

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

06 May 2020

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Not peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Gorard, Stephen and Ventista, Ourania and Morris, Rebecca and See, Beng Huat (2020) 'Who wants to be a teacher? Findings from a survey of undergraduates in England.', Project Report. Durham University Evidence Centre for Education, Durham.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://www.dur.ac.uk/dece/>

Publisher's copyright statement:**Additional information:**

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way


The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

WORKING PAPER TP1

Who wants to be a teacher?

Findings from a survey of undergraduates in England



Stephen Gorard
Ourania Ventista
Rebecca Morris and
Beng Huat See
Durham University Evidence Centre for Education
s.a.c.gorard@durham.ac.uk

ISBN 978-0-907552-31-4

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF METHODS	3
OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESPONSES	5
THE POSSIBLE DETERMINANTS OF WANTING TO BE A TEACHER	9
REGRESSION MODELS FOR CONSIDERING OR INTENDING TEACHING	20
CONCLUSIONS	26
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	27
REFERENCES	28
APPENDIX A	30
APPENDIX B	58

INTRODUCTION

Attracting and retaining qualified teachers in at least some subjects and geographical areas is a common challenge in many developed countries. More than half of the countries in Europe, and almost all school districts in the US, have faced such a challenge (Eurydice, 2018). Various initiatives have been used to try and attract trainees to shortage areas and subjects. These include targeted advertising, bursaries and scholarships for shortage subjects, loan forgiveness, paid internships, incentive payments for teaching in shortage regions, and more specific approaches like the UK Future Scholars programme. These programmes are rarely robustly evaluated, and there is little evidence that any of them are effective (See et al. 2020).

A major problem is that so much of the prior research in this area has been based on evidence collected from teachers in training, and existing and resigning teachers. In the same way that so much research on widening participation to higher education is distorted by only considering those who apply to or enter university (Gorard 2013), work on teacher supply largely ignores the key group of those who might have become teachers but decide against. It is surely the barriers and facilitators from the perspective of this group that we need to uncover if we wish to improve teacher supply. Those already training or already practising may have useful views on the process, but whatever problems they have faced, these have not deterred them so far.

We know quite a lot about the motivations of those who have decided on teaching as a career. A review by Heinz (2015) reported 41 studies examining the motivations of students who go into teaching. However, 39 out of 41 studies invited only pre-service teachers as participants. In other words, they investigated the reasons why people choose to go into teaching without examining the views of people who do not want to go into teaching. Only two studies had a sample of both students who chose or did not choose to go into teaching. A further small study, including students who did not want to become teachers, was not in the review (Kyriacou and Coulthard 2000). One of the two was so old that its findings may no longer be relevant (Valentine 1934). The other study had a sample of 1,845 students from both teaching and other undergraduate courses in institutions in south Wales and south-west England (See 2004). The new study reported in this paper is a continuation of that work, and extends it to a national sample.

According to trainee teachers in small studies, their salary, pay and other financial considerations are seldom the key motivators (Davies and Hughes 2018). Bursaries and other incentives might attract people to train who have no intention to stay on as teachers (Higher Education Policy Institute 2017). Doubts about the usefulness of bursaries and incentives to attract teachers have been expressed by both the National Audit Office (2016) and the Public Accounts Committee (2016).

Instead trainees tend to emphasise intrinsic attractors such as the enjoyment of working with children (Goller, Ursin, Vähäsantanen and Festner 2019), or a desire to help others, perhaps stemming from a negative childhood experience of their own (Kass and Miller 2018). Larger survey studies report similar findings (General Teaching Council 2003). See also Kyriacou et al. (2003), and Wang (2019). Teachers claim that they did not take up teaching just as a fall-back (Davies and Hughes 2018), or because they can see few other options (Watt and Richardson 2007). Trainee teachers report being encouraged in their career choice by having had inspirational teachers themselves, and/or a parent or sibling who was a teacher (Heinz 2015). In some countries, students feel more confident in choosing careers that align with their parents' expectations (Akosah-Twumasi et al. 2018).

Our new study addresses all of these issues and more. It includes systematic reviews, secondary data analyses, a survey of trainee teachers, and interviews with undergraduates before they make a choice of career. Here the focus is on the largest survey element of the project – a generic career questionnaire for undergraduates in many subjects in 53 universities in England.

SUMMARY OF METHODS

Our study involved a nation-wide survey of undergraduate students at universities and higher education colleges in England. We contacted selected departments in higher education institutions across the country, including redbrick, ancient, post-1992 and plate glass universities. We targeted students from maths, physical sciences, medicine, engineering, computer science, sports science, arts and humanities, languages, social sciences, psychology, media and journalism, business studies, architecture and law. Contact was made with students through student organisations, careers guidance units, heads of departments and personal contacts with course tutors.

A questionnaire on general career choice, and on teaching as a career, was adapted from

See (2011) with items informed by Lyons (1981), Wellington (1982), Finch (1986), Poppleton (1989), Smithers and Hill (1989), Stewart and Perrin (1989), Hillman (1994) and Reid and Caudwell (1997). The instrument was piloted both for content and method of delivery in two universities and via focus group. The full instrument appears as Appendix B. It asks about student background and current education, what they are looking for in a career, the sources of information about careers they have found useful, whether they have considered teaching, and which factors attract them to or deter them from teaching. Responses are categorical, or a rating on a scale from 0 (no importance) to 10 (most important). Students were invited to complete the questionnaire on-line or by post, or face-to-face at careers fairs, or at the start or end of a lecture. Most responses came from the data collection at lectures, conducted by the researchers, or occasionally by the tutor. The instrument also asked students if they were happy to be interviewed about the same kinds of issues, and 20 agreed. These interviews were for illustrative purposes, and some extracts are used in this paper.

For most categorical variables, missing values were recoded as “not known”, or not known to be so for any category. For the 11 point ratings, the small number of missing values were noted, and replaced by the overall mean score. Entry qualification tariff points were capped at 168. Where two predicted degree grades were given, the lower was coded. A single parental occupation variable was created recording the most prestigious of the two responses, where there were two.

In the results section, categorical variables are summarised as frequencies and percentages, and cross-tabulated with the three categories of considered, applied for, or intending to teach. The ratings variables are summarised with means and standard deviations, and the means are compared across the same three categories of considered, applied for, or intending to teach. These comparisons are also converted into “effect” sizes by dividing the differences between means by their overall standard deviation.

Putting these patterns all together, we also created two binary logistic regression models. The first is based on predicting the outcome “considered becoming a teacher” or not. The second is based on predicting the outcome “intend to become a teacher” or not. Because intending and applying for teaching are so similar in their descriptive results, applying is not used as well here. Each model is computed in stages, with the predictors being entered in steps representing student family background, the university stage, factors relating to their desired careers, sources of information about careers, whether they intend to become a teacher, factors relating to this choice, and the role of financial

incentives to become a teacher.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE SURVEY RESPONSES

The survey had 4,469 valid responses from current undergraduates, of whom 58% were female, 67% reported a White ethnic origin, 16% South Asian, 4% Black, 4% mixed, and 10% other (full tables of all frequencies are in Appendix A). Of these, 56% had a parent with a degree or equivalent, and 32% had a parent with a higher professional occupation, 28% with a lower professional occupation, 16% with a clerical occupation, and 10% with a manual or craft-related job.

The undergraduates were studying in 53 different universities in England, and covered a wide range of subjects from dentistry to classics. Around 34% were studying maths or physical sciences, and 32% social sciences. These figures are mostly a consequence of the universities and departments that agreed to take part in the survey. Most were home students (77%), and the rest were from the EEA (7%) and beyond (16%). They had entered university with A level qualifications (67%), International Baccalaureate (6%), BTEC (7%), a combination of these (3%), Access (4%) or some other route (13%) including overseas qualifications. The mean tariff scores for their qualifications on entry (where known) were 135 points at Key Stage 5 or equivalent.

Most of the students were in their second year (56%) at university, with 6% in the first year, and 38% in their third or subsequent year. The most common expected degree result (where relevant) was a 2:1 classification (53%), with 31% hoping for a first class degree, 4% a 2:2 or lower, and 12% not known or not relevant.

When considering their likely future career, respondents were mostly concerned with job satisfaction/enjoyment (Table 1). Pay, job security, promotion prospects, an opportunity to develop new skills, and interest in their subject, were all also highly rated. Following a family tradition was the least important factor, along with the status of the job, an introductory bonus, and the chance for an internship.

Table 1 - Ratings for generic career drivers

	Mean	Standard deviation
Job satisfaction, enjoyment	8.77	1.44
Interest in my subject area	7.66	2.33

Career prospects	7.60	1.92
Opportunity to develop skills	7.59	1.98
Job security	7.50	1.96
Pay, salary	7.26	2.04
Kinds of people I will be working with	7.03	2.35
Intellectual stimulation	6.95	2.26
Job that suits my temperament	6.85	2.37
Chance to give something back	6.84	2.56
Job responsibility	6.60	2.18
Autonomy, scope for initiative	6.51	2.18
Chance to share my knowledge	6.28	2.49
Chance to use academic knowledge	6.25	2.55
Ease of getting a job in that field	6.02	2.58
The workload required	5.89	2.43
Convenience, ease of travel	5.78	2.71
A financial incentive to train	5.75	3.06
Length of working day, holidays	5.72	2.68
Opportunity for internship	4.79	3.02
Status, public perception of the job	4.35	2.91
An introductory bonus when starting job	4.31	3.02
Family tradition	2.05	2.67

The most important sources of information for choosing a career were reported to be their (expected) university qualifications, and previous work experience (Table 2). Things like adverts, media stories, and government websites were generally considered the least important.

Table 2 – Ratings for sources of information about career

	Mean	Standard deviation
Qualifications	6.92	2.41
Previous work experience (could be paid or unpaid)	6.52	2.70
Volunteering work in the past	5.62	2.99
Family	5.52	2.93
My lecturers in university	5.41	2.77
People I know	5.15	2.61
Careers advisors	4.81	2.79
My school teachers	4.53	2.79
Publicity campaigns, adverts	3.86	2.53
Government websites (e.g. Get Into Teaching)	3.86	2.90
Media stories or dramas	3.33	2.60

Of the total respondents, 2,619 (59%) had considered teaching as a career, of whom 881 (20%) intended to become a teacher, and 859 (19%) either had applied or were planning to apply for teacher training. The likely teachers were approximately evenly divided between plans to teach in primary (17%) and secondary (19%) phases. Most undergraduates felt that it would be easy to enter a career other than teaching with their degree (83%).

Thinking specifically about teaching as a possible career, the biggest reported attractor for all respondents was the long holidays, having good teachers at their own school, and the chance to give something back to society (Table 3). The biggest deterrent to a teaching career was that teacher salaries are not considered to be high enough. Respondents generally did not agree that teaching is a career for those unable to do anything else, or one especially suited for women.

Table 3 – Ratings for teaching drivers

	Mean	Standard deviation
The long holidays are attractive	7.79	2.15
Teachers' salaries are not high enough	7.45	2.13
It allows you to give something back to society	7.37	2.01
Good teachers at school can encourage people to go into teaching	7.33	2.22
It's for those who enjoy working with young people	6.97	2.35
A good experience at school can encourage people to go into teaching	6.85	2.31
Teaching has high job security	6.47	2.18
There is a problem with poor discipline in schools	6.44	2.37
Working hours in teaching are family friendly	6.31	2.75
It allows you to continue your academic interest	6.17	2.57
Teaching offers intellectual stimulation	6.04	2.48
Learning to teach makes you more employable	5.44	2.35
It has good career/promotion prospects	5.30	2.32
It is a high status profession	4.95	2.41
People who have teachers in their family are more likely to go into teaching	4.76	2.60
Teachers' workload is manageable	4.73	2.51
It's for people who are academic stars	2.94	2.38
It's for those who can't do anything else	2.15	2.54
It's a more suitable career for women	2.01	2.58

Four slightly different existing or possible incentives for becoming a teacher all had similar ratings (Table 4). They appear to be generally influential. However, all of the findings reported so far are for all respondents. What is of more interest is the extent to which these characteristics, views and career drivers differ between those who want to become teachers and their peers. Therefore, the following tables compare the characteristics and responses of those who considered teaching as a career, those who have applied for teacher training, and those who intend to become teachers.

Table 4 – Ratings for teaching incentives

	Mean	Standard deviation
Being paid a salary while receiving training	6.91	2.19
Tax free bursary or scholarship for training to teach	6.80	2.23
A loan to support your living expenses	6.68	2.43
A loan to cover your tuition fees	6.60	2.45

THE POSSIBLE DETERMINANTS OF WANTING TO BE A TEACHER

Background characteristics

Male students were more likely to have considered being a teacher (62%), and much more likely to intend to become a teacher (Table 5). Of course, because there are more females than males both in HE and in our survey, the actual underlying figures intending to enter teaching are more balanced.

Table 5 – Possible teachers by gender

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Male	61.7	23.0	23.6
Female	54.8	13.9	14.1
Other	51.8	14.8	16.2

The different ethnic groups have similar levels of considering teaching, with White students the most interested, but South Asian origin students are the most likely to turn

that consideration into an application or intent (Table 6).

Table 6 – Possible teachers by ethnicity

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Asian	55.8	21.7	22.0
Black	52.9	15.7	12.2
East Asian	54.9	18.6	19.5
White	60.7	19.7	20.2
Mixed	52.8	10.8	11.4
Other	52.8	16.1	18.7

Students whose parents do not have a degree (and presumably mostly did not attend university themselves) are more likely to consider and to apply for teaching (Table 7). This is the first of several indicators throughout the survey suggesting that prospective teachers more often have less educated and professional backgrounds, and with lower qualifications and expected degree results themselves, than their peers in HE.

Table 7 – Possible teachers by parental education

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Yes	54.6	15.1	15.4
No	65.5	26.0	26.4
Not known	54.7	16.8	18.7

Teacher applications are most likely from students whose parents are not usually employed, or who have a craft-related or manual occupation (Table 8). They are least likely to come from students whose parents are higher-level professionals.

Table 8 – Possible teachers by parental occupation

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Technical, health, welfare or education professionals	63.4	19.8	21.4

Clerical, administrative assistant, secretary, dentistry	60.0	18.9	20.4
University/college lecturer, doctor, dentist, solicitor, scientist	52.6	15.9	14.7
Craft related jobs	66.7	29.1	28.9
Small employer (under 10 employees)	58.0	18.8	18.8
Not usually employed	67.3	28.6	30.6
Not known	53.9	18.6	20.3

The university stage

Consideration of a career in teaching is most common among students who enter university with a BTEC, or combination of BTEC and A levels (Table 9). And a very high proportion of these intend to go into teaching. This difference in terms of type of prior qualification is remarkable. It is least common among students with an International Baccalaureate (perhaps more often from private schools), and those with other or unknown qualifications (often from overseas).

Table 9 – Possible teachers by prior qualification type

	Considered	Applied	Intend
A Level	59.2	16.5	17.0
International Baccalaureate	43.7	17.4	13.7
BTEC, GNVQ, other professional diploma	72.6	40.6	43.9
Access to higher education diploma	63.7	28.5	27.9
Scottish Highers or Advanced Highers	50.0	5.0	5.0
A Level and BTEC/IB	76.4	45.5	49.6
Foundation year	66.7	16.7	8.3
Other or not known	49.6	15.1	15.8

Prospective teachers enter university with lower average tariff points than their peers.

And, according to the “effect” sizes, the firmer their intentions to teach become the bigger this difference is (Table 10).

Table 10 - Possible teachers by prior qualification tariff points

KS5 tariff points	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	133.80	23.68	-
Not considered	137.19	20.55	-0.15
Applied	127.48	25.43	-
Not applied	137.04	21.33	-0.42
Intend	127.28	25.60	-
Not intend	137.15	21.22	-0.44
Total	135.20	22.50	

Home students are most likely to consider teaching, and to intend to become teachers (Table 11). EEA students are least likely to consider teaching as a career.

Table 11 - Possible teachers by country of origin

	Considered	Applied	Intend
UK/Home student	61.8	20.3	21.1
EEA student (European Economic Area)	41.5	12.4	9.7
International student	51.5	17.9	17.9
Other	44.9	11.8	13.4

Table 12 is intriguing because previous ‘consideration’ of a career cannot go down over time. A student who considered teaching in the first year or earlier must, by definition, have considered it by the second year as well, even if they had earlier rejected the idea, or no longer considered teaching in year two. Yet in Table 12 consideration declines with each year cohort, and almost as many first year students intend to become teachers as second years who just thought about the idea. One possibility is that this is a product of the specific courses that the first and other years come from, but perhaps the explanation is that as students move towards the end of their course they become more focussed on specific objectives and this narrows their view and their interpretation of

what ‘considered’ any other career means.

Table 12 – Possible teachers by year of study

	Considered	Applied	Intend
First	78.4	51.6	54.4
Second	57.6	17.9	18.2
Third	57.6	17.7	17.6
Fourth and above	54.7	11.1	12.4

Students taking courses related to sports, languages and English are most likely to consider becoming a teacher, and those in more clearly ‘vocational’ areas such as medicine, law and architecture are least likely (Table 13). Their reports of whether they have applied, and actually intend, to become teachers show a similar pattern. A very high proportion of students following sports courses intend to become teachers.

Table 13 – Possible teachers by subject area

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Sport-related courses	75.5	41.2	42.8
Languages, English, classics	70.3	25.6	26.2
Other courses	66.7	16.7	16.7
Social, economic and political sciences, education and humanities, psychology	65.8	26.8	27.0
Creative arts and design, library and information science, media studies	65.1	23.3	22.9
Physical and mathematical sciences, computing, engineering and technology, earth sciences	52.7	11.2	11.8
Business, accountancy and administrative studies	41.7	8.3	14.2
Medicine, Dentistry, Biological Sciences, Veterinary Sciences, Agriculture, Forestry	40.4	6.6	5.6
Law, architecture, building and planning	34.1	4.2	4.2

For the first three classifications of expected degree outcomes (the vast majority of respondents), the likelihood of considering, applying and intending to become a teacher increases with lower grades (Table 14). Teaching is a career attracting lower (prospective) qualified graduates.

Table 14 – Possible teachers by expected degree outcomes

	Considered	Applied	Intend
1st	54.5	15.3	16.8
2:1	61.2	21.7	21.3
2:2	69.9	29.3	30.8
3 rd or pass	56.7	16.7	20.0
Not known or not relevant	54.9	16.4	17.3

General career choices

Potential teachers are more motivated by having a chance to share their knowledge and give something back than their peers are (Table 15). The differences become clearer as they decide to apply for teacher training, and intend to become teachers. They are less concerned with status, pay, and career prospects than their peers. Studies that focus only on teachers, as exemplified at the start of this paper, might downplay the importance of these extrinsic motivators in comparison to the more altruistic ones. Issues like pay and career prospects are more important to the students who might otherwise have become teachers (according to their own reports). Crucial findings like this are lost when there is no comparator group. This issue is taken up again in the conclusion. Potential teachers and their peers are equivalent in terms of concern for recruitment workload, incentives, and autonomy.

Table 15 – ‘Effect’ sizes for general career choice factors

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Chance to give something back	+0.28	+0.48	+0.44
Chance to share knowledge	+0.25	+0.47	+0.42

Kinds of colleagues	+0.17	+0.26	+0.25
Interest in subject	+0.16	+0.28	+0.22
Suits temperament	+0.13	+0.18	+0.17
Use academic knowledge	+0.12	+0.26	+0.22
Length of working day	+0.12	+0.18	+0.17
Ease of getting job	+0.09	+0.28	+0.28
Convenience	+0.08	+0.01	+0.01
Job satisfaction	+0.07	+0.11	+0.07
Workload	+0.05	+0.02	+0.04
Job security	-0.01	+0.13	+0.16
Incentive to train	-0.01	-0.02	0
Family tradition	-0.02	+0.07	+0.10
Chance to develop skills	-0.03	-0.08	-0.03
Responsibility	-0.03	+0.19	+0.17
Intellectual stimulation	-0.04	-0.12	-0.18
Introductory bonus	-0.04	+0.01	+0.01
Autonomy	-0.06	0	-0.02
Job status	-0.12	-0.05	-0.05
Career prospects	-0.13	-0.08	-0.13
Opportunity for internship	-0.16	-0.17	-0.19
Pay	-0.23	-0.27	-0.27

The full tables containing the means and standard deviations for each ‘effect’ size are in Appendix A.

An architecture student, not intending to teach, told us:

I personally have never looked at salaries when I am choosing anything to do, for

instance now I am taking part in a competition which for the time I'm putting it is not worth the reward that I 'm getting but I 'm really enjoying it so I am taking part in it nonetheless.

Another student of international relations, not intending to teach, told us:

Uh, I mean, I mean they could like maybe increase the pay, but to be honest, it's more my, my problem is more... it's not that I don't think teaching is a, is a great profession or whatever. It's just me as an individual, I don't think I'd be good at teaching. [...] It's not really anything about the position itself, it's more how like I interact with the children, I don't think I could be advantageous.

In fact, all students interviewed who did not want to be teachers suggested that pay was not the issue. Here is another, studying Chemical Engineering:

Honestly, um, as a person teaching does not really suit me. Um, that's the only reason why I didn't choose to look into teaching, I know is a really rewarding job and it must feel good to be giving back to young kids especially when you've been in that sort of situation before. As a person I know it doesn't really matter to me what teachers get paid or anything like that, I just don't think it suits me as a career. That's why I didn't choose to look into it.

Sources of information about careers

Potential teachers report being more influenced by advice at school, government websites, and working as a volunteer, than their peers (Table 16). Again, the differences grow as their intention is firmer. And again such a finding could be misleading when focussing only on teachers. Family members, other people, adverts and so on are not major factors dividing prospective teachers and others. Perhaps what this means is that sources rated highly in Table 16, but *not* especially so by prospective teachers, should be highlighted in trying to attract students who would not otherwise be teachers.

Table 16 – 'Effect' sizes for sources of career information

	Considered	Applied	Intend
My school	+0.33	+0.57	+0.58
Government website	+0.33	+0.46	+0.48

Volunteering	+0.27	+0.49	+0.47
My lecturers	+0.15	+0.13	+0.13
Qualifications	+0.15	+0.18	+0.15
Previous work experience	+0.14	+0.36	+0.33
Media	+0.07	+0.06	+0.08
Careers advisors	+0.06	0	-0.02
Adverts	+0.05	+0.04	+0.03
People I know	+0.04	-0.05	-0.05
Family members	+0.02	+0.03	+0.04

A student intending to become a teacher told us:

[In sixth form] I did a peer mentoring program at school where I was paired with a year seven and I was kind of part of a learning support group and I would kind of just meet with them once to twice a week, see if you had any issues, helped them with homework, you know, check if everything's alright at home, all those kinds of little things. And that was another different side to teaching that I had not seen before, that is not just being stood in front of the class.

Another student of Sociology, also not intending to be teacher, told us:

Yeah, probably. Maybe. Yeah. If I've got more feel about it, more national coverage or yeah, promotion, maybe I could have tried and looked into it more.

Probably taster sessions, taster lessons. Maybe have a class about it and the feel about it why it's good and what's the benefits of it that.

Becoming a teacher

Unsurprisingly, the possible teachers are more likely to report that their degree has not made it easy for them to get a job other than teaching, but the differences are not large (Table 17).

Table 17 – Possible teachers and ease of getting another job

	Considered	Applied	Intend
No	61.6	24.9	25.1
Yes	58.0	18.1	18.6

The students who considered being a teacher are quite evenly spread between primary, secondary and specialist post-16 phases (Table 18). But there is more sustained interest in becoming a teacher only in the first two phases – primary and secondary age.

Table 18 – Possible teachers and preferred phase of teaching

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Early Years/ Primary School	85.2	43.6	44.5
Secondary School (11-16 years old)	85.4	38.0	39.5
Further/Higher Education (16+ years old)	74.3	16.8	18.1
I do not plan to become a teacher	23.6	1.3	0.5

In terms of incentives, potential teachers report that they would be influenced by financial incentives to train, with each version of incentives scoring a similar amount (Table 19).

Table 19 – ‘Effect’ sizes for incentives to teach

Incentives to teach	Considered	Applied	Intend
Bursary for training	+0.48	+0.55	+0.62
Training salary	+0.47	+0.54	+0.58
Loan for tuition	+0.42	+0.57	+0.58
Loan for maintenance	+0.40	+0.56	+0.57

Teacher factors

Thinking about teaching as a career, potential teachers report altruistic reasons, coupled with prior good experience of schooling, and academic interest as drivers (Table 20). They are not any more or less interested in holidays, working hours, workload, or poor discipline than their peers. These factors are often reported in relation to teacher dropout, but at this stage they are not a concern for teachers, or even for those not intending to be teachers.

Table 20 – ‘Effect’ sizes for teacher career factors

	Considered	Applied	Intend
Good school experience	+0.41	+0.38	+0.37
Career prospects	+0.37	+0.59	+0.62
Intellectual stimulation	+0.33	+0.57	+0.51
More employable	+0.31	+0.40	+0.39
Had good teachers	+0.30	+0.26	+0.26
Academic interest	+0.29	+0.46	+0.43
Chance to give something back	+0.28	+0.37	+0.31
High status	+0.27	+0.37	+0.40
Teacher salaries are too low	+0.14	+0.07	+0.04
Working with young people	+0.09	+0.17	+0.11
Job security	+0.08	+0.13	+0.17
Teachers in family	+0.02	-0.13	-0.13
Long holidays	+0.01	-0.05	-0.04
Academic stars	+0.01	+0.01	-0.02
Suitable for women	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
Poor discipline	-0.02	-0.11	-0.16
Working hours	-0.08	-0.03	-0.01
Workload manageable	-0.13	0	+0.02
Can't do anything else	-0.31	-0.33	-0.35

One student not planning on being a teacher, and studying Chemical Engineering, did raise the issue of workload, but more about the style than the hours:

I have had teachers at school which I really like at school and teachers that I didn't like. But the main reason why I say I don't really feel suited to those actual roles would be because I think like the environment I'm in, I rather work in an office space than being around young people every single day as a career and in terms of the work load teachers have as well. I would rather be set a task which I can work on individually or in small groups, rather than me, standing up and literally giving out information five to six hours a day.

It is interesting to note that while intellectual stimulation is a factor reported as more attractive about teaching by prospective teachers than by their peers, this is stronger for those planning to teach the younger age groups (Table 21). It might be envisaged that academic stimulation would be greater in subsequent phases of schooling.

Table 21 – Mean ratings for intellectual stimulation by phase of teaching

	Mean	SD
Early years/Primary school	6.85	2.17
Secondary school	6.50	2.23
Further/Higher Education	6.00	2.56
I do not plan to be a teacher	5.50	2.53
Overall	6.04	2.48

REGRESSION MODELS FOR CONSIDERING OR INTENDING TEACHING

Having considered all of these responses in isolation and then compared between likely future teachers and the rest, this section of the paper uses all available variables to model the overall differences between the groups. The following models are based on 3,381 cases, representing all home and EEA students in their first three years of full-time undergraduate study. The first model compares the 2,049 who reported considering teaching as a career with the other 1,332 who did not. Around 60.6% of cases had considered teaching, and so the base figure for the logistic regression model is 60.6. We could predict whether any student had considered teaching with 60.6% accuracy just by guessing that they had done so, with no other information. The second model uses only those who considered teaching, and compares the 715 students who reported intending to teach to the 1,334 not intending to teach. So the base figure for the second logistic regression model is 65.1. Nearly two thirds of students who report considering teaching

had rejected the idea (or at least they were not pursuing it).

Adding information on student background – sex, ethnicity, parental education and occupational group – does little to the accuracy of either prediction (Table 22). The two models increase their accuracy by less than one percentage point. Background indicators like gender and parental occupation and education are generally seen as strongly related to education outcomes. So perhaps this shows that intention to teach is not very stratified, for this group of students who have already been selected for entry to university on the basis of prior attainment.

Table 22 – Percentage predicted correctly at each stage of the two models

Block	% predicted correctly - Considered	Increase on previous figure	% predicted correctly - Intend	Increase on previous figure
Base	60.6	-	65.1	-
Background	61.2	0.6	65.6	0.4
University	65.5	4.3	71.1	5.5
Career	68.1	2.6	79.4	8.3
Teacher factors	70.5	2.4	80.0	0.6
Incentives to teach	71.5	1.0	80.0	0

A bigger increase in the accuracy of both models, by around five percentage points, comes from the relatively simple variables related to being at university – home country of student, their year, and broad subject area of degree. The biggest increase for the model predicting intention to be a teacher, over eight percentage points, comes from reports of students’ general career concerns. Net of these factors, asking students what they think of teaching adds little to the base figure, and the role of incentives to teach becomes negligible or non-existent. Given the apparent importance of incentives based on the raw figures, the results from this model show the crucial relevance of context when considering such factors.

Table 23 only includes variables whose inclusion in the model increases the accuracy of the predicted outcome. Looking at the variables used at each step, males are more likely to consider teaching than females, as are students from less prestigious backgrounds, or with less educated parents. Net of these factors, home and first year students are more likely to consider teaching. Students studying sports, humanities and languages are still

much more likely to consider teaching as a career than those in subjects like law and medicine. Once these differences have been taken into account, the coefficients for all career choice factors are generally small or irrelevant. Students who considered teaching as a career are slightly more likely to want give something back to society, to share their knowledge, and to be interested in the long holidays than all other students.

As importantly, those considering teaching and others are no different in terms of prior attainment and qualification type. These groups also show no differences in terms of career factors like job satisfaction, job security, autonomy, opportunity to develop skills, chance to use academic knowledge, ease of getting job, interest in subject area, the kind of colleagues, the job suits my temperament, workload, family tradition, convenience, intellectual stimulation, a financial incentive to train, and an introductory bonus. They show no difference in terms of factors relating to teaching as a career such as teacher working hours, high job security, poor discipline, teacher in family, academic stars, working with young people, good teachers at school, continue academic interest, more suitable for women, high status, become more employable, and intellectual stimulation. Incentives to become a teacher have generally low coefficients, and being offered a loan to support training is now irrelevant to the model.

Table 23 – Coefficients for each predictor in the two models

Block	Variable	Values	Odds Considered	Odds Intend
Background	Sex	Male	1.42	2.75
		Female	1.08	1.67
		Other	-	-
	Ethnicity	Asian	-	0.86
		Black	-	0.37
		East Asian	-	0.67
		White	-	0.69
		Mixed	-	0.39
		Other	-	-
			Parent degree	Yes
No	1.33			1.14

		Not known	-	-
	Parent occupation	Technical, health, welfare or education professionals	1.51	-
		Clerical, administrative assistant, secretary, dentistry	1.17	-
		University/college lecturer, doctor, dentist, solicitor, scientist	1.07	-
		Craft related jobs	1.42	-
		Small employer (under 10 employees)	1.68	-
		Not usually employed	1.25	-
		Not known	-	-
University	Student	Home	1.92	-
		EEA	-	-
	Year of study	First	1.97	3.45
		Second	1.02	1.07
		Third	-	-
	Main entry qualifications	A Level	-	1.07
		International Baccalaureate	-	1.27
		BTEC, GNVQ, other professional diploma	-	1.84
		Access to higher education diploma	-	1.53
		Scottish Highers or Advanced Highers	-	0.58

		A Level and BTEC/IB	-	3.88
		Foundation year	-	0.00
		Other or not known	-	-
	Tariff points		-	0.989
	Subject area of study	Medicine, Biological Sciences, Veterinary	1.80	6.621
		Physical and mathematical sciences, computing, engineering	3.26	14.98
		Sport-related courses	8.23	27.87
		Business, accountancy and administrative studies	0.88	6.267
		Social sciences, education and humanities	5.05	21.82
		Languages, English, classics	6.56	27.16
		Creative arts and design, media studies	5.07	19.81
		Law	-	-
Career	Pay		0.95	0.92
	Career prospects		0.96	0.91
	Job responsibility		0.94	-
	Chance to give back		1.06	1.08
	Chance to share knowledge		1.09	1.14
	Job status		0.95	-
	Holidays		1.07	-

	Opportunity for internship		0.93	0.92
	Job security			1.11
	Ease of getting a job in that field			1.13
	Job that suits my temperament			0.94
	Intellectual stimulation			0.88
	An introductory bonus			1.06
Sources	My teachers		1.14	1.30
	Media stories		0.94	0.93
	Career advice		0.94	0.92
	Volunteering		1.04	1.11
	Government website		1.11	1.19
	People I know		-	0.95
	Publicity campaigns, adverts		-	0.89
	My lecturers in university		-	0.89
Teacher factors	Teacher salaries low		1.07	-
	Good career prospects		1.09	1.19
	Teacher workload ok		0.96	-
	Good school experience		1.13	-
	Give something back		1.08	-

	Teachers in family		-	0.94
	More employable		-	1.07
Incentives	Salary while training		1.12	-
	Tax free bursary		1.08	1.29
	Loan for tuition fees		1.05	-

The second model compares those who have only considered teaching as a career with those who intend to become teachers. In some respects it is similar to the first model, but with more extreme differences in terms of the predictor coefficients. Males, and Asian students are more likely to report intending to be teachers than Black and mixed ethnicity students, or those whose parents have a degree. First year, BTEC and Access students are more likely to want to be teachers than those with A levels. Those with lower tariff points on entry to university are more likely to intend to teach. Teaching is again more popular for those on sports, humanities and language degrees. Most career factors net of the foregoing are relatively neutral between the two groups. A chance to give back and share knowledge are predictors, but now so are job security and ease of getting a job. A desire for intellectual stimulation predicts not intending to be a teacher. The only incentive for teachers that matters is a tax free bursary for training.

As importantly, many variables are completely irrelevant. These include job satisfaction, autonomy, opportunity to develop skills, job responsibility, chance to use knowledge, subject interest, kinds of colleagues, workload, family tradition, status, length of working day, convenience, and a financial incentive to train. More specific to choice of teaching as a career, the following are also irrelevant - teacher salaries, working hours, job security, workload, poor discipline, long holidays, academic starts, working with young people, good teachers, academic interest, women, school experience, high status, give something back, and intellectual stimulation.

CONCLUSIONS

The research described here is unusual in that it involves teachers, potential teachers *and* those not interested in teaching. In several respects, this alters the kinds of findings produced by standard research based only on the views of teachers. In attempting to improve both the recruitment and retention of new teachers, therefore, a key consideration is about who is intended to be attracted to teaching. This paper looks at

three main groups – those never considering teaching, those considering and rejecting teaching, and intending teachers. Presumably the first group is not fruitful area for new recruitment. A lot of these students are studying subjects at university like accountancy, law, medicine, architecture and engineering, which have their own clear professional outcomes. And a lot are planning a career in their specialist subject area, at this stage at least.

At the other extreme, a focus only on those intending to become teachers would lead to the same, probably misleading, answers as standard research in this area. For the purposes of this paper, the key distinction is between those who express some interest in teaching, and the rest.

In general, teaching is currently attracting students from less educated families with less prestigious occupational backgrounds, who have somewhat lower attainment prior to university. Prospective teachers also tend to expect lower degree results, and come from the most generic subject areas (like sport, English, classics, and history). Ambitious students are not generally attracted to teaching. It is not clear what can be done about this.

Once these pre-existing differences have been accounted for, there is little difference between prospective teachers and others in terms of generic career drivers, or the appeal of financial incentives. As well as pay and incentives being largely irrelevant, many of the issues that teachers do report as negative (in studies only of teachers) also do not discriminate between prospective teachers and others. These issues include heavy workload, and poor student discipline. These headline factors simply disappear when a genuine comparative design is used, as here. Policy-makers and other stakeholders need to learn the lesson that teacher supply will not only (or at all) be addressed by tackling the issues that existing teachers complain about. The reason why most students do not intend to become teachers is much deeper and long-standing. Policies need to be devised to make teaching more attractive to them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research reported here was funded by the ESRC grant number ES/R007349/1.

REFERENCES

- Akosah-Twumasi, P., Emeto, T., Lindsay, D., Tsey, K., and Malau-Aduli, B. (2018). A systematic review of factors that influence youths' career choices—the role of culture. *Frontiers in Education*, 58(3), 1-15
- Davies, G., and Hughes, S. (2018). Why I chose to become a teacher and why I might choose not to become one: a survey of student teachers' perceptions of teaching as a career. *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal*, 10(1), 10-19.
- Eurydice (2018). *Teaching Careers in Europe: Access, Progression and Support*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Finch, H. (1986). *Talking of teaching*. London: Social and Community Planning Research.
- General Teaching Council (2003). Teacher Survey. Available on Guardian website: educationguardian.co.uk/microsite/gtc (accessed on 17th July 2019).
- Goller, M., Ursin, J., Vähäsantanen, K., Festner, D., and Harteis, C. (2019). Finnish and German student teachers' motivations for choosing teaching as a career. The first application of the FIT-Choice scale in Finland. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 235-248.
- Gorard, S. (2013) An argument concerning overcoming inequalities in Higher Education, Chapter 11 in Murray, N. and Klinger, C. (Eds.) *Aspirations, Access and Attainment in Widening Participation: International Perspectives and an Agenda for Change*, London: Routledge
- Heinz, M. (2015). Why choose teaching? An international review of empirical studies exploring student teachers' career motivations and levels of commitment to teaching. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 21(3), 258-297.
- Higher Education Policy Institute (2017) *Whither teacher education and training*. Oxford: Higher Education Policy Institute.
- Hillman, J. (1994). Undergraduate perceptions of teaching as a career. In: National Commission on Education (1994). *Insights into Education and Training*. Papers selected by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation. London: Heinemann.
- Kass, E., and Miller, E. C. (2018). Career choice among academically excellent students: Choosing teaching career as a corrective experience. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 73, 90-98.
- Kyriacou, C., and Coulthard, M. (2000). Undergraduates' views of teaching as a career choice. *Journal of education for Teaching*, 26(2), 117-126.
- Kyriacou, C., Kunc, R., Stephens, P., and Hultgren, A. (2003). Student teachers' expectations of teaching as a career in England and Norway. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 255-263.
- Lyons, G. (1981). *Teacher careers and career perceptions; teacher careers and career perceptions in the secondary comprehensive school*. Windsor: NFER NAO (2016). *Training new teachers*. HC 798. <https://www.nao.org.uk/report/training-new-teachers/>

- PAC (2016). *Training new teachers*. HC 73. London: House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts.
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmpubacc/73/73.pdf>
- Poppleton, P. (1989). Rewards and values in secondary teachers' perceptions of their job satisfaction. *Research Papers in Education*. October, 4, 3, 71-94.
- Reid, I. and Caudwell, J. (1997). Why did secondary PGCE students choose teaching as a career? *Research in Education*. November, No. 58, pp. 46-58.
- Richardson, P., and Watt, H. (2005). 'I've decided to become a teacher': Influences on career change. *Teaching and teacher education*, 21(5), 475-489.
- See, BH (2004). Determinants of teaching as a career in the UK. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 18(4), 213-242.
- See, BH (2011) *Understanding teacher supply in England and Wales*, Saarbrücken: LAP Academic Publishing. ISBN 978-3-8454-2076-9.
- See, BH (2004) Determinants of teaching as a career, *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 18 (4), 213-242.
- See, BH, Gorard, S., Morris, R. and el-Soufi, N. (2020) How to recruit and retain teachers in hard-to-staff areas?: A systematic review of the empirical evidence, *Oxford Review of Education*, forthcoming
- Smithers, A. and Hill, S. (1989). Recruitment to physics and mathematics teaching: a personality problem? *Research Papers in Education*, 4, 1, pp. 3-21.
- Stewart, M.F. and Perrin, R. (1989). A comparison of physics undergraduates' and PGCE students' attitudes to a career in teaching. *Physics Education*, 24, 5, 252-3.
- Wellington, J.J. (1982). Straight from the horses' mouth: physics undergraduates attitudes to teaching. *Durham and Newcastle Research Review*, 10, 49, 21-2.
- Wang, W. (2019) *'I really like teaching, but...'* A mixed methods study exploring pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing teaching as a career. PhD thesis. Available at: <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/72474/> (accessed on 17th July 2019).
- Watt, H., and Richardson, P. (2007). Motivational factors influencing teaching as a career choice: Development and validation of the FIT-Choice scale. *The Journal of experimental education*, 75(3), 167-202.
- Valentine, C. (1934) An enquiry as to the reasons for the choice of the teaching profession by university students, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 4, 3, 237-259

APPENDIX A

This appendix contains the full frequency tables for all categorical variables, and the comparison of means for all real number variables (compared between those considering, applying to, and intending to teach). It only includes tables not in the main text.

Background of all respondents

Table A1 - Sex identified with

	N	Percentage
Female	2588	57.9
Male	1597	35.7
Other	284	6.4

Table A2 - Ethnic group identified with

	N	Percentage
Asian	706	15.8
Black	172	3.8
East Asian	113	2.5
White	2986	66.8
Mixed	176	3.9
Other	316	7.1

Table A3 - Parent/carer with a degree

	N	Percentage
Yes	2495	55.8
No	1647	36.9
Don't know	327	7.3

Table A4 - Parents' occupational group

	N	Percentage
Technical, health, welfare or education professionals	1245	27.9
Clerical, administrative assistant, secretary	735	16.4
University/college lecturer, doctor, dentist, solicitor, scientist	1430	32.0
Craft related jobs	429	9.6
Small employer (under 10 employees)	112	2.5
Not usually employed including home-makers, long-term unemployed, never worked	49	1.1
Don't know	469	10.5

*University factors***Table A5 - Main subject area**

	N	Percentage
Medicine, Dentistry, Biological Sciences, Veterinary Sciences, Agriculture, Forestry	302	6.8
Physical and mathematical sciences, computing, engineering and technology, earth sciences	1532	34.3
Sport-related courses	257	5.8
Business, accountancy and administrative studies	120	2.7
Social, economic and political sciences, education and humanities, psychology	1437	32.2
Languages, English, classics	347	7.8
Creative arts and design, library and information science, media studies	301	6.7
Law, architecture, building and planning	167	3.7

Other	6	.1
Total	4469	100.0

Table A6 - Student type

	N	Percentage
UK/Home student	3458	77.4
EEA student (European Economic Area)	299	6.7
International student	585	13.1
Other	127	2.8

Table A7 - Main university entrance qualification

	N	Percentage
A Level	2998	67.1
International Baccalaureate	270	6.0
BTEC, GNVQ, other professional diploma	303	6.8
Access to higher education diploma	179	4.0
Scottish Highers or Advanced Highers	20	.4
A Level and BTEC/IB	123	2.8
Foundation year	12	.3
Other or not known	564	12.6

Table A8 – Tariff points for university entrance

	Mean	Standard deviation
KS5 tariff points	135.20	22.495

Table A9 - Year of study

	N	Percentage
First	287	6.4
Second	2506	56.1
Third	1163	26.0
Fourth and above	513	11.5

Table A10 - Expected degree result

	N	Percentage
1st	1403	31.4
2:1	2366	52.9
2:2	133	3.0
3rd or pass	30	.7
No known or not relevant	537	12.0

*Teaching intentions***Table A11 - Teaching as a career**

	N	Percentage
Considered teaching as career	2619	58.6
Have/will you apply for teacher training	859	19.2
Do you intend to become a teachers	881	19.7

Table A12 - If a teacher what age group

	N	Percentage
Early Years/ Primary School	737	16.5

Secondary School	840	18.8
Further Education/Higher Education	1169	26.2
I do not plan to become a teacher	1723	38.6

Table A13 - With your degree is it easy to enter careers other than teaching?

	N	Percentage
Yes	3725	83.4

Career choice factors

Table A14 - Mean ratings pay

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.07	2.07	-
Not considered	7.53	1.95	-0.23
Applied	6.81	2.21	-
Not applied	7.37	1.98	-0.27
Intend	6.82	2.23	
Not intend	7.37	1.97	-0.27
Total	7.26	2.04	-

Table A15 - Mean ratings job satisfaction

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	8.81	1.42	-
Not considered	8.71	1.46	+0.07
Applied	8.90	1.33	-
Not applied	8.74	1.46	+0.11
Intend	8.85	1.41	-

Not intend	8.75	1.44	+0.07
Total	8.77	1.44	

Table A16 - Mean ratings job security

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.50	2.02	-
Not considered	7.51	1.87	-0.01
Applied	7.71	2.06	-
Not applied	7.45	1.93	+0.13
Intend	7.75	2.05	-
Not intend	7.44	1.93	+0.16
Total	7.50	1.96	

Table A17 - Mean ratings autonomy

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.45	2.16	-
Not considered	6.59	2.21	-0.06
Applied	6.51	2.17	-
Not applied	6.51	2.19	0
Intend	6.39	2.23	-
Not intend	6.54	2.17	-0.02
Total	6.51	2.18	

Table A18 - Mean ratings career prospects

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.50	1.90	-
Not considered	7.74	1.95	-0.13
Applied	7.48	1.89	-
Not applied	7.63	1.93	-0.08
Intend	7.41	1.99	-
Not intend	7.65	1.90	-0.13
Total	7.60	1.92	

Table A19 - Mean ratings develop skills

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.57	1.99	-
Not considered	7.62	1.96	-0.03
Applied	7.71	1.96	-
Not applied	7.56	1.98	-0.08
Intend	7.64	2.02	-
Not intend	7.58	1.96	-0.03
Total	7.59	1.98	

Table A20 - Mean ratings responsibility

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.57	2.20	-
Not considered	6.64	2.14	-0.03
Applied	6.93	2.17	-
Not applied	6.52	2.18	+0.19

Intend	6.89	2.21	-
Not intend	6.53	2.17	+0.17
Total	6.60	2.18	

Table A21 - Mean ratings use academic knowledge

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.37	2.55	-
Not considered	6.07	2.54	+0.12
Applied	6.78	2.42	-
Not applied	6.12	2.57	+0.26
Intend	6.69	2.52	-
Not intend	6.14	2.55	+0.22
Total	6.25	2.55	

Table A22 - Mean ratings ease of getting job

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.12	2.54	-
Not considered	5.88	2.63	+0.09
Applied	6.61	2.52	-
Not applied	5.88	2.58	+0.28
Intend	6.60	2.48	-
Not intend	5.88	2.59	+0.28
Total	6.02	2.58	

Table A23 - Mean ratings chance to give back

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.14	2.48	
Not considered	6.42	2.61	+0.28
Applied	7.84	2.19	
Not applied	6.61	2.58	+0.48
Intend	7.74	2.31	
Not intend	6.62	2.57	+0.44
Total	6.84	2.56	

Table A24 - Mean ratings subject interest

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.81	2.26	
Not considered	7.44	2.40	+0.16
Applied	8.18	2.11	
Not applied	7.53	2.36	+0.28
Intend	8.07	2.18	
Not intend	7.55	2.35	+0.22
Total	7.66	2.33	

Table A25 - Mean ratings kinds of colleagues

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.20	2.29	
Not considered	6.79	2.40	+0.17
Applied	7.52	2.23	
Not applied	6.91	2.36	+0.26

Intend	7.49	2.26	
Not intend	6.91	2.35	+0.25
Total	7.03	2.35	

Table A26 - Mean ratings suits temperament

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.98	2.34	
Not considered	6.67	2.40	+0.13
Applied	7.20	2.37	
Not applied	6.77	2.36	+0.18
Intend	7.18	2.35	
Not intend	6.77	2.37	+0.17
Total	6.85	2.37	

Table A27 - Mean ratings share knowledge

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.54	2.45	
Not considered	5.92	2.51	+0.25
Applied	7.22	2.40	
Not applied	6.06	2.46	+0.47
Intend	7.13	2.46	
Not intend	6.08	2.46	+0.42
Total	6.28	2.49	

Table A28 - Mean ratings workload

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.96	2.45	
Not considered	5.78	2.39	+0.07
Applied	5.93	2.54	
Not applied	5.88	2.40	+0.02
Intend	5.96	2.54	
Not intend	5.87	2.40	+0.04
Total	5.89	2.43	

Table A29 - Mean ratings family tradition

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	2.02	2.66	
Not considered	2.08	2.69	-0.02
Applied	2.21	2.87	
Not applied	2.01	2.62	+0.07
Intend	2.25	2.95	
Not intend	1.99	2.60	+0.10
Total	2.05	2.67	

Table A30 - Mean ratings status

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.20	2.87	
Not considered	4.56	2.95	-0.12
Applied	4.23	2.98	
Not applied	4.38	2.89	-0.05

Intend	4.22	2.99	
Not intend	4.38	2.89	-0.05
Total	4.35	2.91	

Table A31 - Mean ratings length of working day

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.85	2.66	
Not considered	5.54	2.70	+0.12
Applied	6.12	2.69	
Not applied	5.63	2.67	+0.18
Intend	6.09	2.73	
Not intend	5.63	2.66	+0.17
Total	5.72	2.68	

Table A32 - Mean ratings convenience

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.87	2.67	
Not considered	5.65	2.77	+0.08
Applied	5.81	2.81	
Not applied	5.77	2.69	+0.01
Intend	5.80	2.84	
Not intend	5.78	2.68	+0.01
Total	5.78	2.71	

Table A33 - Mean ratings intellectual stimulation

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.91	2.23	
Not considered	7.01	2.30	-0.04
Applied	6.73	2.34	
Not applied	7.01	2.24	-0.12
Intend	6.62	2.36	
Not intend	7.03	2.23	-0.18
Total	6.95	2.26	

Table A34 - Mean ratings incentive to train

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.75	3.32	
Not considered	5.78	2.65	-0.01
Applied	5.80	4.52	
Not applied	5.76	2.60	-0.02
Intend	5.76	4.47	
Not intend	5.77	2.60	0
Total	5.76	3.06	

Table A35 - Mean ratings introductory bonus

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.26	3.05	
Not considered	4.39	2.97	-0.04
Applied	4.33	3.18	
Not applied	4.31	2.98	+0.01

Intend	4.34	3.19	
Not intend	4.30	2.98	+0.01
Total	4.31	3.02	

Table A36 - Mean ratings opportunity for internship

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.59	3.05	
Not considered	5.06	2.97	-0.16
Applied	4.38	3.22	
Not applied	4.88	2.97	-0.17
Intend	4.32	3.19	
Not intend	4.90	2.97	-0.19
Total	4.79	3.02	

Sources of information on career choices

Table A37 - Mean ratings for family

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.54	2.92	
Not considered	5.48	2.94	+0.02
Applied	5.59	3.08	
Not applied	5.50	2.89	+0.03
Intend	5.60	3.06	
Not intend	5.49	2.89	+0.04
Total	5.52	2.93	

Table A38 - Mean ratings for people I know

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.20	2.60	
Not considered	5.09	2.64	+0.04
Applied	5.04	2.76	
Not applied	5.18	2.58	-0.05
Intend	5.05	2.77	
Not intend	5.18	2.58	-0.05
Total	5.15	2.61	

Table A39 - Mean ratings for adverts

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	3.91	2.55	
Not considered	3.78	2.50	+0.05
Applied	3.93	2.68	
Not applied	3.84	2.49	+0.04
Intend	3.92	2.67	
Not intend	3.84	2.49	+0.03
Total	3.86	2.53	

Table A40 - Mean ratings for my school

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.91	2.82	
Not considered	3.99	2.66	+0.33
Applied	5.81	2.87	
Not applied	4.22	2.69	+0.57

Intend	5.82	2.83	
Not intend	4.21	2.69	+0.58
Total	4.53	2.79	

Table A41 - Mean ratings for media

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	3.40	2.62	
Not considered	3.22	2.56	+0.07
Applied	3.46	2.74	
Not applied	3.30	2.56	+0.06
Intend	3.51	2.76	
Not intend	3.29	2.55	+0.08
Total	3.33	2.60	

Table A42 - Mean ratings for careers advisers

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.88	2.81	
Not considered	4.70	2.76	+0.06
Applied	4.81	2.93	
Not applied	4.81	2.76	0
Intend	4.76	2.94	
Not intend	4.82	2.75	-0.02
	4.81	2.79	

Table A43 - Mean ratings for my lecturers

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.59	2.79	
Not considered	5.18	2.72	+0.15
Applied	5.70	2.85	
Not applied	5.35	2.74	+0.13
Intend	5.71	2.87	
Not intend	5.35	2.74	+0.13
Total	5.42	2.77	

Table A44 - Mean ratings for previous work

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.68	2.66	
Not considered	6.30	2.76	+0.14
Applied	7.31	2.50	
Not applied	6.33	2.72	+0.36
Intend	7.23	2.57	
Not intend	6.35	2.71	+0.33
Total	6.52	2.70	

Table A45 - Mean ratings for volunteering

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.95	2.92	
Not considered	5.14	3.01	+0.27
Applied	6.81	2.84	
Not applied	5.33	2.95	+0.49

Intend	6.74	2.86	
Not intend	5.34	2.95	+0.47
Total	5.62	2.99	

Table A46 - Mean ratings for qualifications

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.07	2.31	
Not considered	6.70	2.52	+0.15
Applied	7.27	2.33	
Not applied	6.83	2.42	+0.18
Intend	7.20	2.37	
Not intend	6.85	2.41	+0.15
Total	6.92	2.41	

Table A47 - Mean ratings for government website

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.26	2.94	
Not considered	3.30	2.75	+0.33
Applied	4.94	3.09	
Not applied	3.61	2.79	+0.46
Intend	4.99	3.10	
Not intend	3.59	2.78	+0.48
Total	3.86	2.90	

Incentives to become a teacher

Table A48 - Mean ratings for training salary

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.34	2.07	
Not considered	6.30	2.20	+0.47
Applied	7.87	2.20	
Not applied	6.68	2.16	+0.54
Intend	7.94	1.96	
Not intend	6.66	2.16	+0.58
Total	6.91	2.19	

Table A49 - Mean ratings for bursary for training

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.25	2.14	
Not considered	6.17	2.22	+0.48
Applied	7.89	2.04	
Not applied	6.54	2.20	+0.55
Intend	7.91	2.02	
Not intend	6.53	2.20	+0.62
Total	6.80	2.23	

Table A50 - Mean ratings for loan for tuition

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.03	2.41	
Not considered	6.00	2.37	+0.42
Applied	7.73	2.27	

Not applied	6.33	2.41	+0.57
Intend	7.75	2.29	
Not intend	6.32	2.40	+0.58
Total	6.60	2.45	

Table A51 - Mean ratings for loan for maintenance

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.08	2.37	
Not considered	6.11	2.39	+0.40
Applied	7.78	2.21	
Not applied	6.42	2.41	+0.56
Intend	7.79	2.23	
Not intend	6.41	2.40	+0.57
Total	6.68	2.43	

Factors in choosing teaching as a career

Table A52 - Mean ratings for low teacher salaries

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.57	2.06	
Not considered	7.28	2.22	+0.14
Applied	7.57	2.12	
Not applied	7.42	2.13	+0.07
Intend	7.53	2.12	
Not intend	7.43	2.14	+0.04
Total	7.45	2.13	

Table A53 - Mean ratings for working hours

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.22	2.75	
Not considered	6.44	2.73	-0.08
Applied	6.25	2.79	
Not applied	6.33	2.74	-0.03
Intend	6.29	2.69	
Not intend	6.32	2.76	-0.01
Total	6.31	2.75	

Table A54 - Mean ratings for job security

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.55	2.15	
Not considered	6.37	2.20	+0.08
Applied	6.71	2.18	
Not applied	6.42	2.17	+0.13
Intend	6.76	2.12	
Not intend	6.40	2.18	+0.17
Total	6.47	2.18	

Table A55 - Mean ratings for career prospects

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.65	2.27	
Not considered	4.79	2.28	+0.37
Applied	6.41	2.19	
Not applied	5.03	2.27	+0.59

Intend	6.45	2.19	
Not intend	5.01	2.26	+0.62
Total	5.30	2.32	

Table A56 - Mean ratings for workload manageable

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.60	2.49	
Not considered	4.92	2.53	-0.13
Applied	4.74	2.48	
Not applied	4.73	2.51	0
Intend	4.77	2.44	
Not intend	4.72	2.53	+0.02
Total	4.73	2.51	

Table A57 - Mean ratings for poor discipline

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.42	2.34	
Not considered	6.47	2.41	-0.02
Applied	6.23	2.33	
Not applied	6.49	2.38	-0.11
Intend	6.14	2.35	
Not intend	6.51	2.37	-0.16
Total	6.44	2.37	

Table A59 - Mean ratings for long holidays

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.80	2.15	
Not considered	7.77	2.13	+0.01
Applied	7.70	2.23	
Not applied	7.81	2.12	-0.05
Intend	7.72	2.22	
Not intend	7.81	2.13	-0.04
Total	7.79	2.15	

Table A60 - Mean ratings for can't do anything else

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	1.82	2.34	
Not considered	2.61	2.72	-0.31
Applied	1.47	2.22	
Not applied	2.31	2.58	-0.33
Intend	1.42	2.16	
Not intend	2.32	2.59	-0.35
Total	2.15	2.54	

Table A61 - Mean ratings for teachers in family

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	4.78	2.59	
Not considered	4.74	2.60	+0.02
Applied	4.49	2.79	
Not applied	4.83	2.55	-0.13

Intend	4.48	2.78	
Not intend	4.83	2.55	-0.13
Total	4.76	2.60	

Table A62 - Mean ratings for academic stars

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	2.95	2.41	
Not considered	2.92	2.35	+0.01
Applied	2.96	2.58	
Not applied	2.94	2.34	+0.01
Intend	2.91	2.54	
Not intend	2.95	2.34	-0.02
Total	2.94	2.38	

Table A63 - Mean ratings for working with young people

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.05	2.31	
Not considered	6.84	2.40	+0.09
Applied	7.30	2.38	
Not applied	6.89	2.33	+0.17
Intend	7.18	2.46	
Not intend	6.91	2.32	+0.11
Total	6.97	2.35	

Table A64 - Mean ratings for had good teachers

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.61	2.12	
Not considered	6.94	2.30	+0.30
Applied	7.79	2.18	
Not applied	7.22	2.22	+0.26
Intend	7.79	2.18	
Not intend	7.22	2.22	+0.26
Total	7.33	2.22	

Table A65 - Mean ratings for academic interest

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.47	2.52	
Not considered	5.73	2.59	+0.29
Applied	7.12	2.28	
Not applied	5.94	2.59	+0.46
Intend	7.06	2.36	
Not intend	5.95	2.58	+0.43
Total	6.17	2.57	

Table A66 - Mean ratings for suitable for women

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	2.00	2.61	
	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.47	2.52	
Not considered	5.73	2.59	+0.29

Applied	7.12	2.28	
Not applied	5.94	2.59	+0.46
Intend	7.06	2.36	
Not intend	5.95	2.58	+0.43
Total	6.17	2.57	

Table A67 - Mean ratings for good school experience

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.24	2.17	
Not considered	6.30	2.40	+0.41
Applied	7.57	2.16	
Not applied	6.68	2.32	+0.38
Intend	7.54	2.14	
Not intend	6.68	2.33	+0.37
Total	6.85	2.31	

Table A68 - Mean ratings for high status

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.23	2.40	
Not considered	4.57	2.36	+0.27
Applied	5.70	2.45	
Not applied	4.78	2.36	+0.37
Intend	5.73	2.42	
Not intend	4.76	2.36	+0.40
Total	4.95	2.41	

Table A69 - Mean ratings for more employable

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	5.74	2.30	
Not considered	5.02	2.35	+0.31
Applied	6.20	2.27	
Not applied	5.26	2.33	+0.40
Intend	6.17	2.30	
Not intend	5.26	2.33	+0.39
Total	5.44	2.35	

Table A70 - Mean ratings for give something back

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	7.61	1.91	
Not considered	7.04	2.11	+0.28
Applied	7.98	1.88	
Not applied	7.23	2.02	+0.37
Intend	7.88	1.97	
Not intend	7.25	2.00	+0.31
Total	7.37	2.01	

Table A71 - Mean ratings for intellectual stimulation

	Mean	SD	Effect size
Considered	6.38	2.41	
Not considered	5.56	2.51	+0.33
Applied	7.17	2.20	
Not applied	5.77	2.47	+0.57

Intend	7.05	2.26	
Not intend	5.79	2.47	+0.51
Total	6.04	2.48	

APPENDIX B

The purpose of this survey is to determine the factors that undergraduates consider important in their career decision. Your responses will contribute towards policy and practice in recruitment for certain careers.

The survey takes approximately 10 minutes to complete.

All answers from this survey are for use in this research only, and will be anonymised for reporting purposes. All reports will be based on aggregated results and so no individuals or institutions will be identifiable. Data will be maintained in compliance with GDPR regulations. Information about our data protection policy is available at <https://www.dur.ac.uk/ig/dp/>

Completion of this survey is voluntary. By responding to this survey you are agreeing to your anonymous responses and data being used as part of this project. The anonymised data (with all identifiers removed) may be made available to your institution for their own record.

If you have any questions regarding this survey or the project please contact:

o.m.ventista@durham.ac.uk

Ourania Ventista
Durham University Evidence Centre for Education (DECE)

DECE website: <https://www.dur.ac.uk/dece/>

Project website: <https://www.dur.ac.uk/research/directory/view/?mode=project&id=1034>


Section A: INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR STUDY AND POSSIBLE CAREER

Indicate your responses by putting a tick in the boxes provided or by writing on the lines given.

1. Indicate the broad subject area you study at university. Tick the one that most closely aligns to your subject area.

<i>Subject area</i>	Tick one
Medicine, dentistry, subjects allied to medicine, biological sciences, veterinary sciences, agriculture and forestry	
Physical and mathematical sciences (e.g. maths, physics, chemistry), computing, engineering and technology, earth sciences	
Sport-related courses	
Business, accountancy and administrative studies	
Social, economic and political sciences, education and humanities, psychology	
Languages, English, classics	
Creative arts and design, library and information science, media studies	
Law, architecture, building and planning	
Other (please specify): _____	

2. To what extent would the following factors influence YOUR choice of career? Select from “not influential” (0) to “very influential” (10).

	Not influential  Very influential										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pay, salary											
Job satisfaction, enjoyment											
Job security											
Autonomy, scope for initiative											
Career prospects											
Opportunity to develop skills											
Job responsibility											
Chance to use academic knowledge											
Ease of getting a job in that field											
Chance to give something back											
Interest in my subject area											
Kinds of people I will be working with											
Job that suits my temperament											
Chance to share my knowledge											
The workload required											
Family tradition											
Status, public perception of the job											
Length of working day, holidays											

Convenience, ease of travel											
Intellectual stimulation											
A financial incentive to train											
An introductory bonus when starting job											
Opportunity for internship											
Other - specify and rate how likely _____											

3. Below are some sources of information/advice that may influence your career decision. Indicate the strength of their influence, from “not influential” (0) to “very influential” (10).

	Not influential \longrightarrow Very influential										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Family											
People I know											
Publicity campaigns, adverts											
My school teachers											
Media stories or dramas											
Careers advisors											
My lecturers in university											
Previous work experience (could be paid or unpaid)											
Volunteering work in the past											
Qualifications											
Government websites (e.g. Get Into											

Teaching)												
Other - specify and rate how likely _____												

There is currently a shortage of people going into teaching. We want to know why some people choose teaching and some people do not.

4. For each question below tick the answer that applies to you.

	Yes	No
Have you considered school teaching as a career?		
Have you applied or will you apply for teacher training?		
Do you intend to become a school teacher?		

5. If you were to teach, what age group would you like to teach?

	Tick one
Early Years/ Primary School (up to 11 years old)	
Secondary School (11-16 years old)	
Further Education/Higher Education (16+ years old)	
I do not plan to become a teacher	

6. With your first degree do you think it would be easy for you to gain entry into careers other than teaching?

	Tick one
Yes	
No	

7. The government offers financial incentives for teacher training. For each, indicate how likely they are to encourage YOU to take up teaching as a career. Select from “very unlikely” (0) to “very likely” (10).

Very unlikely \longrightarrow Very likely

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Being paid a salary while receiving training											
Tax free bursary or scholarship for training to teach											
A loan to cover your tuition fees											
A loan to support your living expenses											

8. What is YOUR perception of teaching as a job? For each of the following, indicate how much you agree from “totally disagree” (0) to “totally agree” (10).

Totally disagree \longrightarrow Totally agree

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teachers’ salaries are not high enough											
Working hours in teaching are family friendly											
Teaching has high job security											
It has good career/promotion prospects											
Teachers’ workload is manageable											
There is a problem with poor discipline in schools											

The long holidays are attractive														
It's for those who can't do anything else														
People who have teachers in their family are more likely to go into teaching														
It's for people who are academic stars														
It's for those who enjoy working with young people														
Good teachers at school can encourage people to go into teaching														
It allows you to continue your academic interest														
It's a more suitable career for women														
A good experience at school can encourage people to go into teaching														
It is a high status profession														
Learning to teach makes you more employable														
It allows you to give something back to society														
Teaching offers intellectual stimulation														
Anything else (please specify and rate): _____														

Section B: INFORMATION ABOUT YOU AND YOUR STUDIES

9. Which of the following best describes you?

	<i>Tick one</i>
UK/Home student	
EEA student (<i>European Economic Area</i>)	
International student	
Other (please specify):	

10. What year of study are you currently in?

	<i>Tick one</i>
First year	
Second year	
Third year	
Fourth year and above	

11. What was your main university entrance qualification? Please also indicate your grades or points (e.g. AAB).

<i>Type/ Level</i>	<i>Tick</i>	<i>Grades/points (e.g. BCC or 1 to 9)</i>
A Level		
International Baccalaureate		
BTEC, GNVQ, other professional diploma		
Access to higher education diploma		
Scottish Highers or Advanced Highers		
Other (please specify):		

12. What degree result do you expect to attain?

<i>Degree result</i>	<i>Tick one</i>
1st	
2:1	
2:2	
3 rd or Pass	
Don't know	

13. Which gender do you identify with?

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Tick one</i>
Female	
Male	
Prefer not to say	
Other	

14. Which of the following ethnic groups do you most closely identify with?

<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>Tick one</i>
Asian	
Black	
East Asian	
White	
Mixed	
Other (please specify):	

15. Do either of your parents' or carers' have any university-level qualifications, such as a degree, diploma or certificate of higher education?

	<i>Tick one</i>
Yes	
No	
Don't know	

16. Tick the box that best describes the occupation that is most like your parents'/carers' usual occupation. Tick once in each column where applicable.

<i>Occupation type and examples</i>	Parent/Carer 1	Parent/Carer 2
Technical, health, welfare or education professionals (examples of these professions could be nurses, midwives, social workers, teachers, librarians, military or police officers, aircraft pilots, journalists, artists, actors, musicians, clergy)		
Clerical, administrative assistant, secretary, dental nurse, technician, photographers. Self-employed and own account workers, farmers, publicans, restaurateurs		
University/college lecturer, doctor, dentist, solicitor, scientist, engineer, large employer, company director, senior executive, senior civil servant		
Craft related jobs, plumber, butcher, train driver, soldier, carpenter, shop assistant, security guard, typist, gardener, hairdresser, waiter, cleaner, courier, labourer, lift attendant, caretaker		
Small employer (under 10 employees)		
Not usually employed including home-makers, long-term unemployed, never worked		
Don't know		

Other (please specify):		
-------------------------	--	--

Thank you for completing the questionnaire. Please feel free to make any other comments you may have in the space provided.

As part of the project, we would like to talk in more depth about how students make their career choice. We would therefore like to contact some of you for a brief discussion. If you are happy for us to speak to you, please provide your contact details in the box below.

Name: Telephone or email:

ISBN 978-0-907552-31-4