohort 5 (n=18), which made it difficult to show the distinct difference of women who grew up in that cohort. Further research is needed to examine the differences of the women in all five cohorts with a larger sample.

Further research is also needed to compare the difference in the larger study to the teacher sample, examining the difference in those who chose to be teachers and those who chose a different career path. This would give a better understanding of career choice and how influences are important for educational and occupational decisions.

Based on the research, the following recommendations for future research can be made:

1. Obtain data that evenly distributes respondents between cohorts for a clear understanding of how occupational choices have impacted women throughout time.
2. Research the Social Cognitive Career Theory more thoroughly by examining the open ended question responses contained in the data.
3. Collect longitudinal data on women and/or women teachers over time to see the cohort effects of educational and occupational choices and the life course balancing issues women face.
4. Use path analysis to determine the level of effect of educational attainment on delaying family formation of these women.

The teacher study was not for generalizing women teachers in the state of Kentucky or for any other state in the United States. A national study would be very interesting to see the influences of the teachers’ occupational and educational decisions. Although there are more career options
today it is still important to study teachers as it is a career today that is still very popular for women.
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