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Abstract

This was a mixed-method study investigating factors which might affect newly-qualified teachers’ continued motivation to teach in the post-compulsory sector during the period 2000-2004. It aimed to identify the nature of demotivators and to measure the extent and impact of these on intentions to remain in teaching.

Research would suggest that nation states’ changes to the management of education to address the challenges of globalisation have caused tension between teachers’ motivation to teach and outside interference to control the process of teaching. Consequently, retaining teachers in both the compulsory and post-compulsory sectors is a significant concern, not only in the UK but internationally. However, despite being described as ‘pivotal’ to government objectives of social justice and economic success, the post-compulsory sector has tended to be under-researched. Although studies have explored the impact of New Public Management and Incorporation on the working conditions for experienced teachers and investigated trainees’ perceptions of the sector, there appeared to be a gap in the research focussing on newly-qualified teachers (NQTs) during this time. It is hoped that this research will contribute to this body of literature.

This was an exploratory study followed by a confirmatory enquiry and was conducted in two phases. A qualitative approach was adopted for the first phase to re-interrogate data collected for a MA in Research Methods. Data
collected from NQTs using focus groups and reflective essays written as part of the assessment for their initial teacher training course, was re-interrogated to identify the nature of demotivators in the sector. The subsequent findings informed the second phase and the design of a survey instrument to investigate the prevalence of these demotivators and the impact of these on intentions to continue teaching with a much larger sample of NQTs. Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1959) and Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (1975, 1985, 1992, 2000) formed the theoretical framework for this investigation.

Ten higher education institutions from the East Midlands, Yorkshire, South-West and South-East of England, who had delivered training provision to meet the standards of the Further Education National Training Organisation since their introduction (FENTO, 1999), assisted in this project by forwarding the instrument to 2,235 NQTs. The survey was self-administered and 308 completed questionnaires were returned (13.8% return rate).

Research would suggest that the first three to four years after training will determine whether teachers stay in the profession; it is hoped that the findings will highlight factors responsible for the fragility of a long-term teaching career in this sector.
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Introduction

*Until you actually get into a job you never know what’s involved in it. I think teaching is like everything else; there’s good and bad… I know it will take a lot of my life over. That’s the sort of job it is and I sort of expect that to a certain degree.*

( Newly-qualified teacher participating in focus group undertaken on 29 July 2003 in Matthews, 2003:47)

Attracting and retaining teachers in the compulsory and post-compulsory sectors is a significant issue, not only in this country but internationally. In the UK, this has been a concern for some time; in 1996, Nash suggested that six out of ten further education teachers wanted to leave the profession and in 1999 Finegold claimed that 400,000 had left. In 2005 the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) expressed concern about the supply and quality of school teachers across 25 countries, including the UK, and research would suggest that these shortages arise from the resignation of qualified teachers and the difficulties of attracting new recruits to the profession to offset the retirement of an ageing labour force (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011; Lam & Yan, 2011; Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Müller et al, 2009; Sinclair, 2008; Olson et al, 2007; Loeb et al, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003). In the United States, 30% of new school teachers leave within 3 years and 50% have left within 5 years (Olson et al, 2007). In the Netherlands, it is expected that 75% of active teachers will leave within the next six years or so (Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010).
Findings from the International Teacher 2000 project (Scott et al, 2001) with a sample in excess of 3,000 school teachers in New Zealand, England, the United States and Australia would suggest that in all four countries:

... while they [teachers] are, in general, pleased with their choice of career...outside forces have intervened to prevent teachers from performing their jobs as they perceive them. The result has been a major decline in professional satisfaction, (Scott et al, 2001:13).

Studies suggest that the main factors influencing teachers to leave the compulsory sector are workload, poor pupil behaviour, low salary and status (Smithers & Robinson, 2003; OECD, 2005; Sinclair, 2008). However, the majority of research in this area was undertaken in the compulsory school sector: in comparison, the UK post-compulsory sector tends to be under-researched (Wallace, 2002; Jephcote et al, 2008) and yet, New Labour highlighted this sector as ‘pivotal’ to this government’s objectives of social justice and economic success (DfES, 2002). In 2005, speaking at the annual conference of the Association of Colleges, John Brennan, the CEO, stated that further education had evolved from being a ‘political backwater in 1995’ to ‘mainstream’ evidenced by the ‘thirty-six separate Government or Government-sponsored reports or white papers specifically devoted to the post-16 sector’ (Jameson, 2005, in Hillier, 2006: foreword). Over the years the sector has moved into the limelight in response to government policies focusing on social inclusion, widening participation and lifelong learning to fulfil the skills needed for a productive, flexible and therefore competitive workforce in the global economy. These policies have had an impact on the student profile, the management of FE institutions, and arguably, the nature of teaching itself. When conceiving this PhD study in 2003, studies emerged
examining the effects of these policies but they tended to focus on the impact on existing teachers rather than trainees or newly qualified teachers.

Two exceptions were studies by McKelvey and Andrews (1998) and Wallace (2002). Their findings suggested that although trainees had observed low morale within the further education institutions where they had undertaken their work placements, they were still positive about their new careers. However, as highlighted by the OECD in their report of the UK compulsory sector, ‘Teacher retention is at least as much of a concern as recruitment. A significant number of teachers leave the profession early’ (OECD, 2005: viii) and evidence suggests that the first three to four years after training will determine whether new teachers remain in this career (Jones, 2003). This raised the question, once trainees, like those who took part in the studies by McKelvey and Andrews (1998) and Wallace (2002), started working in the post-compulsory sector, did they intend to continue to teach longer-term?

My interest in this area stemmed from teaching on the Postgraduate Certificate in Continuing Education (PGCCE) aimed at people wanting to teach in post-compulsory education. When I studied for my teaching qualification to meet the new training requirements (FENTO, 1999), I was an experienced practitioner. However, the vast majority of my fellow students had no experience of the sector. For many, the teaching placement undertaken in the second semester was an eye-opener and not everyone who eventually achieved the qualification decided to take a teaching post. Those who did were either excited about teaching or already expressing severe doubts about remaining in this career long-term. Given the public investment
in training fees and maintenance grants, and the personal contributions of
time, commitment and financial hardship for mature students during the
course, this conclusion to training was hardly satisfactory. Some of these
trainees were not expecting the workload or having to deal with difficult
students. These experiences were not unique. Research at the time
suggested that classroom management training was not sufficiently addressed
on both compulsory and post-compulsory initial teacher training courses (TTA
2002, Harkin et al 2003). However, insufficient training did not explain the
polarisation between peers studying with me on my teacher training course
since we had experienced the same training. Research undertaken in
Australia which examined trainees’ motivation and commitment to teaching in
the compulsory education sector during initial training concluded that:

Student teachers start with motivational expectations of what teaching
involves and why they want to be a teacher. The reality of teaching
and being a teacher then occurs through their initial teacher education
course (both its coursework and its practicum) at which time these
motivations are tested out and reassessed. During this process
motivations may act as motivators or demotivators, and motivation and
commitment increases or decreases, (Sinclair, 2008:98).

Significantly, although teacher retention is also a concern in that country
(OECD, 2005; Scott et al, 2001), Sinclair found that the practicum (work
experience element of the training course) had a positive effect on motivation
(2008). This finding had also been observed in a study undertaken in the
Although these findings did not necessarily reflect my peers’ experiences or
those of my students when I later taught on the course, it seemed to me that
blaming inadequate teacher training as an underlying cause for potential
attrition was too simplistic. Indeed, following her study with
further education teacher trainees, Wallace argued that:

> It was the consistency of evidence which raised questions about the original premise of the inquiry and appeared to indicate problems that would not be easily resolved by changes to lecturers' education and training, but which rather demanded a careful critical scrutiny of current policies and practices, (2002:80).

This demand for scrutiny of current policies and practices operating in post-compulsory education was echoed in a later study undertaken by Edward et al, (2007), who expressed concern about the pace and management of policy-led changes and the need to consider the impact on staff. Following the International Teacher 2000 project outlined, Scott et al (2001) argued that teachers' professional satisfaction had declined due to nation states' changes to the management of education to address the challenges of globalisation. This had resulted in a tension between teachers' motivation to enter teaching and outside interference to control the process of teaching ‘to benefit the nation economically’ (Scott et al, 2001:13). Since the 1980s, British governments have increasingly developed policy steering strategies as direct control over public services administration was withdrawn. According to Steer et al (2007), in the post-compulsory sector, government policy levers have focused on initiatives, funding, targets, planning and inspection (although Spours et al (2007) point out that there is variation in how colleges translate these policy levers so arguably, not all the changes stem directly from government policy). Nonetheless, it is claimed that policy-driven changes have resulted in the growth of a performativity dominated climate which has eroded the professional autonomy of teachers (Colley et al, 2007).

In an attempt to conceptualise the motivation to teach, Dörnyei lists four factors which characterise this career: a prominent intrinsic component
illustrated through internal desires to educate and impart knowledge; social contextual influences which include institutional demands and constraints of the workplace but also the social profile of the profession; a temporal dimension associated with career structures and promotion possibilities; and fragility, in that motivation is exposed to negative influences, some being inherent in the profession (2001:157-8). Traditionally teaching has been regarded as a ‘vocational’ profession associated with intrinsic motivation (Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Pop & Turner 2009; Richardson & Watt, 2005; Su et al 2003). According to the theorists Deci and Ryan (1975, 1985, 1992, 2000) to enhance intrinsic motivation, humans need to feel a sense of autonomy, competence and relatedness. Their Self-Determination Theory (SDT) postulates that behaviour is motivated in part by the belief that organisms can exert control over their environment and that the more individuals feel competent and in control, they are more likely to enjoy tasks and display greater intrinsic motivation. However, as Dörnyei (2001) argues negative influences are demotivating teachers, not only in the UK but in other countries. In compulsory education, world-wide, new teachers struggle with similar issues which include classroom management; dealing with differences among pupils; assessing pupils’ work; motivating them to learn; interacting with colleagues and communicating with parents (Olson et al, 2007:27). As the opening quote for this introduction, made by a NQT, implies, there were also issues facing new teachers in post-compulsory education. This particular quote surfaced during data collection for a project for my MA in Research Methods¹. The participants in that study had just spent a year

¹ The research focus for the MA research study was exploring a positive model of orientation towards teaching to ascertain the type of person suited to the career.
studying full-time for a postgraduate teaching qualification for the post-
compulsory sector and, other than a few weeks in a work placement as part of
the course, had yet to experience employment in a college. Since post-
compulsory education tends to be commonly seen as the Cinderella sector
with differences in teachers’ conditions of service (Edward et al, 2007) and
provision which tends to ‘work on a deficit model… compensating for gaps in
learners’ prior education and in basic and vocational skills’ (Jephcote el al,
2008:164), it was not unrealistic to expect to find additional negative
influences to those found in compulsory school teaching.

This generated the central question for this research; what were the
demotivators for NQTs which might impact on their continued motivation to
remain in teaching in the post-compulsory sector? In order to address this
question, a series of sub questions were designed:

1. What was the nature of demotivators for NQTs?
2. To what extent were these demotivators common to most
   NQTs across the post-compulsory sector?
3. Were there patterns of prevalence in terms of:
   - the age and sex of participants and their previous
     experience?
   - their modes of employment, the type of employing
     institution and the region in which they worked?
   - the subjects they taught and the level of qualification?
   - the age of their students?
4. Did most NQTs expect to remain in teaching, and if not, what
   were the possible explanations to account for this?
Since motivation is abstract, not directly observable, multi-dimensional and inconsistent (Dörnyei, 2001:185-6), to address these questions, a mixed method approach was adopted, using a sequential exploratory design (in Creswell et al, 2003) which is an exploratory study followed by a confirmatory enquiry and thus undertaken in two phases. The first phase employed a qualitative approach and involved re-interrogating the data collected for the MA study to isolate ‘the bad’, to which the participant cited at the beginning of this introduction had alluded. The theories of Motivation-Hygiene (Herzberg, 1959) and Self-Determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985) formed the framework for this analysis to identify the negative influences that Dörnyei (2001) refers to as demotivators, which could potentially affect motivation to remain in teaching. Both theories have been used in a number of studies which have investigated teacher motivation in compulsory and higher education (see Dinham & Scott, 1997; Kiziltepe, 2008; Wagner & French, 2010; Lam & Yan, 2011). Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (SDT) highlights the need for feelings of autonomy, competence and relatedness to enhance motivation (1975, 1985, 1992, 2000) and Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959) identifies motivators and hygiene factors to explore career satisfaction. Although it appears that these two theories are addressing different concepts, as Dinham and Scott argue:

Generally, motivation is taken to mean a stimulus for behaviour and action in the light of a particular context, while satisfaction – and indeed dissatisfaction – is usually taken to mean a product of behaviours and action in the light of a particular context or

---

2 The MA study aimed to investigate trainees’ orientation towards teaching in an effort to develop a positive expectancy profile for candidate selection onto future training courses. It was anticipated that the findings would be used to inform a longitudinal study for further PhD research. However, after completing the qualification, it seemed more useful to investigate the concerns which had surfaced during data collection than pursue the original research aim.
environment. However, both phenomena are inextricably linked though the influence each has on the other, (1997:362).

Indeed, the Motivation-Hygiene theory is derived from the motivation theory, Hierarchy of Needs, proposed by Maslow (1943, in Maslow, 1987) and thus Herzberg’s work was consulted to identify factors which may erode feelings of autonomy, competence and relatedness. The Motivation-Hygiene theory was used to inform the work of Rhodes et al (2007), who studied the motivation, career satisfaction and morale of academic staff in higher education in the UK. They found that key facets ‘deemed either deeply satisfying or deeply dissatisfying … have the potential to impact upon academics’ motivation and morale’ (2007:71). They also argued that motivation and satisfaction are related:

The extent to which work is deeply satisfying or deeply dissatisfying bears a relationship to the likely motivation or de-motivation of individuals to engage with activities, (2007:74).

For this doctoral study, the definition of job satisfaction as being: ‘a state of mind determined by the extent to which the individual perceives her/his job related needs being met’ (Evans, 1997:832-3) is adopted, as it provides the link to my chosen theoretical framework. Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (1985) and the Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1943, in Maslow, 1987), from which Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959) is derived, are both rooted in needs-related motivation.

The second phase, the confirmatory study, adopted a quantitative approach and involved designing and administering a survey instrument to measure the prevalence of the demotivators identified in the first phase. In addition, the survey aimed to capture other demotivators which might also affect NQTs’ motivation to remain in teaching. A much larger population than those of
previous studies of trainees in the post-compulsory sector was sampled – 16 participants took part in the study by Mckelvey and Andrews (1998) and 41 participants were involved in the study by Wallace (2002) – and was drawn from a population of NQTs who had undertaken their postgraduate teacher training from 2000, when the Further Education National Training Organisation’s standards (FENTO, 1999) came into force, until 2004. Since the evidence suggests that the first three to four years after training will determine whether teachers stay in the profession (Jones, 2003), this range of time frames for completion of the course enabled comparisons to be made between the various cohorts. As a consequence, this study related to a specific period and reflected the challenges imposed on teaching staff during that time.

Scott et al (2001) concluded from their international investigation into teaching in compulsory education that political changes to educational systems and economic and social problems had severely impacted on professional satisfaction and would continue to do so if educational systems are perceived to provide solutions for economic and social problems. To interpret their findings, Scott et al (2001) used Bourdieu’s concept of the Right and Left Hands of the state and concluded that the dissatisfaction in all four countries was due to ‘the concurrent juxtaposition of and antithetical nature of two major forces… motivation to enter teaching and the issue of control’ (2001:14).

Although this large-scale survey was undertaken in the compulsory education sector, the post-compulsory sector has also been subjected to the reforms of New Public Management to tackle social and policy problems (Steer et al, 2008), which has resulted in ‘a highly directive but surprisingly unstable environment’ (Hamilton, 2007:251). Given the findings, I hypothesised that
the tension described by Scott et al (2001) would also exist for experienced teachers in the post-compulsory sector. However, I believed that this tension would not be felt to the same extent by NQTs because experienced teachers would have to endure change with measures imposed on them, whereas NQTs would be entering the sector with these measures already in place. Added to which, the NQTs would have some idea of what the career would entail from the work placements. In my experience, the work experience was enough to convince some trainees not to pursue the career.

To explore the two forces outlined by Scott et al (2001) within the context of the post-compulsory sector, the first two chapters in this study provide a literature review of the motivation to teach and an outline of government interventions on the sector to highlight potential issues of control. Thus Chapter One gives an overview of the main theories of motivation to provide the context and the justification for the two named theories employed for this study. The second section in this chapter reviews the literature on teachers’ initial motivation to teach. Potential areas of future conflict are identified to initiate the discussion which is continued in the second chapter.

Chapter Two provides the context for the working environment of teachers working in further education in the UK from the time of Incorporation until 2004, when data for this study was collected. Although this sector has a long history dating back to the mid-19th Century with the formation of the Mechanics’ Institutes, which evolved and developed reflecting a ‘voluntarist relationship between education, training and the state’ (Green & Lucas, 1999:11 in Huddleston & Unwin 2002), incorporations have been subjected to continued regulation by the state. Policies of both the Conservative and
Labour governments have enforced changes not only to the curriculum, the student profile and institutional funding but also to the operational approach adopted by further educational establishments - often referred to as the new managerialism - to promote efficiency and public accountability. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the notion of ‘issue of control’ proposed by Scott et al, (2001) within the context of post-compulsory education and explore the effects of government policy reforms by drawing on studies which have investigated the impact of these on institutions and on the teaching staff working in this sector. The second section reviews the research undertaken with trainees which has been published during the life of this study (McKelvey & Andrews, 1998; Wallace, 2002; Bathmaker & Avis, 2005, 2007; Wallis, 2007). This section also presents the findings following the re-interrogation of the data collected for my MA study, indicative of the first phase.

Chapters Three and Four discuss the methodology and methods employed for this study. The reader should be warned that this element of the thesis is substantial because of the decision to mix methods. Although the mixed methods approach might be seen as a means to offset the shortcomings of employing either a solely qualitative or quantitative method, it raises a number of issues pertaining to the ‘paradigm wars’ and the compatibility of mixing these approaches. The field is both complex and contentious with differing views on how mixed methods should be employed. Consequently, not only do researchers have to consider the methodological assumptions of adopting this alternative method, but also the practicalities of what is being mixed, how, and at what stage in the research process. Thus Chapter Three provides a discussion of the paradigms associated with qualitative and quantitative
approaches, my rationale for choosing to adopt a mixed method approach, a review of the various models for mixed method research and the rationale for the model I employed. Chapter Four outlines the methods used for sampling, data collection and data analysis for each phase of the research. This chapter will also outline the development and the piloting of the survey instrument, the application of measures to address ethical considerations and confidentiality in addition to describing the sample of NQTs, who responded to the survey.

Many ‘mixed methods’ researchers encourage integration of the presentation of the findings (Bryman, 2008) so the results of both the quantitative and qualitative elements of the survey instrument are presented in Chapter Five. These findings are discussed drawing on Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (1975, 1985, 1992, 2000) and Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959) and compared with the findings of the literature review.

Finally, Chapter Six highlights issues which still need to be addressed to support teachers’ continued motivation to teach in this sector and areas for further research are identified. There is also some reflection of the use of employing a mixed method approach.
Chapter One

To Teach Or Not To Teach?

Guiding the intellectual and emotional development of students, whether in nursery school or graduate school, can be profoundly gratifying for teachers, satisfying their psychological needs and contributing to their growth as individuals. (Deci, Kasser & Ryan, 1997:57)

Motives for wanting to become teachers have been categorised in various ways but the most frequently used distinction is a three-category list of reasons: intrinsic, extrinsic and altruistic motives (Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Pop & Turner 2009; Richardson & Watt, 2005). According to Dörnyei (2001) researchers have argued that the motivation to teach ‘is best understood in the light of expectancy-value theory, goal-setting theory and self-determination theory’ (2001:157). Since the aim of this study was to identify the factors which can demotivate newly qualified teachers (NQTs) and affect their commitment to teach in the post-compulsory sector long-term, it seemed appropriate to employ a theoretical framework from a motivation theory which addressed intrinsic motivation, since this is the prominent motivational component (Dörnyei, 2001). It was also important that the chosen theoretical framework enabled not only an understanding of the motivation towards teaching as a career, but also how motivation can be sustained and eroded. Consequently, Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (SDT) was used, which highlights the need for feelings of autonomy, competence and
relatedness to enhance continued motivation towards a given activity (1975, 1985, 1992, 2000). This theory has underpinned various studies to investigate teacher motivation and demotivation in the compulsory education sector (see for example Wagner & French, 2010; Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Müller et al, 2009). However, in order to identify specific elements which could be mapped to the three needs of SDT, Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959) was also used. Motivation-Hygiene theory has been employed in studies examining school teachers’ and higher education lecturers’ job satisfaction and motivation (see for example Lam & Yan, 2011; Kiziltepe, 2008; Rhodes et al, 2007; Dinham & Scott, 1997).

The study of motivation is an attempt to explain human behaviour in terms of causes and processes. The word ‘motive’ is derived from the Latin verb movere, meaning ‘to move’, which implies motion and therefore action. Although there is disagreement, theories attempt to explain motivation in terms of the initiation of energy and the process of direction. It is this process of being continuously activated which is most relevant to this study. However, in order to identify factors which can erode motivation to teach, an appreciation of the factors which initiate behaviour will be useful to the reader. After all, motivation theory attempts to explain human behaviour towards an activity; teaching is one such activity. As Sinclair (2008) argues:

... salient motivations determine: a) what activities people do or do not engage in (‘attraction’); b) how long they engage in these activities (‘retention’); and c) the depth to which they engage in these activities (‘concentration’)… Therefore, determining student teachers’ motivation to teach could inform teacher recruitment and retention, (Sinclair, 2008:80).
This chapter provides an overview outlining the main tenets of key motivation theories to situate and explain Deci & Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (1985) and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1959). The second section reviews the literature on the motivation to teach. The purpose of this is to initiate discussion highlighting potential areas of conflict between individuals' motives for entering teaching and the reality of working in the sector. This later discussion is continued in the following chapter.

1.1 Theories of Motivation

Historically, the study of motivation has its roots in philosophy. When psychology emerged as a separate subject discipline, there were two prominent schools of thought: one, resonant of rationalist thinking, assumed that motivation was explained in terms of will/volition, the desire to do something and the translation of that will into action; the other stressed that motivation and thus behaviour was instinctive and hedonistic. From these early perspectives, five major theoretical approaches have evolved – neurobiological, psychoanalytic, behaviourist, humanistic-existential and cognitive (see Gross, 1996).

Although both humanistic and cognitive theory can be traced back to rationalism since they share the basic premise that humans are free to behave as they choose, humanists stress the importance of the unique individual who is motivated by the need to self-actualize. This is in direct contrast to both behaviourist and psychoanalytical theory, born from the hedonistic principles of seeking pleasure and avoiding pain. However, behaviour is largely seen to
be determined by unconscious forces by psychoanalysts, but shaped by environmental forces according to behaviourists. It is useful to consider these models in terms of a descriptive continuum ranging from the mechanistic model to the organismic model with the contextual model represented as a compromise between the two. Theories which can be described as mechanistic, assume that motivation can be reduced to the laws of natural science, and emphasize environmental stimuli. Organismic theories however, stress the importance of the individual, who initiates behaviour. Theories from the contextual model share many of the assumptions of organismic theories but assume that individual behaviour is the process of dynamic interaction with the environment (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

These models raise the discourse of structure and agency, and the debate about whether individuals can really escape the subjective/objective and social/individual dialectic. Within psychology, two research traditions have evolved: motivational psychology and social psychology. Traditionally, motivational psychology has tended to adopt an individualistic perspective. However, contemporary theorists have been placing increasing emphasis on the socio-cultural and contextual influences on behaviour. As Dörnyei argues, since most personal cognitions and emotions are – directly and indirectly – socially constructed, in many situations social and personal motivation are difficult to separate, (2001:31).

Consequently, the gap between the two approaches has decreased as many motivational psychologists have tried to incorporate a social dimension.

To present this overview, I have adopted the structure assumed by Rogers (1996). He discusses motivation theories, useful to teacher trainees, with
three broad sets of ideas: learned motivation, needs-related motivation, and motivation related to goal setting (1996:87-91). Although Rogers describes the concepts and only writes in depth about two humanist theories (under the heading of needs-related motivation), I will be using the format since this organisation not only provides an introduction to the different perspectives and the interplay between them, but is also useful for illustrating the development of the more complex theories. For example, Rogers (1996) uses the term *intrinsic* motivation in a generalised sense and yet this concept has a theoretical background grounded in needs-related motivation but is not regarded as assuming a humanist approach.

1.1.1 Learned Motivation

Within empirical psychology, theorists working in this mechanistic paradigm analysed observable behaviour by applying reductionist methods. The behaviourist writers, Thorndike (1913, in Pintrich & Schunk 2002), Pavlov (1927, in Gross, 1996) and Skinner (1954, in Gross, 1996) focused on the association between stimuli and responses as the mechanism for motivating behaviour and are responsible for various conditioning theories whereby behaviour is reduced to a series of simple principles shaped and controlled by environmental contingencies. According to Thorndike’s connectionist theory, associations are made between sensory experiences and neural impulses:

When a modifiable connection between a situation and a response is made and is accompanied or followed by a satisfying state of affairs, that connection’s strength is increased. When made and accompanied or followed by an annoying state of affairs, its strength is decreased, (Thorndike 1913, in Pintrich & Schunk 2002:24).
Thorndike’s Law of Effect maintains that behaviour is based on trial and error and responses will be repeated if a successful or pleasurable outcome is achieved but responses, which are not pleasurable or unsuccessful, are gradually abandoned. Therefore, the consequence of behaviour will influence future behaviour. This notion differs from Pavlov’s classical conditioning theory (1927, in Gross, 1996) since what happens before behaviour (through the pairing of conditioned and unconditioned stimuli) is crucial to determining behaviour in the future. Although Skinner’s operant conditioning (1954, in Gross, 1996) also adopts the behaviourist stimulus-response approach, the individual is seen as much more active. Therefore rather than assuming that the stimulus will elicit an automatic response, Skinner’s theory, developing Thorndike’s work, maintains that certain behaviour is more likely to occur in the presence of some stimuli rather than others and will be shaped and maintained by its consequences through positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement and punishment, (1954, in Gross, 1996). Positive reinforcement strengthens behaviour and therefore increases the likelihood of the action being repeated. Negative reinforcement can remove or cause behaviour to change to avoid aversive stimuli.

In the 1960s and 70s these theories were criticised for ignoring cognitive processes by social learning theorists (Bandura, 1986). Although they did not deny the importance of classical and operant conditioning, they noted that behaviour would be limited if it was subject to just those two types of motivation and emphasized that cognitive or mediating variables should also be considered as intervening mechanisms between stimulus and response behaviour. Bandura (1986) argues that in Skinner’s theory, the environment
is depicted as autonomous, and although Skinner commented on people’s ability to counter-control, the environment was still seen as the instigator of behaviour. Freedom of choice, according to Skinner, was an illusion, but Bandura maintains that people are ‘foreactive’ and draws attention to history and the struggles to preserve and create freedom (Bandura, 1997). In addition, Deci and Ryan point out that:

> The prominence of these non-motivational psychologies through the 1950s and 1960s was largely due to their success in controlling behaviour and to their relatively easy application to a variety of settings, (1985:8).

Indeed, these conditioning theories were of interest to educationalists and some of the principles Skinner advocated are applied in today’s classroom, such as practices of praise, criticism and grades (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). These theories are also useful for explaining why pupils who enjoyed and achieved at school are more likely to continue in education; whereas those who did not, are often reluctant to participate further (Rogers, 1996). In the context of this investigation, since behaviourist theories are reductive, logic would suggest that since so many teachers have resigned (OECD, 2005), presumably all teachers will eventually leave. In addition, these theories do not account for why some people would want to teach in the first place.

### 1.1.2 Goal theories of Motivation

Although Rogers (1996) does not provide any concrete examples, there are various different types of goal theories, namely goal-setting, goal content, goal orientation and the expectancy-value models, which have been employed to research teacher motivation (Dörnyei, 2001). According to Pintrich and
Schunk (2002) early cognitive theories focused research on the subjective and phenomenological psychology of the individual and have some of the strongest empirical support in educational settings (2002:89).

Tolman's theory of purposive behaviourism developed the relationship between stimuli and response from conditioning theories by adding a cognitive dimension in the form of expectancies (1932, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). These expectancies form cognitive maps to help individuals achieve goals. This theory linked the mechanistic conditioning theories and drive theories (explained in the next section). Lewin introduced the term *valence* to account for the value an individual attaches to an object in the environment to satisfy a need (1935, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Valence is said to increase the longer the need is unsatisfied. In addition, some objects may be intrinsically more appealing and therefore have more valence.

Now considered to be one of the early perspectives of achievement, Atkinson's classic achievement motivation theory adopted an expectancy-value framework building on the constructs developed by Tolman and Lewin (Atkinson, 1974, in Pintrich & Schunk 2002). Two key factors were identified as motivational influences: the individual's expectancy of success in a given task and the value attached to the success. To these principles, Atkinson added the need for achievement and the fear of failure. Atkinson proposed that there was an inverse relation between the incentive value and the probability of success; a high incentive value would equate to low expectations of success and vice versa. Hence, it was assumed that individuals perceived
challenging tasks, which are more difficult to achieve, to be more valuable than easier ones (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

There are many contemporary theories which have developed some type of the expectancy and value constructs. According to Pintrich and Schunk (2002) the work of Eccles and Wigfield bears the closest resemblance to the Atkinson model and has generated the most research and theory in academic achievement (2002:60). This social cognitive model, defines the expectancy and value constructs as two fundamental questions: ‘Am I able to do this task?’ and ‘Why should I do this task?’ (Eccles et al, 1983 in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). This model developed ideas about an individual’s perception of the importance of the task (attainment value), incentive (extrinsic utility value), effort, time and emotional costs (cost belief), and the desire/enjoyment of performing the task (intrinsic value/interest). These values are believed to be influential in goal choice and commitment (Eccles & Wigfield, 1998, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

Theories of self-efficacy have also evolved from the expectancy framework. Self-efficacy ‘refers to beliefs in one’s capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments’ (Bandura, 1997:3). This definition is very similar to the notion of competence described by Deci and Ryan and indeed in later work they do use the term (2000). Bandura’s social cognitive theory proposes that individual’s appraise their self-efficacy through previous performance, vicarious (observational) learning, forms of
persuasion and physiological reactions:

In social cognitive theory, human agency operates within an interdependent causal structure involving triadic reciprocal causation. In this transactional view of self and society, internal personal factors in the form of cognitive, affective and biological events; behaviour; and environmental events all operate as interacting determinants that operate bi-directionally, (Bandura, 1997:6).

Significantly, Betz and Hackett found that self-efficacy is an important mediator of structural and social influences on career choices (1981, 1983 in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Relevant to this study, is the suggestion that gender differences in self-efficacy account for vocational choices; women feel inefficacious for careers traditionally held by men but efficacious for careers traditionally held by women. In contrast, men are efficacious for all careers. Significantly, traditionally teaching has been viewed as a feminine, caring occupation alongside nursing and office work (Sharpe, 1976; Lees 1986).

Expectancy-value models, social cognitive and goal-setting theories attempt to explain individual choice, engagement, learning and performance. Pop and Turner (2009) cite research which has utilized these theories as theoretical frameworks to investigate why individuals have pursued teaching as a career. Their own study (Pop & Turner, 2009), investigating pre-service school teachers’ commitment to a teaching career, adopted a goal-orientated lens insofar that:

…their [participants’] understanding of their goal of becoming a teacher was mostly related to how they made sense of their choices in the context of life experiences, (2009:695).

However, Deci argues that these theories assume that:

All behaviour is initiated by a decision and guided by a standard. The amount of intensity of motivation is the only variable feature. None of these cognitive theories includes a conceptual component like
motivational orientations or regulatory styles to explain different qualities or types of human functioning, (1992:168).

1.1.3 Needs-related Motivation

In contrast to theories of learned behaviour, needs-related motivation theories view learning as a process of satisfying inner drives or urges rather than responding to stimuli. Historically, drive concepts take two major forms – homeostatic and non-homeostatic needs and drives. The former generally explains behaviour as physiological and theorists belonging to the psychoanalytic and empirical traditions, such as Freud (1917, in Deci & Ryan, 1985) and Hull (1943, in Gross, 1996), have considered these physiological aspects as primary instigators of motivation. They have argued that motives can be reduced to a small number of drives including sex, aggression, hunger, thirst and the avoidance of pain. Consequently, behaviour is initiated to reduce these drives. In contrast, non-homeostatic drives or needs have been identified as motives which are not derived from a specific physiological need but nevertheless energize behaviour and usually involve a search for stimulation such as the need for competence, control, achievement and play (in Gross, 1996).

The concept of intrinsic motivation can be traced back to effectance motivation, the need to feel competent (White, 1959, in Deci & Ryan, 1985), and arousal theory proposed by Berlyne wherein arousal is equated to drive (1960, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Both of these theories assumed that some behaviour was intrinsically motivated and did not require reinforcement for
maintenance. White (1959) maintained that organisms have an inherent need to feel competent and to deal effectively with their environment. The feeling of effectance which follows is its own reward. Berlyne (1960, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002) argued that exploratory activity is often accompanied by increased physiological arousal to the nervous system so attempts are made by the organism to maintain it at an optimal level. However, although what constitutes an optimal level is vague (Deci, 1975), Berlyne argued that if the level is too low, boredom sets in and the organism is motivated to increase it, but if it is too high, efforts are made to lower it. In addition, Berlyne argued that the collective properties of stimuli involving novelty, ambiguity, incongruity and surprise affected arousal (in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

From these early theories on intrinsic motivation, contemporary theorists have developed concepts of mastery (Harter, 1978, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002), perceived control (Rotter, 1966, de Charms, 1968, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002) and self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985). All of these theories postulate that behaviour is motivated in part by the belief that organisms can exert control over their environment and that the more individuals feel competent and in control, they are more likely to enjoy tasks and display greater intrinsic motivation.

Intrinsic motivation refers to engaging in an activity for its own sake and it has been suggested that there are three subtypes of intrinsic motivation: to learn for the pleasure of satisfying curiosity; towards achievement for the satisfaction of accomplishment; and to experience stimulation (Vallerand, 1997 in Dörnyei, 2001). This is in contrast to extrinsic motivation which is
viewed as engagement in order to receive an extrinsic reward or to avoid punishment. It is accepted that both types of motivation are context and time dependent, and should not be viewed as two ends of a continuum as it is possible to be highly intrinsically and extrinsically motivated at the same time (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). However:

... when rewards are contingent on performance, they are more likely to decrease intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, when rewards are expected before the behaviour begins, they are more likely to decrease intrinsic motivation, (Deci, 1975:158).

At the heart of Deci’s argument is the need for self-determination whereby individuals exercise ‘will’ so their behaviour emanates from within. He refers to the regulatory processes of self-determined versus controlled behaviour which arise from an individual’s perceived locus of causality (1992). The perceived locus of causality in self-determined behaviour is the ‘self’ as opposed to compliance due to forces external to the self in controlled behaviour. This concept develops the intrinsic/extrinsic dichotomy and according to Deci and Ryan (1985) if an individual is adequately self-determined, it is possible that controlled (extrinsic) motivation can be combined with, or even converted into self-determined (of a more intrinsic nature) motivation through processes of internalization and integration. They argue that there are different forms of extrinsic motivation so it is not a unitary construct which is ‘invariantly non-autonomous’ as it is often portrayed (2000). The orientation of extrinsic motivation is central to this argument. Humans can be extrinsically motivated to perform tasks but their attitudes could vary; a task might be undertaken with resentment or with willingness. The latter would illustrate that an extrinsic reward or goal has been internalized and converted into self-determination motivation. However, as it was pointed out earlier, it
also follows that extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation if events do not facilitate self-determination and consequently, do not support autonomy. Individuals need to feel that they are exercising free choice and are responsible for their actions. In addition to this, they need to feel competent and this will increase if individuals succeed at a task or receive positive feedback as long as the feedback is perceived to facilitate self-determined functioning. This is labelled by Deci and Ryan (1985) as informational which can maintain or enhance intrinsic motivation. They also identify two types of functions, which can undermine feelings of autonomy and competence, in the form of controlling and amotivating events. Controlling events such as deadlines, rewards and surveillance promote an external perceived locus of control. Amotivating functions such as negative feedback can undermine an individual’s perceived competence. However, these events can be interpreted by individuals in different ways depending on the interpersonal context. For example, positive feedback, which would usually be viewed as informational, might be interpreted as controlling if experienced as an evaluation of performance (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

The third psychological need postulated by Deci and Ryan to accompany those of autonomy and competence, is relatedness, which is described as, ‘a sense of belongingness and connectedness to the persons, group, or culture disseminating a goal,’ (2000:64). In the classroom setting, teachers who care and respect their students are more likely to promote internalization of extrinsically motivated behaviours. Deci argues that the orientation of motivation, be it intrinsic or extrinsic, will affect the quality of functioning in terms of creativity, cognitive flexibility, satisfaction, and physical and
psychological well-being, even though the amount of motivation may not necessarily differ (1992).

There is debate about the most appropriate way to conceptualize intrinsic motivation. According to Deci and Ryan (1985) empirical psychologists tend to view it as a non-drive-based energy which is intrinsic in nature. However, Deci and Ryan argue that the concept has emerged from the drive theories to focus on inner dispositions and, ‘is based in the organismic needs to be competent and self-determining,’ (1985:5). These theorists argue that self-determination theory, which has evolved from mini-theories, including their own cognitive evaluation theory (1985), is an organismic theory which attempts to explain different qualitative aspects of behaviour. Although it is non-reductionistic and multiplicative, I question whether Self-Determination Theory – or SDT as Deci and Ryan later referred to it (2000) – can be deemed as belonging solely to the organismic paradigm since there are elements which reflect the contextual model. Their reasoning surrounding the interpretation of informational, controlling and amotivating events and the need for relatedness would infer an interactionist approach insofar that behaviour is a result of the individual’s perception and interaction with their environment:

Self Determination Theory is specifically framed in terms of social and environmental factors that facilitate or undermine intrinsic motivation, (Deci & Ryan, 2000:58).

It may be that these theorists do not recognise the contextual paradigm; although they discuss mechanistic and organismic models, they do not make any reference to contextual models. Yet, the environmental dimension is central to the process of internalization. However, the functions of relatedness and competence (efficacy) are not dissimilar to concepts described in the
following two theories from the humanists Maslow (1943, in Maslow, 1987) and Rogers (1980), which definitely fall into the organismic paradigm. Maslow and Rogers believed that humans are self-evolvers. Maslow (1943, in Maslow, 1987) claimed that there is a hierarchy of stages to human development starting with physiological needs (which includes some of drives described in drive theory) followed by safety needs. Once these deficiency needs are satisfied, needs of belongingness, and then esteem would come into play. The final stage is the need to self-actualize through the realization of one’s potential. Maslow was convinced that:

... the basic human needs are organised into a hierarchy of relative prepotency. One main implication of this phrasing is that gratification becomes as important a concept as deprivation in motivation theory, for it releases the organism from the domination of a relatively more physiological need, permitting thereby the emergence of other more social goals, (1987:18).

On the other hand, Rogers believed that all behaviour is motivated by the need to self-actualize. In his view, this is the fundamental tendency which:

...may express itself in the widest range of behaviours and in response to a wide variety of needs, (Rogers, 1963, in Pintrich & Schunk 2002:40)

And, rather than being hierarchical:

...the transformation from one state to another is a sudden shift, a non-linear event, (Rogers, 1980:131).

However, both theorists agreed that these needs or drives are self-propelling. Rogers described this process as a ‘tendency which permeates all of organic life,’ (1980:134). Failure to achieve self-actualisation is explained through the absence of the right conditions or, in Maslow’s opinion, not adequately satisfying the lower levels of need. These interpretations have been criticised for being too simplistic and for not explaining motivation towards the different forms of self-actualisation such as the need to know and understand, to
appreciate and to create (Rogers A, 1996). In addition, these theories are less concerned with thought processes; thus any behaviour can pertain to a need as the cause which does not provide any real insight into the behaviour (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). However, the work of Rogers and Maslow has given rise to a much more student-centred approach to teaching in the post-16 environment but there is a potential site of conflict between the students and teachers’ expectations and attitudes; school-leavers may have been accustomed to more behaviourist forms of teaching and NQTs may be expecting to teach using more humanistic approaches. Also, given the government policies to encourage continuing education, the students might not necessarily be attending courses because they are intrinsically motivated to do so, but because of extrinsic rewards such as receipt of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA). These extrinsic rewards may not have an effect on motivation, but as Deci and Ryan point out, the orientation of motivation is called into question. Consequently, the NQTs teaching in the FE sector may have a very diverse body of students to deal with.

Although there is some acknowledgement of environmental factors, humanist theory is limited in comparison to theories from the contextual paradigm. However, one theory which has been developed from Maslow’s work, which does take into account of external factors and is applied in industrial environments to understand continued motivation, is Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959).

Herzberg (1959) identified the concepts of motivators and hygiene factors – a two-factor theory to motivate employees by challenging work, which enables
responsibility. Factors identified as motivators are achievement; recognition within the work environment; advancement (or the potential for such); interest in the work; and responsibility. The presence of these internal factors will encourage a positive attitude, although they need to be reinforced. The hygiene factors, however, are external and relate to the work environment and include company policies; company administration; on-the-job supervision; working conditions; interpersonal relations with others and salary. If these factors are poor or absent, Herzberg argues that employees will become dissatisfied or unhappy. However, the balance is complex; just increasing the motivators will not increase job satisfaction if the hygiene factors are unsatisfactory. Alternatively, improving the hygiene factors without increasing the presence of motivators will also be of no benefit. For this study, this two-factor theory was used to identify specific factors which may erode feelings of autonomy, relatedness and competence, outlined in Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985, 1992, 2000), and is discussed further in the following section.

This section has attempted to position the theories employed for the framework for this study within the field of motivational psychology. As outlined in the introduction, Dörnyei’s four factor model conceptualising the motivation to teach (2001) highlights a prominent intrinsic component. Consequently, this section has aimed to provide a rationale for choosing Deci and Ryan’s SDT and Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory, and explained the tenets of these theories. However, in order to explore the factors which have given rise to the tension between teachers’ motivation to teach and the outside interference to control the process of teaching, which Scott et al (2001)
conclude is the cause of profound dissatisfaction in compulsory education in England, New Zealand, Australia and the United States, an understanding of why teachers want to teach is necessary. The following section will consider research which has sought to address this question and to identify the factors required to sustain motivation.

### 1.2 Teacher Motivation

‘I love teaching but…’ is the title of one of the journal articles arising from the International Teacher 2000 project (Scott et al, 2001). The purpose of the following sections is to deconstruct the concept of teacher motivation drawing on the conceptual model, which characterises teaching, outlined by Dörnyei (2001). This model includes: a prominent intrinsic component, social contextual influences, a temporal dimension associated with career structures, and fragility, in that motivation is exposed to negative influences (2001:157-8). Furthermore, Dörnyei (2001) distinguishes between the motivation to teach and the motivation to be a teacher as a lifelong career. This distinction forms the structure of this section: it examines the literature to explore what motivates individuals to become teachers and what needs to be in place for continued motivation. The reader should be advised that although there is plentiful research studying teachers in the compulsory sector, it is extremely limited for the post-compulsory sector. However, as the previous section has illustrated, motivation theory attempts to explain human behaviour towards an activity; teaching is one such activity so arguably the initial motivation to teach will be consistent across the various sectors. There may be variations in terms of the decision to teach in one sector rather than another and there will...
be differences in the actual experiences of teaching in the different sectors. Indeed, findings from a quantitative study undertaken by Martin et al (2012) in the United States would suggest that elementary school teachers were less likely to consider leaving teaching than colleagues teaching in middle and high-school due to the differences in the student body and the need for different teaching techniques. Consequently, besides reviewing studies relating to the post-compulsory sector, where possible, only research relating to teaching predominantly 11-18 year-olds has been reviewed, since many teachers in post-compulsory education are teaching students as young as 14.

1.2.1 Motivation to enter teaching

Evans (1976) argues that the decision to enter the teaching profession is based on socio-demographic variables and motive patterns which can be realised through teaching. He states that every prospective teacher:

… embraces two concurrent, mutually dependent clusters of values or beliefs… one cluster consists of personal gratifications that might or can be realised by teaching. A second cluster is composed of a network of attitudes, or perhaps rationalizations that support or justify these gratifications, (1976:21).

Evans (1976) discusses the values as orientations: teacher-centred, pupil-centred, status-striving and critic. Teachers who have a teacher-centred orientation use teaching as a means to achieve pragmatic, tangible goals and they will be concerned with hours, salary, vacations etc. They may need reassurance regarding their own superiority and regulate behaviour with a preoccupation with rules. They might also need close supervision and
guidance. Justification of these motives includes ideas that teaching should be detached, discipline should be maintained and superiors know best.

Teachers who exhibit a pupil-centred orientation are characterised by feelings of affection for children. They may be attention-seeking themselves and prefer the company of children. In addition, they may strive to minimise dependency on the teacher. They may justify these behaviours as an effective means to identify and empathise with children in the name of self-actualisation.

Status-striving teachers are more concerned with the prestige of the profession and reflect a pre-occupation with professional dignity and propriety. Finally, the critic, the fourth orientation, is dedicated to reform and improvement and may express negative feelings concerning the motives of authority figures. The last two orientations, according to Evans, can be teacher or pupil-orientated.

Evans argues that these motive patterns are seldom explicit and may be subconscious. However, they can appear implicitly in conversations or be observed in teaching behaviour. For example, Evans suggests that a pupil-centred teacher might complain about the lack of funds available for classroom activities, whereas an individual with a teacher-centred orientation will display more self-concerns (1976:21-23). Examining Evans’ descriptions it occurred to me that the phrases ‘regulate behaviour’ and the need to ‘maintain discipline’ suggest that these roles are resonant of behaviourist theory; conversely ‘self-actualisation’ and the nurturant role of affection and love used
to describe the pupil-centred orientation are suggestive of Rogers’ facilitator and humanist theory (1980). However, neither of these two main orientations is presented as being superior or inferior by Evans.

Evans does not give a lot of credence to a love of learning or subject matter as a motive for the career and argues that there is little evidence to support that, ‘school teachers, as a group, are strongly committed to deep intellectual study and research’, (1976:25). This was not an idea supported by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA, previously known as the Teacher Training Agency, TTA). On the recruitment website in 2006 various profiles highlighted teachers’ enthusiasm for their subject as well as their love of teaching (TDA, 2006). These influences are identified by Dörnyei (2001) as the main intrinsic components for entering teaching and cites the work of Csikszentmihalyi, who categorizes intrinsic rewards into two groups: rewards gained from the educational process itself in terms of the actual teaching and interaction with students; rewards resulting from continuous engagement with the subject matter and the potential for lifelong learning (1997, in Dörnyei 2001).

This theory has support from McKelvey and Andrews (1998) who interviewed post-compulsory education teacher trainees in London and the South-East prior to their college placement. They found that trainees were attracted to teaching out of a ‘desire to pass on knowledge or love of a subject or vocational skill and expertise,’ (1998:361). The participants who took part in the focus groups for my MA project also indicated that their motivation to enter teaching was driven by intrinsic rewards gained from the teaching process and
from engagement with the subject matter in line with Csikszentmihalyi’s categorisations. However, my findings indicated that motivation tended to be driven by a combination of both (Matthews, 2003). Extrinsic rewards were not found to be prime motivators; indeed, participants, who raised the issue of salaries, thought that given the work involved, teachers were not paid well (Matthews, 2003). Significantly, although aiming to recruit school teachers rather than post-compulsory teachers, the TDA’s focus changed: the advertising campaign launched in May 2006 used the by-line ‘Work with the most exciting people in the world’, whereas the previous campaign’s selling point was, ‘You will be well paid and have great career prospects’ (TTA, 2003).

These findings appear to be cross-cultural. A case study involving Tibetan student teachers found that intrinsic reasons were considered to be more important than extrinsic in decisions to become school teachers (Su et al, 2003). An investigation undertaken in Australia by Manuel and Hughes (2006) also found that the majority of teacher trainees in their study decided to teach based on the desire to work with young people and to maintain engagement with their subject area. In addition, a study undertaken by Seco and Graca (2002) in Portugal concluded that the intrinsic dimension of teaching had more influence than extrinsic aspects. These findings are replicated in studies in France, Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands and the Slovak Republic (see OECD, 2005).

However, a national six-year study of school teachers’ experiences during training, induction and early professional development by Hobson et al (2003)
would suggest that extrinsic rewards also feature in the attraction of teaching. Although the findings suggested that people are primarily attracted to teaching in compulsory education by the idea of working with children or young people and helping them to learn, there were other factors which featured in participants’ decisions. During the study, the participants were offered a list of 26 factors and asked to rate the extent to which these factors had encouraged or deterred them from undertaking a teacher training programme. Factors which received a high score for being strongly attractive included: being inspired by a good teacher, giving something back to the community, the challenging nature of the job, long holidays, staying involved with subject specialism, job security, wanting to teach pupils better than they had been taught and the professional status of teaching. However, there were differences between trainees training for primary teaching and those training for secondary school teaching. A higher proportion of primary teaching trainees were attracted to working with children or young people and helping them to learn. However, trainees for secondary school teaching were more attracted to the career by the opportunities to stay involved with a subject specialism and career advancement. These differences could be explained by the nature of the respective teaching roles. Although primary school teachers may be subject co-ordinators, they tend to teach cross-curricula; whereas secondary school teachers usually teach subjects relevant to their specialised field. However, it is interesting that long holidays and professional status which are extrinsic rewards should also score so highly and are indicative of the teacher-centred and status striving motives proposed by Evans (1976). This would suggest that although the initial decision to teach might be based on the intrinsic rewards gained from teaching, other extrinsic motives are also
prevalent. In addition, Hobson et al (2003) found that there were gender differences: a higher proportion of men were attracted by the financial incentives attached to teaching training and by the benefit packages such as an occupational pension.

Significantly, financial incentives were offered by the Labour government to offset the skill shortages of teachers in the further education (FE) sector during the sampling for this doctoral study. These included the Initial Teacher Training Bursary initiative introduced in 2000 and the Golden Hello initiative introduced in 2002 as part of the Success for All strategy. A study, undertaken for the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) to evaluate the impact of the Teacher Training Bursary, found that 70% of bursary recipients would not have applied for a full-time teacher training course without the £6,000 bursary and training institutions reported that they would not have been able to run teacher training courses full-time without the incentive as many students could not afford to undertake such courses (York Consultancy Ltd, 2004). The study also revealed that the bursary had widened participation among women and ethnic minorities. However, the research also suggested that there was a ‘glut’ of trainees specialising in the arts, social science and humanities subjects and 50% of survey respondents who were not teaching were struggling to find posts in the non-shortage subject areas.

The Golden Hello initiative aimed to increase the attractiveness of teaching in shortage subject areas through one-off payments (up to a maximum of £4,000 given during the second year of teaching). According to Hopwood (2004) although take-up exceeded the profile for the 2003-4 financial year, the
majority of early respondents had already entered the profession prior to being aware of this extrinsic reward, and only 10% of those who knew of its availability had been influenced to work in these particular areas. However, the findings also suggested that there appeared to be differences in interpretations of shortage subjects and eligibility. In addition, although 54% of the teachers reported feeling more valued as a result of receiving the reward, some participants felt that the incentive was divisive (Hopwood, 2004).

If we review these evaluation studies in light of Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (SDT), these incentives have facilitated self-determination and therefore autonomy. The initial decision to teach was, arguably, determined by ‘will’ and the incentives merely strengthened the decision. Although the majority of trainees would not have undertaken a full-time training course without the bursary, the financial help enabled them to do so. However, the amount of the bursaries, I would suggest, would not be enough to encourage people already in full-time employment to change their occupation unless they had already decided for other reasons to re-train. In addition, since the Further Education National Training Organisation’s standards came into force in 1999, requiring new FE teachers to undertake a teaching qualification, this may have influenced take-up for teachers who were working part-time or sessional but intended to find a full-time post.

Coincidentally, I was one of the participants surveyed in the evaluation of the bursary undertaken by York Consultancy (2004). The bursary allowed me to study full-time without having to combine it with part-time work and of course, it would only take a year to complete. I was not the only person on my course
in that situation. Although the bursary reduced stress and enabled us to achieve our goals more quickly, it was not the reason why we decided to teach. In addition, the vast majority of us were female and it was not surprising that findings from these studies revealed widened participation among women as the bursary eased the financial pressure on our families and made re-training more feasible. The influx of women might also account for the choices of subject specialism as the shortage areas tend to be in science and science-related areas, which are traditionally viewed as ‘male’ subjects (Halsey et al, 1997).

1.2.2 Motivation to remain in teaching

According to Evans (1976), motive patterns can change as a function of experience and when confronted with the realities of teaching, NQTs will either adapt their attitudes or become disillusioned. If they become disillusioned, they may leave the profession early in their careers but, if this is not an option, they might remain but be disappointed. Indeed, according to Jones (2003) evidence suggests that the first three to four years after training will determine whether teachers stay in the profession, and Watt et al (2012), following their study of pre-service school teachers with samples from Australia, the United States, Germany and Norway, warn that if new teachers find themselves in situations which prevent them fulfilling their motivations, ‘they are likely to feel less efficacious, less satisfied with their career choice, and to experience burnout or leave the profession,’ (2012:801). Pop and Turner (2009) presented similar findings in their study of 67 undergraduate students enrolled in a teacher training programme in the United States. The students fell into
three groups: some were intending to teach; some were undecided; and the others were no longer considering teaching. The findings indicated that the most powerful motivators for considering teaching in all three groups had been altruistic. However, their decisions about whether they would pursue this career after their course appeared to be related to self-perceptions about their knowledge, skills and confidence to teach. This would imply that even before they had graduated, for some of these students, feelings of competence outlined in SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985) were already being compromised. Pop and Turner (2009) suggested that more support should be available for pre-service teachers so that they enter the profession with realistic goals.

Studies undertaken in the UK’s compulsory education sector would also indicate that trainees’ experiences during training might affect their continued motivation. The breakdown in the relationship between the mentor and trainee was cited as a major factor influencing trainees’ decisions to withdraw from teaching courses in research undertaken by Chambers’ et al (2002). This study used questionnaires in addition to interviews with trainees and school co-ordinators to ascertain reasons why trainees had withdrawn from a secondary teacher training course. Besides the relationship with mentors, the trainees also cited a mismatch between their expectations and the reality of teaching, which included workload and the staff room atmosphere where, ‘All teaching staff do is moan’ (2002:380).

Butcher (2003) used a case study approach with trainees training on an 11-18 secondary PGCE course. Findings indicated that trainees were surprised by the lack of motivation, commitment and skills of pupils electing to continue to
advanced-level study. Mentoring was also found to be inconsistent; many trainees experienced ‘hands-off’ mentoring and were ‘left to learn to teach post-16 unaided’ (2003:45).

Jones (2003) also adopted a case study approach with ten NQTs, who were teaching 11-18 year-old pupils. Participants talked of losing self-confidence, feeling insecure and the effects of working with disillusioned, more experienced colleagues. They also highlighted the discrepancy between the idealised image portrayed by the Teacher Training Agency and the reality of teaching.

Findings from all these studies would indicate that just being altruistically motivated to teach is not enough to sustain continued motivation. Working with Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959), Dinham and Scott (1997) argue that social contextual influences affect teachers’ motivation. These influences can be separated into two categories: micro-contextual and macro-contextual. The former refers to the climate of a particular institution, the classroom and the learner group, and can include the institute’s norms, facilities, resources, regulations, decision-making structures, feedback systems and expectations regarding student potential. The macro-contextual influences refer to the influences at societal level such as the image of the profession, educational policy and the impact of politicians, parents and the media. Dinham and Scott (1997) suggest that these contextual influences can affect teacher motivation in different ways. At the micro-level, the effects of school-based extrinsic factors vary, being primarily dependent on school leadership. However, societal-level factors operating at the macro-level
function as major demotivators since the teachers and school have little control over what takes place. Bandura (1997) argues that these conditions can affect teachers’ efficacy and occupational satisfaction, but suggests that the behaviour of the principals can affect the environment. He identifies the attributes of highly efficacious schools which include principals who act as educational leaders and discern ways ‘to work around stifling policies and regulations that impede academic innovativeness’ (1997:244). In contrast, principals who serve as administrators and disciplinarians are more likely to head a low-achieving school.

Ashton identifies two dimensions indicative of a teacher’s sense of efficacy: teaching efficacy and personal efficacy (1985, in Dörnyei 2001). Teacher efficacy refers to the teacher’s belief in being able to facilitate student learning in spite of challenges. Teachers with a high sense of teaching efficacy (or instructional efficacy as Bandura refers to it) believe that even difficult students can achieve through appropriate and effective teaching techniques. Those with a low sense of teaching efficacy believe that if a student is unmotivated, there is not a great deal that the teacher can do. Personal efficacy however, refers to the teacher’s personal appraisal of their effectiveness as a teacher, which implies that performance feedback is required either from peers, line managers, parents, inspectors and/or students. A principal who fosters an environment of high levels of efficacy among teachers, which in turn affects students’ sense of efficacy, will promote the relatedness and competence function described by Deci and Ryan. (Significantly, from 2000, Deci and Ryan also use the term efficacy when discussing competence.) A longitudinal study undertaken by Avis and Bathmaker (2006) investigating the experiences
of trainee further education teachers would suggest that the institutional environment is not always conducive in supporting efficacy. One of their participants noted:

I was let loose on a bunch of students, nobody from the college, nobody from the department ever saw me teach, the head of department never poked his nose in to see what he’d let loose on his students. That was poor, really was, [sic.] (in Avis & Bathmaker, 2006:179)

In this instance the trainee concerned was left to his own devices and whilst this situation would not facilitate self-determined functioning, neither would an environment which is one of control. If the environment is restrictive and controlling, teachers are likely to feel pressure from above (from administrators, managers and so forth) and from below (from the pupils/students) which will not only affect their feelings of autonomy but the way in which they deal with pupils. They are more likely to become ‘controlling’ teachers rather than those who facilitate autonomy.

Consequently, Deci and Ryan call for:

… more attention be devoted to the creation of informational, autonomy-supporting environments for teachers as well as students, (1985:271).

A study by McKelvey and Andrews (1998) also investigating FE trainees' experiences of their teaching placement illustrates such an autonomy-supporting environment. Fourteen students (eight were female and six were male ranging in age from 25 -57) were interviewed after their college placements in London and the South-East. Comments such as: ‘The more I put in, the more they [the students] gave me’, and ‘I really liked the students. I liked being in charge taking lessons,’ (1998:362) would suggest that the trainees received positive feedback from the students which increased the
trainees’ sense of competence and relatedness. In addition, the comment about ‘being in charge’ supported autonomy.

In the introduction to this section, Dörnyei’s (2001) four factor model characterising teacher motivation was outlined. The literature presented so far has highlighted the intrinsic component of teacher motivation and highlighted the social contextual influences which can affect this, positively or negatively. The third aspect of this model to sustain motivation is the temporal dimension, which, ‘... is most clearly reflected when talking about career structures and promotion possibilities,’ (Dörnyei, 2001:158). Dörnyei cites the work of Raynor (1974, in Dörnyei, 2001) and the concept of a ‘contingent path’ for career advancement. Achievement-related motivation is enhanced as the teacher moves along the career path. During this prolonged activity, individuals experience both intrinsic and extrinsic awards through advancement. According to Dörnyei (2001) these extrinsic rewards, such as power, status, money, public acclaim and approval of family and friends, are just as important as intrinsic rewards to sustain career motivation. However, should achievements fail to create future career steps then the path is closed and will have a negative effect on motivation. Indeed, the Tibetan student teachers interviewed in the Su et al study (2003), outlined earlier, who had embarked on teaching for intrinsic reasons, were reluctant to commit themselves to the profession as a lifelong career due to the low status and poor compensations of teaching. In addition, these student teachers were all male which suggests that there may be gender differences in motive patterns as argued by Evans (1976).
The final element of Dörnyei’s model (2001) is exposure to negative influences. Dörnyei identifies five main factors which appear to be inherent in the profession:

1. The stressful nature of most teaching jobs;
2. The inhibition of teacher autonomy by set curricula, standardised tests, imposed teaching methods, government mandated policies and other institutional constraints;
3. Insufficient self-efficacy on most teachers’ part due to inappropriate training;
4. Content repetitiveness and limited opportunity for intellectual development;
5. Inadequate career structure. (Dörnyei, 2001:165)

Some of these negative influences can be mapped to the hygiene factors of Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1959). For example, poor working conditions and the negative impact of company policies and administration can give rise to career dissatisfaction. Other hygiene factors include on-the-job supervision, which can be an issue for teachers in terms of feedback, and interpersonal relations with others, (this would include students and colleagues in the context of teaching). Absence of these factors would not support feelings of competence nor relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

However, key to Herzberg’s work is that a decrease in the negative hygiene factors does not increase job satisfaction if motivators - such as achievement, recognition, career advancement, interest in the work and responsibility – are lacking. Alternatively, increasing the presence of motivators will not increase satisfaction if the hygiene factors are unsatisfactory. The balance is complex; as discussed in the earlier section of this chapter, receiving feedback can be perceived as positive or negative, thus informational or controlling, depending on the context according to SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985).
A large-scale study undertaken by Smithers and Robinson (2003) in England, which investigated experienced school teachers' reasons for leaving, highlights these motivators and hygiene factors in teaching. Data was collected from a questionnaire survey involving over a thousand teachers who were not intending to take another post. Interviews were then conducted with a sub-sample of 306 leavers. Smithers and Robinson (2003) found that workload, the prospect of a new challenge, the school situation (which included poor pupil behaviour), salary and personal circumstances were the main factors which influenced decisions to leave. However, the most important factor, by far, was workload, which significantly, has also been the most frequently cited factor leading to illness (Bowers & McIver, 2000).

Participants in Smithers and Robinson's study were also asked what factors could influence them to stay. Over 40% said 'nothing' and the remaining participants listed a reduction in work-load, fewer initiatives, and improvements to the way schools were run. Some said that an improvement in pupil behaviour and a better salary might have made a difference (although this was cited as the least important factor). Around the same time that Smithers and Robinson (2003) were undertaking their study, poor student behaviour was also reported as a problem in the post-compulsory sector: ‘disruptive 14-16 year olds are driving college lecturers to take stress-related sick leave’ (TES, 2002). Given that one of the most cited reasons for entering teaching is working with young people, this is a serious challenge to sustaining motivation. As Dörnyei argues: ‘... almost every aspect of the motivational power base is being challenged,’ (2001:165).
This review of the literature would suggest that there are commonalities between the sectors in terms of factors that can affect the needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness and thus continued motivation. These include: the behaviour of students/pupils; whether the environment is supportive; and the quality of performance feedback and mentoring. In the compulsory education sector, teachers’ work and restrictions on the autonomy that they can exercise will have an impact on motivation (Dörnyei, 2001). This element needs further consideration within the context of post-compulsory education since working conditions are quite different, not only in regards to pay, career prospects, past experience and qualifications (Edward et al, 2007), but also in terms of government policies and initiatives imposed on this sector. This will be explored in the following chapter.
Chapter Two

The Post-compulsory Sector

The learning and skills sector has never been more important to the Government’s agenda than it is today. It is pivotal to our overriding objective to strengthen Britain on the dual and inextricably linked foundations of social justice and economic success. We must give further education and training its proper place as a vital mainstream part of the education system (DfES, 2002:2)

The previous chapter examined teachers’ motivation to enter teaching and explored factors which can challenge continued motivation. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the ‘issue of control’, highlighted by Scott et al, (2001) as the reason behind dissatisfaction following their International Teacher 2000 study, within the context of post-compulsory education and to explore the inhibition of teacher autonomy in this sector, which according to Robson has historically always been limited (2006:11). Scott et al (2001) employed Bourdieu’s concept of the Right and Left Hands of the state to interpret their findings. A similar lens is employed here to highlight key government policy reforms and initiatives from 1991 until 2004, when the data for this study was collected, and to outline the effects of these on experienced teachers drawing on studies which have investigated impact. Finally, studies which have investigated trainees’ perceptions of the sector during their training programmes are reviewed to examine commonalities and differences between their perceptions of teaching in the sector and existing teachers’ experiences.
As outlined in the introduction, I hypothesised that whilst the literature would demonstrate that there is tension between the two forces of teacher motivation and issues of control for experienced teachers (Scott et al, 2001), this would not be felt to the same extent by NQTs. Although all teachers need to feel autonomous for continued motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985), the boundaries for autonomous behaviour will be perceived slightly differently; measures will have been imposed on experienced teachers, whereas NQTs may have different expectations about the extent of their autonomy.

Included in this second section is a summary of the findings following the re-interrogation of the data collected for my MA study as these findings formed the basis for identifying the nature of demotivators. Some of the findings presented here were not included in the earlier MA study.

### 2.1 Educational Change

When the data for this doctoral study was collected New Labour was in government and as the statement by Charles Clark, from the *Success for All* policy (DfES, 2002), used to open this chapter indicates the sector was very much in the limelight. This policy document reiterated principles which can be traced back to James Callaghan’s 1976 Ruskin College speech now seen as a watershed for the reorientation of purpose for education (Lea *et al*, 2003). The Green Paper, *Education in Schools* in July 1977, was underpinned by the belief that the rationale for education should be meeting the needs of industry. Subsequent policies and legislation initiated by both Conservative and Labour governments have propagated this understanding that an education system
should be instrumental, yet at the same time create educational opportunities. The Industrial Revolution created the nation’s wealth through technology. However, contemporary economic activity is knowledge-intensive and national ‘prosperity is linked to its inventiveness, education and research capacity’, (Giddens, 2001:32). This transformation, according to Giddens (2001), was due to three main factors: the effects of globalisation through globalised finance and investment and the development of electronic communications; the emergence of the knowledge economy underpinned by technological innovation which has been a factor in the progressive shrinking of the manufacturing sector; and the transformation of people's lives through the rise of individualism, especially for women, who were no longer confined to rearing children.

The policies of New Labour's Third Way were underpinned by the beliefs that to be competitive in the global market-place, lifelong learning was crucial for economic success and social justice, and that a learning society had to be flexible, adaptable and multi-skilled. The role of government was perceived to be one of enabling through investment in skills and infrastructure. This framework of an enabling state was seen as an alternative to a Keynesian administrative state and a neo-liberal minimal state. The former assumes practices of mass production, an elitist state staffed by small groups of public-spirited experts and an economy substantially contained within sovereign boundaries (Hodgson & Spours, 1999). This approach of economic management and planning was reflected in Labour’s ‘New Britain’ manifesto during the period of 1964-70 through Wilson’s ‘white-hot heat of the technical revolution’, where the focus was on efficiency and productivity through
technological advances, which relied on central manpower planning. The second management model or ‘second way’ – typified by Thatcherism in Britain and Reaganism in the United States – sought to produce low taxation and low-spending through policies of privatisation of public sectors and the reduction of the economic management role of the government. Consequently, the Thatcherist government of the 1980s and 1990s transformed the public sector through policies of New Public Management, which included privatisation, the restructuring of central civil services, and the introduction of competition and efficiency indicators (Steer et al, 2007). However, the Third Way sought to bridge the gap between socialism and liberalism, grounded in the belief that the two could co-exist through ‘interdependence, responsibility, incentives and devolution’ (Latham, 2001 in Giddens, 2001:26). From 1997, the New Labour government adopted the Welfare to Work agenda through low taxation and investment in human capital with the emphasis on education and health to discourage the unemployed sector from consuming public expenditure. This approach was based upon a discourse of modernisation and whilst it differed from New Public Management in that it was linked to social democracy by employing a system of arms-length regulation, the ethos of New Public Management was continued through the use of market mechanisms and increasing accountability to consumers (Steer et al, 2007). This arms-length regulation describes the situation whereby the government’s role shifted; operational functions previously performed were contracted out to various agencies and bodies, leaving the government to perform the role of ‘regulator of services, setter of standards and guarantor of quality’ (Newman, 2001:83, in Steers et al, 2007) through the employment of
policy levers – funding, inspection, targets, planning and initiatives – used to ‘direct, manage and shape change in public services’, (Steer et al, 2007:177).

This shift in role, according to Bourdieu (1998), undermined public interest in favour of private. He discusses stakeholders in terms of the ‘left hand of the state’ which comprises teachers, family counsellors, youth workers and so forth, and the ‘right hand’, such as ministerial cabinets and banks. He argues that this shift was perceived by the Left Hand as withdrawal resulting in ‘despair at the failure of the state as the guardian of the public interest’ (1998:2). Furthermore, not only had the Right Hand failed to provide the means for the Left Hand to deal with the consequences of this withdrawal, it did not know or want to know what the Left Hand had to do. The result was that the Left Hand had to do more with less, and agents suffered a decline in prestige and remuneration for the work undertaken (Bourdieu, 1998).

This withdrawal from the post-compulsory sector was evidenced in the white paper, *Education and Training for the 21st Century* in 1991, which proposed to give colleges independence from Local Education Authorities (LEAs). The reforms, referred to as the incorporation of colleges, included the re-organisation and change of status and of governance by establishing colleges as corporate bodies (McGinty & Fish, 1993). The Further and Higher Education Act 1992 continued with this reorganisation by making changes in the funding and administration of further education by setting up boards to manage incorporated colleges, enabling polytechnics to become universities; and by creating a Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) to allocate funding. This legislation reflected the government’s desire for more business
involvement and less government control in education. It was argued that by overturning the LEAs and changing the status of colleges to corporate, self-governing institutions, colleges would have the flexibility to respond effectively to market forces and the needs of their ‘customers’ (students, parents and employers); they would be able to employ their own staff, manage their own resources and expand their provision (Elliot, 1996). This change to the operational approach, often referred to as the new managerialism, forced colleges to emulate business models to increase productivity, and improve their efficiency through performance auditing and measurement (Steer et al, 2007). According to Hillier (2006) the freedom granted by Incorporation ‘led to a frenzy of activity’ (p.28), which included the appointment of business managers, the introduction of management information systems and franchise arrangements to expand provision, resulting in:

...cut-throat competition in setting fees, in creating attractive packages to woo students from one institution to another and in the range of the curriculum on offer. This expanded to take advantage of the funding mechanism, so that, providing any programme met the criteria for funding through Schedule 2 of the 1992 FHE Act, any college could ‘sell’ any learning opportunity to anybody! (2006:28)

Although it had been envisaged that the funding mechanism would encourage more planning to meet the needs of students, employers and the community, this was largely absent (Steer et al, 2007). Colleges were primarily driven by funding as the FEFC funding mechanism worked on the principle of driving down unit costs and expanding student numbers, which led to the ‘bums on seats’ strategy (Hillier, 2006). Colleges started to accommodate school-aged pupils, some of whom had been excluded from schools. Findings from a case study, undertaken by Attwood et al (2004) at a college (not identified) which offered provision to accommodate these pupils, suggested that although more
than 50% of these pupils benefited from the programme, a significant proportion had their places withdrawn following problems with behaviour or attendance. This programme was perceived as a ‘last chance’ for students and it had been necessary to ‘win tutors over’ (2004:16). Staff had not had special training or expertise in working with either this age-group - raising legal issues - or with young people who had statements of special educational needs or behaviour problems. Atwood et al, (2004) found that although staff were comfortable with working with students with learning difficulties, some teachers felt that dealing with behaviour issues was ‘not the remit of FE’ (p.116).

By the time New Labour came into government following the 1997 election, the sector was working across a range of partnerships with Training Enterprise Councils, employers, adult and community organisations, schools and higher education to the extent that the boundaries of the sector were blurring (Hillier, 2006). The green paper The Learning Age: A renaissance for a new Britain (1998) highlighted the importance that New Labour attached to lifelong learning and improving quality and standards. Two key themes were widening participation and the need to secure improvement in basic skills. To encourage widening participation, one of the government’s initiatives was to introduce financial support in the form of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA). This was piloted in September 1999 to encourage 16-19 year-olds from lower income families to remain in education by offering a £30 or £40 weekly allowance. This initiative was extended to include 16-18 year-olds deemed to be especially vulnerable to economic and social exclusion, and included homeless teenagers, teenage parents and young people with
special needs (Dobson et al, 2003). However, lack of attendance was cited by Ashworth et al (2002) for non-receipt of EMA and although the EMA had significantly increased participation in post-16 education, according to a number of studies (Ashworth et al, 2002; Knight & White, 2003; Dobson et al, 2003), recipients’ reasons for participation varied. Coffield et al (2007) found that some students said that they would have attended without the incentive, but Knight and White (2003) reported that whilst the EMA was enabling for some young people, others had been strongly influenced by the financial incentives: ‘This applied to young people who had no strong motivation to stay on’ (Knight & White 2003:2). Coffield et al (2007) also reported that some students did not qualify for the EMA, which caused resentment in student groups. This measure had been introduced to improve inclusion and yet it appeared to be divisive and only attracted some students because of the financial gains. Consequently, teaching staff not only had to deal with students who were questionably motivated, these students had low confidence and abilities, and their studies were often disrupted for various reasons including family problems and even court appearances (Edward et al, 2007).

The other key theme in The Learning Age (1998) green paper was the need to address and improve the nation’s literacy and numeracy skills. The Skills for Life strategy published in 2001 outlined spending targets and the introduction of the Adult Core Curriculum. This curriculum set standards and achievement levels for learners to attain Level 2, aligned to the level of performance for attainment of a GCSE. This policy was the government’s response to the Moser report, A Fresh Start – Improving Literacy and Numeracy (DfEE, 1999), which highlighted the disappointing findings of the
International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS), published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 1997. Findings of the IALS revealed that the UK ranked ninth against twelve of its competitors. It was argued that this illiteracy was costing business and government £10 billion annually (DfEE, 1999b). A significant amount of funding was allocated to implement the strategy through a number of initiatives including tutor training, the creation of national teaching resources, and the establishment of a national research and development centre (NRDC). However, Williams (2005) argued that since the Skills Strategy tended to focus on basic skills, ‘the problem here is not with teaching basic skills, but the fact that teaching anything beyond basic skills is called into question’ (2005:189). The Skills for Life initiative enabled substantial growth in the basic skills sector. This was one area which saw unprecedented levels of funding which according to Hamilton (2007) ‘does not just expand provision but raises the status of a field’ (p.252). Funding prompted the expansion of classes and new teaching appointments and yet, poor basic skills was still causing concern in the White paper 21st Century Skills: Realising our potential (DfES, 2003), and later in the Leitch Report, Prosperity for all in the global economy, where it was recommended that the ‘UK must raise its game’ in terms of the nation’s level of skills (HMSO, 2006:1).

In its mission to improve standards outlined in The Learning Age (1998), New Labour introduced the Learning and Skills Act in 2000, which replaced the Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) and the Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs) with a Learning and Skills Council (LSC). However, comparative research of four local LSC areas – two in the North-East and two
in London - undertaken by Hodgson et al (2005) during 2004 and 2005, suggested that although the LSC simplified funding streams, targets were ‘still set centrally and driven by accountability’ and failed ‘to meet the needs of some learners’ (Hodgson et al, 2005:50). In addition, according to Fletcher and Owen (2005), a funding gap existed, albeit unintentionally, between school sixth forms and the college sector. Schools were paid more for each qualification than colleges; they did not lose money if students dropped a subject; they received automatic funding for increased numbers and for the management of disadvantaged students. In addition, schools did not have to pay VAT. Fletcher and Owen argued that the gap had arisen because the LSC were given separate accounts for schools and colleges, which ‘appear[ed] to be planned without reference to each other’ (2005:1). Indeed, TES (2003) reported that colleges received £1,000 less per student taking three A-levels than sixth-form colleges and they were expected to teach more cheaply as funding for each student decreased by more than 10%.

The Learning and Skills Act 2000 also introduced the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI) to inspect training providers catering for students aged 19+. In addition, it extended the remit of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) to include provision of 16-19 year-old students and introduced publishable league tables measuring ‘value-added’ or ‘learning gain’. This drive for continually improving education also included teaching qualifications, outlined in the LSC’s quality improvement strategy. As a consequence, the Further Education National Training Organisation (FENTO) was established and compulsory teaching qualifications for all new FE teachers were introduced from September 2001 to meet agreed national standards. Prior to
this, although teaching qualifications were encouraged in colleges – such as 
the Certificate of Education, the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (which 
may or may not have an FE focus), and the City and Guilds 730 series – they 
were not compulsory especially for part-time staff, which was often the route 
into obtaining a full-time teaching post. The framework for the FENTO 
standards emerged from a competence-(NVQ)-model of initial teacher training 
explored by the Further Education Staff Development Forum (FESDF) drawing 
on the approach adopted in Scotland (Lucas, 2004). Although the intentions 
for this type of approach for England and Wales was abandoned as teachers 
wanted broad statements to allow for professional interpretation, there still 
remained a feeling of ‘technicisation of teaching’ (Avis et al, 2003) and 
concern that training courses mapped to FENTO standards did not 
accommodate the diverse cultures, traditions, diversity of student learning and 
professional practice in the FE sector (Lucas, 2002). Indeed, entry routes into 
teaching in FE were traditionally varied reflecting the diversity of the vocational 
and technical nature of the curriculum. As Robson (1998) notes, many 
teachers in FE perceived themselves as specialist practitioners who teach and 
have, ‘consistently prioritised their industrial or commercial experiences over, 
for instance, a teacher training qualification’ (p.589). As a consequence, 
many teachers did not necessarily see the need for teacher education (Lucas, 
2004), and were more concerned about their industrial and commercial 
credibility (Robson, 1998). Ironically, before incorporation, the ‘Silver Book’ 
agreement was introduced to attract occupational experts to teach in the 
sector and without this industrial expertise, these practitioners would not have 
obtained a teaching job in FE. This national contract was dismantled in 1993 
and without a nationally agreed contract, colleges made economies around
staff pay and conditions including teaching and contact hours, term-time only contracts, and temporary contracts (TES, 2003) leading to ‘an increasingly casualized and deprofessionalised FE sector’, (Shain & Gleeson, 1999:450). According to Hillier (2006) more than half of the teachers working in the sector were part-time by 1995-6 and Young et al. (1995) claimed that this increased use of part-time staff to reduce staffing costs caused a blurring of roles between teachers and support staff. Significantly, although the use of support staff employed in compulsory education was actively promoted by the government, it raised debate about the potential threat to the professionalism of teachers. However, according to Bailey and Robson (2004) the creation of ‘para-teaching’ posts in the FE sector appeared to have gone ‘unnoticed by commentators and experts in the field’ (2004:374). Accordingly, there was no measuring or monitoring of the development of these posts by official bodies, which was not the case for the compulsory sector. Bailey and Robson suggest that this lack of attention:

… might be explained by the greater political salience of schools, the weakness of trade unions and professional associations in FE and by the lack of official interest in educational changes in this sector, (2004:391).

As Spours et al., (2007) note, whilst it was recognised that FE was important for the success of younger and adult students, the teaching staff had less favourable terms and conditions than their colleagues working in compulsory education.

In 2001, the Learning and Skills Sector (LSS) was formed which brought together post-16 (and increasingly post-14) education and training. This included FE and sixth-form colleges, adult and community education, work-
based learning but not higher education and schools. This was followed by the *Success for All* programme introduced 2002 with the promise of considerable additional funding, which Besley (2003) argues was a genuine attempt by the Labour government to re-invent the sector (in Hillier, 2006). The programme outlined four aims. The first, 'meeting needs and improving choice' necessitated each LSC undertaking Strategic Area Reviews (StARs) of regional provision. The second aim, 'putting teaching, training and learning at the heart of what we do', saw the establishment of the Standards Unit to foster good practice and to create teaching materials. The third aim, 'developing the leaders, teachers, lecturers, trainers and support staff of the future' followed recommendations for a different qualification structure and the need to ensure that by 2005/06 'the vast majority of full-time and a majority of part-time college teachers and lecturers should be appropriately qualified' (2002:12). The last aim, 'developing a framework for quality and success', introduced block funding rather than the annual funding mechanism (DfES, 2002). This change to the funding mechanism appeared to acknowledge the difficulty for providers in planning longer term due to the system of annual finding agreements. Consequently, three-year funding arrangements were proposed, subject to an agreed development plan with improvement targets, between a provider and their local LSC. The funding was linked to performance management, whereby higher rates of funding would be allocated to providers delivering the targets. However, as Steer *et al.*, (2007) found, funding continued to be allocated annually so the greater sense of stability failed to materialise. In addition, providers, who persistently under-performed, received a lower rate of funding. This contributed to instability and uncertainty within the sector; Spours *et al.*, (2007) reported closure of courses and subsequent
staff dismissal following their study of four FE colleges in London and the North East. Senior managers, who participated in their study, also complained that LSC policy was highly directive and unstable due to changes in national priorities. Targets, funding and inspection became closely related and increased accountability. The ensuing paperwork ‘multiplied as staff had to cope with the bureaucratic demands of meeting the targets as well as those for funding and inspection’, (Spours et al, 2007:197). According to Coffield et al, (2007) this increased workload prompted ‘underground working’, whereby staff routinely worked in their free time above their contracted hours and engaged in tasks well beyond the remit of their job descriptions to meet demands. Furthermore, the emphasis on funding and targets was found to impact detrimentally on students’ best interests. Spours et al, (2007) reported incidents of students being persuaded onto low-recruitment courses, potentially leading to student attrition or disruptive behaviour due to lack of commitment and motivation.

The inspection policy lever was viewed most positively with senior managers as ‘it galvanised staff to focus on teaching and learning’, (Spours et al, 2007:198). However, teachers associated them with stress and findings from a study undertaken by Jephcote et al, (2008), examining the experiences of twenty-seven teachers working in three colleges in South Wales, suggested that inspections and data gathering for audit ‘detract[ed] them from what they saw as their core roles in teaching and supporting learning’ (2008:169).

McDonald and Lucas (2001) examined the impact of incorporation and the funding mechanisms of the FEFC on 14 colleges across England during the
period 1996-97. The impact of the policy levers on staff was reported as a ‘growing burden’ through the ‘intense scrutiny, the inordinate time spent on audit, mounting demands for evidence resulting in huge increases in paperwork’ culminating in the loss of experienced staff, high sickness and absenteeism rates (2001:220). The general feeling was that:

…educational purposes were getting lost behind the ever increasing emphasis upon data generation… the information flow tended to be only one way … the funding council did not feed back useful information, (McDonald & Lucas, 2001:217).

Teaching group sizes had increased, putting a strain on facilities and space for practical workshops and some of the colleges reported negative effects on health and safety, syllabus coverage and the management of practical sessions. There was also criticism about the ‘heavy emphasis upon retention and achievement’ (McDonald and Lucas, 2001:217) which often contradicted the widening participation agenda. Colleges started selecting more able students to meet targets since the system for measuring achievement and student retention did not allow for partial achievement. If students left courses to take up full-time work, it was registered as an educational failure. Students were gradually seen as commodities because of the funding they attracted. As Finlay and Finnie argued, these values ‘are set in a discourse of free market principles… They certainly do not reflect the values of identifying and meeting learner needs’ (2002:154).

This conflict of ideological differences was evidenced in a case study of a creative arts department (unspecified college), undertaken by Elliot (1996). Teachers not only claimed that managers lacked sufficient understanding of the courses, teaching and the associated resources required but also that the
top-down style of management undervalued student teaching and created unnecessary hierarchal college structures which alienated staff who thought of themselves as ‘professionals’.

Power (1994) argued that an auditing model was necessary to deal with the contradictions arising from both the centralising and decentralising characteristics of educational reform since;

…one the one hand there is the need to extend a traditional hierarchical command in order to maintain existing structures of authority; on the other the need to cope with the failure of this style of control, as it generates risks which are increasingly hard to specify and control, (1994, in Scott et al, 2001:3).

However, as Scott et al (2001) argued this:

…facilitated a shift in trust from operatives, the performers of activities, to auditors, those who police performance. Operatives are no longer to be trusted to do their jobs correctly, efficiently, effectively and indeed ethically, but auditors are trusted to ensure that all this occurs. The audit as it is currently conceived comes to shape the activities it is meant merely to oversee, (2001:3).

Auditing and thus accountability did not present professionals ‘as active partners who have much to contribute to the improvements of public services’, (Steer et al, 2007:188) and eroded teachers’ sense of professionalism (Scott et al, 2001). Robson (1998) defines professionalism in the post-compulsory sector as autonomy, professional knowledge and responsibility, and argued that the reduction of teacher autonomy was the main cause for concern. She cites the work of Ainley and Bailey (1997) wherein a teacher in their study:

…speaks of feeling invaded by management who cannot, it seems to her, trust her now to do the simplest thing well. She (and others in the study) feel de-professionalised by this loss of autonomy, (Robson, 1998:600).
In addition, Shain & Gleeson (1999) argued that teachers’ professional values of services to the community (the altruistic motives for becoming a teacher outlined in the last chapter) were being challenged since the definition of quality changed from being the process of teaching to one based on outcomes measured through performance indicators and targets. It is not difficult to see how the ‘bums on seats’ strategy would create conflict between a teacher’s responsibility to the students and to the institution.

Research into the employment experience of 687 full-time post-compulsory teachers through postal questionnaires undertaken by Hill (2000) suggested that:

… unlike the picture nationally for the UK workforce, full-time lecturers in further education colleges may be experiencing a violated psychological contract with the consequences for their employment relationship of loss of trust and a significant, depressing effect on commitment, job satisfaction and work performance, (2000:67).

This is perhaps not surprising if the findings of the research reviewed are mapped to Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959). Many of the consequences arising from incorporation and marketization relate to the hygiene factors and undermine the needs outlined by Deci & Ryan (1985) for continued motivation. Teacher autonomy was threatened by company policies, in this case the new management culture driven by increasing student numbers to attract funding. The auditing and accountability model resulted in more on-the-job supervision, through internal and external inspections, and funding implications created poorer working conditions and salaries. Writing in 1999, Shain and Gleeson found that growing casualization and the threat of redundancy became ‘integral features of
college life’ (p.451). A climate which according to Bourdieu:

…prevents all rational anticipation and, in particular, the basic belief and hope in the future that one needs in order to rebel, especially collectively, against present conditions, even the most intolerable, (1998:82).

However, according to Shain and Gleeson (1999), teachers responded in one of three ways: resistance, compliance and strategic compliance to the challenges to professionalism and work practices and argued that: ‘patterns of deprofessionalisation go hand in hand with patterns of reconstruction’ (1999:445). If this is the case, arguably new teachers to the sector would hold different notions about professional autonomy from their predecessors since the imposed changes would have already been embedded in teaching practice and the work environment. Thus issues arising from tensions between pre-incorporation and post-incorporation practices would be absent.

Although at the conception of this PhD study little research had been undertaken in this area, there were a few studies, which had investigated the experiences of trainees during their teaching placements, that were useful for identifying what might be important to these new professionals preparing to enter the sector a decade after Incorporation. The following section will review these studies and also present findings from the re-interrogation of the qualitative data collected for my MA.

2.2 Trainee Teachers’ Perspectives

McKelvey and Andrews (1998) interviewed 14 students - eight were female and six were male ranging in age from 25 -57- who were undertaking a FE PGCE initial teacher training course for academic and vocational teaching.
These students had college placements, either in London or the South-East, and were interviewed periodically during their course. Significantly, the students ‘thought that the pressure which they saw lecturers working under was part of ‘normal working life’ and ‘were comfortable about working in a context where issues of quality control, accountability and the pursuit of efficiency were central’, yet, ‘there was enormous frustration with the “inefficiency” and “clumsiness” of management and administrative systems’ (McKelvey & Andrews 1998:363). They also thought the funding methodology was ‘bizarre in its complexity’ (p.363). Other findings included the lack of job security. Prior to the college placements, participants said ‘they hoped to get full-time work but most did not expect to’ (p.361). At the end of the study, none had gained permanent or full-time posts and seemed to accept that they would need to be flexible about work opportunities.

The trainees’ feelings of satisfaction about teaching had been ‘strikingly enthusiastic’ before their contact with the colleges and increased after the placements (McKelvey & Andrews 1998:361). However, ‘nearly all students were shocked when they first went into colleges about low levels of lecturer morale’ (p.362) and they were critical of the conflict of cultures between some managers and lecturers, which McKelvey and Andrews described as ‘a conflict between “professionalism” and “managerialism”, between a pedagogic culture and managerialist culture’ (p.364). Many of the trainees had experience of management in the private sector and found the FE management style ‘very old-fashioned’ and ‘hard’ (p.365). They also felt that some of the lecturers ‘seemed ill-prepared for the changes in FE’, believed that some vocational lecturers needed their own skills updating and were surprised at the lack of
systematic staff development (p.364). In conclusion, this research study suggests that:

The main concern of trainee lecturers was to be able to do a socially useful job for realistic remuneration and in a work environment which offered them the resources to be able to do it well. They were not as hostile to cost cutting, efficiency changes in FE and did not perceive conditions as poor except in regard to resourcing and management but feared that further pressure might make the work much more difficult, (McKelvey & Andrews 1998:366).

A later study with a larger cohort was undertaken by Wallace (2002). Based on personal accounts of 41 trainees studying full-time, the investigation focused on the effectiveness of the Postgraduate Certificate in Education and Training (PGCET) in preparing teacher trainees for their new careers. The accounts reflected the trainees' observations and reflections of their college placements, which involved 18 colleges in the south of England. Wallace's findings were grouped into three main themes: students, FE staff and college infrastructure. The diaries of 23 females and 18 males, ranging in age between 23 and 47, evidenced a 'growing disillusion' with the trainees' initial assumptions that they would be teaching 'willing students' who 'want to be there' (Wallace, 2002:82), as opposed to school pupils who have to be there. Poor attendance and low level of punctuality was noted, in addition to failure of students to complete classroom tasks and coursework. Trainees were also surprised by students' negative classroom behaviour and their ability, which included low standards of spelling and grammar, low concentration and comprehension levels and the 'degree to which students need to be spoon-fed' (Wallace, 2002:84).
The trainees recorded surprise about the teachers’ workload, their high tolerance of inappropriate student behaviour and the low expectations these teachers had of their students. Many trainees reflected that much of this could be linked to funding: ‘students may well be aware and therefore take advantage of the fact that lecturers feel their scope for classroom management is hobbled in this way’ (Wallace, 2002:85). Another recurring observation was the ‘polarity between managers and teachers’ (p.86).

Wallace described the trainees’ expectations prior to their placement as ‘reasonable, even modest’, with regards to student co-operation and the expectation that students would be capable of the level of work demanded of them; that most lecturers would expect and require such behaviour, and that the major objective of the lecturers and students would be student achievement of the learning outcomes (2002:87). However, the diaries suggested that the students did not appear capable of meeting the demands of the course and were unwilling to co-operate; the prevailing standards of behaviour were detrimental to learning and to teacher-student relationships; most teachers appeared resigned to and unwilling to challenge this behaviour; and student learning was not always a central concern. However, like the findings of the McKelvey and Andrews’ study (1998), the trainees still recorded positive feelings about teaching. One such trainee wrote:

I believe the placement has been invaluable in my development, and although it has introduced me to the internal squabbling and dissatisfactions within FE it has also whet my appetite for teaching and proved to me that teachers can make a positive difference, (in Wallace 2002:86).

This positive view of teaching was also found in a research study of three cohorts of trainee teachers following their college placements in the East
Midlands (Wallis, 2007). Data was collected from 127 trainees over a period of three years (2003 -2006) through class discussions during their one-year course. Findings from this study also suggested that students in the colleges were not capable of the level of work demanded of them. In addition, the trainees reported that in order to create full-time programmes, students were being 'guided' into courses, for which they had neither expressed initial interest nor the necessary skills or knowledge. Lack of time also became an issue which was often hindered by class sizes. There were also reports of disruptive students who were often pressurised into attending college by families or state agencies. In addition, the Educational Maintenance Allowance (EMA) was found to be an area of conflict, not only in terms of student motivation as some students were inclined to do the absolute minimum, but the mechanism also created some prejudice between students who did not receive the support and those who did, replicating the findings by Coffield et al (2007) outlined earlier.

Other issues which were raised included the key skills curriculum. In the trainees’ experiences although some students’ skills were insufficiently developed, often the work was resisted if there was no perceived relevance by the individuals concerned. The question of relevance was also observed in the main curriculum whereupon student motivation for undertaking areas of learning was often dependent on the assessment. Some trainees also felt that this extended to their teaching:

You couldn’t recognise a really interesting point of learning and pursue it because of the pressure to concentrate on the core business of totting up “relevant” learning, (in Wallis 2007:16).
This relationship between motivation and relevance was discussed by the trainees in the context of teaching practices, and questions were raised about the appropriateness of applying adult learning theory given the behaviours, motivation and ability of the adolescent students – an issue raised in a study by Harkin et al. (2003) during an investigation of perceptions of initial teacher training courses.

However, one area which appeared to break with findings from all the studies reviewed so far was the basic skills and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) provision. In the study by Wallis (2007) trainees working in this area had very positive experiences: students had high levels of motivation, excellent commitment and it was possible to use adult learning strategies. However, there were still frustrations in terms of the inadequate time frames for student achievement.

Trainees also discussed the professional role of teachers and clearly believed that the staff they had encountered were desirable role models. However, the trainees pointed to some areas where teachers’ professionalism appeared to be undermined. This was especially the case with part-time teachers who worked beyond their contract and attended staff meetings in their own time supporting Coffield et al’s (2007) findings of underground working. Other indicators included the perceived demands of examination boards and external institutions. The trainees also noted that the teachers tended to hold themselves personally responsible for matters which were beyond their control such as exam results, student under-performance, overall college assessment and even the state of the classrooms.
The FE teacher’s professional role was also explored by Bathmaker and Avis (2005) using case studies of two female trainee lecturers who worked with students in the 16-19 age range on low level courses (below Level 3) during their college placements, which, like the study by Wallis (2007), was undertaken in the Midlands. These trainees also reported low motivation, poor attendance and unwillingness of students, in addition to finding that assessment dominated teaching. However, unlike the accounts describing experienced staff above, these trainees did not hold themselves responsible for problems outside of their control. Indeed, Bathmaker and Avis (2005) reported that one of the trainees, demoralised by student behaviour, responded by distancing herself from them. She acknowledged that recruitment and retention had a negative effect on teaching and learning, and blamed the students for these problems, arguing that she and other colleagues were not trained to teach these disaffected students. This trainee’s account also described the teachers at her placement as ‘the miserablest [sic] bunch of people I’ve ever met’ (2005:520), which contrasts sharply to the desirable role models described by the trainees interviewed by Wallis (2007) but shares similarities with the findings of McKelvey and Andrews (1998) and Wallace (2002).

The focus of this research by Bathmaker and Avis (2005) was the development of teachers’ professional identity, and the findings suggested that trainees’ identities are constructed and reconstructed through engagement with their work, the students and FE culture. This finding would appear to reflect notions of compliance in relation to professionalism presented by Shain and Gleeson (1999). The two trainees who participated in the study, both
struggled with their imagined teaching identity, which was based on their own experiences as learners and involved respect and support. However, the role they found themselves adopting was one which they associated with school teachers (Bathmaker & Avis, 2005).

For my MA study (Matthews, 2003), six participants (two male and four female) were recruited from a full-time student cohort who had just completed their training. Data was collected from focus groups and reflective essays, which had been an element of the summative assessment for their training. Based on their experiences of the work-placement element of the course, four out of the six participants were already considering taking part-time work rather than full-time due to the workload. This workload was described by participants as planning the lessons, getting up to speed with the syllabus, marking, form-filling and monitoring students. Supporting findings from the studies outlined, participants for my study also indicated that students’ behaviour in the colleges had been challenging and generating participation had been problematic. Participants also registered concern about poor attendance and felt that students were often pressurised into attending college, consistent with the findings of Wallace (2002) and Wallis (2007). In addition, they also observed the tolerance exercised by existing teachers:

Learners frequently talked loudly over her as she [another teacher] taught, walked out without warning or, in the case of one student, often lay on the floor with a book on her head… I would not be happy to accept the level of antisocial behaviour which characterised the group, (Essay from Participant A2, page 7, July 2003: Matthews: unpublished).

During the focus groups, participants discussed the tension between notions of being a facilitator, rather than a ‘school teacher’ and the reality of the
They were dismayed about the lack of students’ basic knowledge and skills for the level of courses that they were undertaking:

When, for primarily commercial reasons, entry qualifications to an ‘A’ level course are ignored, classes become characterised by massive discrepancies in ability and motivation, (Essay from Participant A6, page 6, July 2003: Matthews: unpublished).

These findings reflect the changing character of the student body through New Labour’s Welfare to Work agenda and the initiatives resulting from the Learning Age (1998) document. However, the effect of these initiatives has clearly challenged any pre-conceived notions about students’ motivations for continuing to advanced-level study; a finding supported by the study by Butcher (2003) conducted with trainees training on an 11-18 secondary PGCE course.

Since the essays were part of the assessment for the participants' training course, the actual teaching process was discussed, and in these documents, lack of teacher autonomy in relation to teaching practice was a recurring theme. Participants complained that although they were given responsibility for planning sessions for students, the teaching method was almost entirely resource-based learning using centre-produced materials. Attempts to abandon plans in an attempt to meet individual needs were frowned upon. This issue was neither highlighted in any of the research studies concerned with new trainees’ perceptions of FE cited, nor did it surface in the focus groups, yet the essays revealed that participants felt that being able to design their own materials was important to the learning process and for engaging students.
Another concern which participants felt impacted on teacher autonomy was insufficient time to deliver the syllabus; a problem which was apparently obvious to students as well as the experienced teachers. Although there was an exception, the general consensus was that the syllabus was restricting. This was especially pertinent when teaching basic skills as it was felt that the Core Curriculum had resulted in a narrowing of approach as funding appeared to depend on students working to a level of skills detailed in the curriculum rather than in their own way.

Participants appeared to prefer the idea of working alongside colleagues doing the same work. Indeed, some of the participants admitted to being scared and ‘petrified’ about working on their own:

> The idea of going into a college and doing a subject that is only taught by you because it’s a specialist subject and there’s no-one else to discuss anything with is such a responsibility, (Participant A4 during focus group held on 11 August 2003: Matthews, unpublished).

However, there seemed to be a pay-off between autonomy and working in teams:

> It’s a bit daunting … but there are two sides to every coin – on the one hand I quite like the autonomy. I like the challenge but on the other hand there’s an element of trepidation and gut fear, (Participant A6 during focus group held on 11 August 2003: Matthews, unpublished).

Class size was also an issue with participants arguing that this might be related to student engagement and participation. Participants recounted incidents when they had to teach classes that were twice the size that they had been expecting due to having to take new students or accommodate another class at the same time. Two participants also complained of insufficient equipment such as the lack of photocopiers and an insufficient number of computers for IT sessions.
Two participants had already secured a teaching post but were not oblivious to the pressure of performance indicators and potential consequences:

The onus is on you to produce grades that count, (Participant A5, Matthews 2003:46)

...at the end of the year if it’s all gone belly-up then I don’t expect to escape the responsibility, (Participant A6 in focus group undertaken on 11 August 2003: Matthews, unpublished).

In spite of this, there was evidence of the service to the community values identified by Shain and Gleeson (1999): ‘If you don’t get it right, it’s the students that suffer, (Participant A4: Matthews, 2003: 46).

The re-interrogation of the data collected for my MA suggested that the participants did not appear concerned with auditing and accountability measures, which contributed to perceptions of de-professionalism experienced by the ‘old timers’ (Shain & Gleeson, 1999). In all the studies reviewed pertaining to the perceptions of trainees, the tension between teacher motivation and the ‘issue of control’, as defined by Scott et al, (2001) appeared to centre on factors directly related to the actual teaching practice. Issues raised tended to be related to their autonomy in the classroom, the characteristics of the students and college facilities. In terms of Dörnyei’s model (2001), inhibition of teacher autonomy through set curricula, standardised tests and imposed teaching methods appear to be more of an issue than government mandated policies and other institutional constraints. Given that NQTs have not experienced the changes to the sector, this, in my opinion, was not a surprise. However, this difference may also be due to the trainees' preoccupation with their own sense of efficacy – teaching and personal (Ashton, 1985, in Dörnyei, 2001) – at this stage of their careers. In
addition, their observations were experienced from the relative safety of a teaching placement as opposed to being employed and thus, having the full responsibilities of a teaching post. It is this next stage of their careers that this study focused on.
Chapter Three

Methodology

There is no room for simplistic approaches to such complex issues as motivation
(Williams, 1994, in Dörnyei, 2001:186)

The idea for this study stems from my initial experiences of teaching teacher trainees undertaking a FENTO recognised teaching qualification for the sector. The module I convened followed the trainees’ 12-week block teaching placements and the experiences they described afterwards suggested that for many teaching in post-compulsory education was very different to what they had expected; some trainees were already expressing doubts about a teaching career in the long-term and others were uncertain that they would even apply for a post after they completed the course. In light of these concerns, the qualitative data collected for my MA project was re-interrogated with a different research question, namely what were the demotivators for NQTs? This process formed the first phase of this PhD study. Since I had adopted a grounded theory approach, the re-interrogation of existing data was not an issue; indeed in this tradition it is expected (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Having identified the nature of the demotivators, I wanted to measure the extent of these demotivators with a much larger sample to investigate the effect on continued motivation for remaining in teaching.
However, there are inherent problems with conducting research into motivation as the opening quote to this chapter implies and Dörnyei (2001) argues that simple measures and one-off examinations are unsuitable for such a multifaceted concept. Consequently, a mixed method approach seemed appropriate for this study. Phase 1 was inductively driven, adopting a grounded theory approach, through the re-interrogation of the qualitative data, originally collected using focus groups and content analysis of reflective essays written for the summative assessment of the training course. Phase 2 assumed a deductive approach and a quantitative method to measure prevalence and data was collected through a self-administered survey. By adopting a quantitative approach for the second phase, I was able to test the extensiveness of the findings from the first qualitative phase. However, in addition to closed questions, the survey instrument also included opportunities for open comments. It was hoped that these sections would not only illuminate the findings of the quantitative data but also provide additional demotivators, which had not been considered.

Although works adopting the use of grounded theory tend to concentrate on qualitative data collection (Charmaz, 2006), it can involve testing ideas as well as generating them (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Indeed, Glaser has maintained that the grounded theory method can use both quantitative and qualitative data (in Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Since grounded theory is an iterative process, adapting both the question and the data collection method to test the findings is acceptable and the combination of qualitative research followed by a quantitative large scale survey is a common design in mixed method research (Brannen, 2005). Mixing methods ‘has come to be seen as a good
thing’ according to Mason (2006:3) justifying her observation based on perceptions of research funders’ preferences for proposals using more than one method for generating and analysing data. Proponents of mixed research argue that combining and integrating methodological approaches is important and useful, resulting in more superior research compared to that of mono-method research. However, although mixing methods might be seen as a means to offset shortcomings of using a mono-method approach, it also raises a number of issues. These issues pertain to the appropriateness of mixing methods which are normally associated with different paradigms (positivist and constructivist/interpretivist) and are therefore linked to different paradigmatic assumptions. Consequently, researchers need ‘to clarify just what is being mixed and how it is being mixed’ (Bazeley, 2002:2) as ‘mixing methods for no good reason other than the sake of it can produce disjointed and unfocussed research’ (Mason, 2006:3). Elements of the research process, including the type of investigation and the logic employed (deductive or inductive), the type of data collected (numerical or textual), the method of analysis (interpretive or statistical) and approaches to explanation, need to be considered carefully. The aim of this chapter is to provide an account of what was done and why for this doctoral investigation, addressing methodological considerations.
3.1 Rationale for Mixing Methods

Since theories of motivation are derived from various psychological disciplines, it is perhaps not surprising that motivational studies have adopted positivist and interpretive approaches. Rogers, a proponent of subjective methodology cites scientific experiments with sea urchins to justify his belief that all humans have an innate tendency to self-actualise (1980:117-123). This scientific approach tends to attract the sense of authority which is afforded by society through the quantitative reliability and objectivity of empirical methodology (Benton & Craib, 2001). According to Ballard (1997), the positivist tradition has two fundamental features: the first acknowledges the importance of value-free, objective scientific data for making knowledge claims; the second, a legacy from functionalist thought, emphasises the positive aspect of social structures as opposed to the negative, in that, ‘the use of positivism would illuminate the ‘goodness’” (1997:92). Historically, positivism is linked to the quantitative paradigm. Paradigms are:

… a patterned set of assumptions concerning reality (ontology), knowledge of that reality (epistemology) and the particular ways of knowing that reality (methodology), (Guba, 1990 in Sale et al, 2002:44).

The quantitative paradigm assumes that knowledge claims can be tested by experience or through observation. Knowledge is objective and is based on the premise that there is only one truth. Thus, research designs measure, and analyse cause and effect based on deduction using methods to survey representative samples to effect generalisations. However, quantitative findings cannot provide the depth and insights afforded by qualitative data and
since motivation is an abstract term:

It is therefore *not* subject to direct observation but must be inferred…
This means that there are *no* objective measures of motivation,
(Dörmey 2001:185).

Intrinsic motivation suggests inclusion of the emotions but there is a lack of
agreement about this. Opinions are diverse: the emotions are a form of
motivation; different to motivation; subjective feelings or the result of bodily
changes (Murray, 1964). Sexual arousal and extreme negative emotions,
such as anger and fear, will cause bodily changes which can be measured,
but critics argue that it is difficult to measure the state of happiness (Cardwell
*et al*, 1996). In addition, motivation is time and context dependent and
therefore can change (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002:245).

The research studies cited in the last chapter focusing on teacher trainees
employed an interpretive approach by using qualitative methods for collecting
Wallace’s study was based on personal accounts of 41 teacher trainees
(2002); Wallis (2007) conducted his research through class discussions with
127 trainees (2007); and, Bathmaker and Avis (2005) used a case study
method with two trainee teachers. These qualitative methods are associated
with interpretivism or constructivism with an emphasis on subjectivity, multiple
realities and multiple truths. This qualitative paradigm assumes that we
understand a shared culture so that if a participant expresses pleasure or
anxiety we can empathise, drawing on our own emotional experience to
recognise that state. Research is focused on process and meanings, using
techniques such as in-depth interviews, to elicit rich descriptive data from
small purposeful samples. Adopting qualitative techniques is useful for
describing complex phenomena in local contexts but since it is used for
studying limited cases, data may be unique to the participants in the study and
is not saturated, meaning that the data cannot be generalised to the
population (although some qualitative researchers would argue that sample
size is not the issue as saturation of the phenomenon could be achieved when
no new ideas or themes emerge from the data). In the studies outlined above,
the samples were relatively small and participants were only drawn from
selected regions (London and the South-East, and the Midlands). Therefore,

as Cohen et al argue:

> Just as positivistic theories can be criticised for their macro-sociological
> persuasion, so interpretive and qualitative can be criticised for their

It could be argued that due to the limited representation, the findings from
those qualitative studies were regional rather than national concerns. This
criticism can also be said for the findings of the first phase of my study, since
the data was also qualitative and the sample population was from the
Midlands.

In the study of the Tibetan student teachers, discussed in Chapter One, Su et
al (2003) adopted both qualitative and quantitative methods which enabled the
study of both the micro- and macro-phenomena. Indeed, Dörnyei (2001)
advises the use of qualitative and quantitative methods to address the
challenges posed by the nature of motivation, and according to Creswell et al,
2003, researchers mixing methods argue that the strength behind the
approach is being able to offset problems associated with a mono-method
strategy. Mixed methods research (also called mixed research, multi-
methods, multi-strategy, mixed methodology) is becoming a recognised
approach, alongside that of qualitative and quantitative research, with its own research paradigm (Johnson et al, 2007; Cresswell & Tashakkori, 2007). However, although mixing methods might be seen as a viable alternative, mixed methodology is complex. The appropriateness of mixing methods, the reason for mixing, the diversity in the actual ‘mixing’ and even whether researchers using the method recognise the paradigm for this approach, seem to be subject for debate within the mixed methods community. Consequently, for the reader to comprehend my approach and to situate this study within the literature, an overview of the different perspectives and the debates surrounding this approach follows.

3.2 Review of Mixed Method Approaches

…generally speaking, [mixed method research is] an approach to knowledge (theory and practice) that attempts to consider multiple viewpoints, perspectives, positions and standpoints (always including the standpoints of qualitative and quantitative research), (Johnson et al 2007:113).

A review of the literature would suggest that there are predominantly two types of approach for combining qualitative and quantitative methods:

… mixed methods as a collection and analysis of two types of data (qualitative and quantitative) and mixed methods as the integration of two approaches to research (qualitative and quantitative), (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007:3).

The first approach dates back to the late 1950s when researchers used more than one method for validation purposes. This practice was developed later to include triangulation.
Greene, Caracelli and Graham identified mixed method designs as ‘those that include at least one quantitative method (designed to collect numbers) and one qualitative method (designed to collect words)’, (1989:256). The dominance of each method can vary: the qualitative and quantitative method for collecting data can be of equivalent status (the two methods are used equally), or be of dominant-less dominant status. In the latter, a smaller component of the other method is used. In these designs, data tends to be collected and analysed separately but findings are integrated in the discussion or conclusion (Creswell et al, 2003). The mixing can be undertaken in a variety of ways:

- Two types of research questions (with qualitative and quantitative approaches)
- The manner in which the research questions are developed (participatory vs. pre-planned)
- Two types of sampling procedures (eg. probability and purposive)
- Two types of data collection (focus groups and surveys)
- Two types of data (eg. numerical and textual)
- Two types of data analysis (statistical and thematic) and
- Two types of conclusions (‘objective’ and ‘subjective’)

(from Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007).

Rationales for mixed method studies have been identified by Greene, Caracelli and Graham (1989) as:

(a) Triangulation (ie. seeking convergence and corroboration of results from different methods studying the same phenomenon);
(b) Complementarity; (ie. seeking elaboration, enhancement, illustration, clarification of the results from one method with results from the other)
(c) Development (ie. using the results from one method to help inform the other method
(d) Initiation (ie. discovering paradoxes and contradictions that lead to reframing of the research question)
(e) Expansion (ie. seeking to expand the breadth and range of inquiry by using different methods for different inquiry components).

(taken from Johnson et al, 2007:115).
The adoption of methods from both qualitative and quantitative approaches has its advantages: both paradigms have been used for years; funding agencies have supported research from both paradigms; both paradigms have influenced policy; and so much has been learned and taught, (Datta, 1994 in Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998:11). Researchers can use methods to complement each other so that the strengths of a method are used to enhance the other and combining the two approaches can enable triangulation or cross-validation, which offers an opportunity for a more complete understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Denzin, 1978, in Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

Denzin (1978) identified four types of triangulation: data triangulation, investigator triangulation, theory triangulation, and methodological triangulation, which includes within-methods and between-methods (1978, in Johnson et al, 2007). Within-methods triangulation refers to the use of multiple methods of the same paradigmatic approach and between-methods triangulation employs both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Denzin argues, that since within-methods triangulation uses methods associated with the same paradigmatic approach, triangulation will be of limited value.

However, Sale et al (2002) point out that there is a slight difference between the triangulation rationale and that of complementarity. Combining methods to enable triangulation implies that the two are interdependent, whereas the complementarity rationale suggests independence. These writers recommend that mixed methods research should be used for complementarity but not for triangulation since qualitative and quantitative paradigms do not study the
same phenomena. They argue that although both paradigms ‘may use common labels to refer to phenomena, what the labels refer to is not the same,’ (Sale *et al.*, 2002:48). For example, a label to a quantitative researcher refers to an external referent but to a qualitative researcher this would be a personal interpretation or meaning:

Loss of information is a particular risk when attempts are made to unite results from the two paradigms because it often promotes the selective search for similarities in data, (Sale *et al.*, 2002:49).

Indeed, findings from the re-interrogation of the qualitative data for this doctoral study illustrate the implications of this point. One of the recurring themes was the abilities of the students for their course of study. The participants who were teaching academic subjects (history, English) voiced disappointment about the students’ levels of literacy. Given that students were expected to write essays in these subjects, the lack of good writing skills was a problem for the participants concerned. However, participants, who taught basic skills had low expectations of their students’ abilities in this regard and so this was not seen as a problem. Since the first phase was purely qualitative, these differences in the findings were explained. However, the findings might have been distorted had this phase adopted a purely quantitative approach. Consequently, based on this insight my rationale for mixing methods is not for triangulation, but rather for complementarity. Indeed, according to Bazeley (2002), Denzin later abandoned the notion of triangulation as a tool for validity and instead suggested that mixed methods can be employed to overcome biases prevalent in mono-methodologies in an effort to seek in-depth understanding.
Although for Sale et al. (2002) the ontological and epistemological differences between the two approaches are ‘incommensurate’ (2002:50), this view is not shared by some writers who advocate combining and integrating both qualitative and quantitative methodology and methods across *all or various* stages of the research process (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1999). The key concept with this approach to mixing is ‘integration’:

Integration can be confined as the combination of quantitative and qualitative research within a given stage of inquiry. For example, integration might occur with research questions, within data collection (e.g. open-ended questions on a structured instrument), within data analysis (e.g. transforming themes into quantitative items or scales) or interpretation (e.g. examining the quantitative and qualitative results for convergence of findings), (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, in Creswell et al., 2003:220).

This perspective advances mixed method research beyond method to include the process of research and the philosophical assumptions and values that researchers bring to their work. However, critics question whether integrating qualitative and quantitative research is possible since these approaches are associated with two different paradigms which are incompatible with each other:

The quantitative-qualitative dogma (or ‘Incompatibility Thesis’, Howe, 1988, 2003) holds that quantitative and qualitative methods are incompatible with one another such that they may be combined ‘disjunctively’ but not ‘conjunctively’, (Howe, 2009:428).

The ‘Incompatibility Thesis’, has been developed to include another two dogmas; the fact-value dogma, which draws on the dichotomy of fact and value; and the empirical science-humanities dogma, which relates to the divide between science-orientated and humanities-orientated researchers (Howe, 2009). These dogmas highlight the divisions between the two major paradigms in the social and behavioural sciences, which have been at the root
of the quantitative-qualitative debate or ‘paradigm wars’ over the last three decades (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Consequently, Symonds & Gorard (2010) argue that:

…far from freeing researchers from the restrictions of paradigms and the strife of paradigmatic struggle, mixed methods can actually reinforce the binary positioning, (2010:133).

According to Rossman and Wilson (1985), there are three schools of thought regarding the compatibility of qualitative and quantitative approaches, which have arisen from the paradigm wars; purists, situationalists and pragmatists (in Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). Purists take the view that the two cannot and should not be mixed and therefore support mono-method approaches. Situationalists perpetuate the purist stance but concede that both methods have merit and each is more appropriate for certain research questions to the extent that they can be regarded as complementary to each other. Finally, there are the pragmatists, who advocate integrating methods. This perspective has given rise to pragmatism as the foundation of mixed method research. According to Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) the pragmatist paradigm can be described as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Uses both qualitative and quantitative methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Both inductive and deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Both objective and subjective points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axiology</td>
<td>Values play a large role in interpreting results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Accept external reality. Choose explanations that best produce desired outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal linkages</td>
<td>There may be causal relationships but we will never be able to pin them down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998:23).
This paradigm has grown from the classical pragmatic philosophers, Peirce, James and Dewey, and has received criticism about its American perspective, which it is argued, is not consistent with worldviews in other countries (in Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007). In addition, since this perspective appears to strive for a middle ground, sometimes requiring an outright rejection of philosophical dualisms, it has been criticised for failing to solve logical philosophical disputes (in Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Purists have tended to focus on the differences between the two philosophies, whereas pragmatists, ‘contend that a false dichotomy exists between quantitative and qualitative approaches’ and advocate that ‘researchers should utilize the strengths of both techniques in order to understand better social phenomena,’ (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005:377). Onwuegbuzie and Leech also suggest that both sets of purists ‘use techniques that are relatively analogous at some level of specificity’ (2005:379).

My position is that of a situationalist, since, as I have already stated, my rationale for adopting a mixed method approach is complementarity. Although I triangulated the findings of the first phase, this was undertaken through two qualitative methods (the use reflective essays with the data collected from the focus groups). Thus this approach was a within-methods triangulation which respected the principles of the qualitative paradigm. As indicative of my interpretation of the variations in the findings regarding the literacy abilities of students mentioned earlier, I agree with Sale et al (2002) that qualitative and quantitative paradigms study different phenomena. However, not all mixed method researchers and writers adopt a paradigm
perspective when designing a research strategy; Niglas (2000) and Greene (2008) found that paradigm assumptions were rarely cited as important practical influences in their respective studies on researchers’ methodological decisions. Instead, according to Creswell and Tashakkori (2007), besides a paradigm perspective, researchers could adopt a method perspective, a methodological perspective or even a practice perspective. The former refers to the combining of a qualitative and quantitative method – for example to triangulate or complement. The methodological perspective is the approach taken for integrating qualitative and quantitative methods in all elements of the research process. This typology is recognised as a distinct methodology but as noted earlier, it has been criticised on the grounds of incompatibility between paradigms. The remaining perspective, the practice perspective, is described by Creswell and Tashakkori as following ‘a “bottoms-up” approach to conducting research’ (2007:306) in that:

The need to use mixed methods strategies may emerge during investigators’ ongoing research projects, as part of efforts for finding answers to research questions, or planned from the outset, (Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007:306). According to Greene (2008) the mixed methods community would tend to agree that ‘methodology follows from inquiry purpose and questions’ (2008:13). She adds that the purpose of the study will drive the design – for example, convergence/triangulation or development.

Certainly for me, although I agree with situationalists, the practice perspective also has currency for this study since I wanted to explore the extensiveness of the findings which emerged from the qualitative data. This is typical, according to Tashakkori and Creswell, for a sequential study since ‘the questions of a second (or later) strand emerge as the result of the findings of
the first (or earlier) strand’ (2007b:210). However, the practicalities involved in
the design and implementation of this type of method also need to be
considered as the following section illustrates.

3.3 Models of Mixed Methods

Bryman points out that ‘there are relatively few guidelines about how, when
and why different research methods might be combined’ (2006:99). This is
particularly difficult for the first time researcher. However, given that, as
outlined, there are predominantly two types of approaches – the collection and
analysis of qualitative and quantitative data and the integration of the two, I
found the work of Morse (2003) a useful tool for illustrating how this might look
in practice. Morse describes two designs – mixed method and multi-method
– and suggests principles for each:

The differences between a single study using multiple strategies
(mixed method design) and a research programme using multiple
methods is that in the single study the less dominant strategies do not
have to be a complete study in themselves, (Morse, 2003:195).

Or to put it another way, ‘… in a multi-method design all projects are complete
in themselves’ (Morse, 2003:199). For a mixed method design, Morse
suggests:

- Principle 1: Recognise the theoretical drive of the project;
- Principle 2: Recognise the role of the imported component in the
project (i.e. how to inform the base project);
- Principle 3: Adhere to methodological assumptions of the base
method;
- Principle 4: Work with as few data sets as possible.

(Morse, 2003:193).
And for a multi-method design:

Principle 1: Identify the theoretical drive of the research project;

Principle 2: Develop overt awareness of the dominance of each project;


For a multi-method design the integrity of the methodological assumptions is respected. For example, when data is collected adopting a quantitative method, the data is analysed and reported by employing quantitative approaches and vice versa. It tends to be at the final stage of the inquiry - the discussion - when the findings are combined.

Given the above definitions, my study would appear to adopt a multi-method design as it provides ‘a logical extension from the findings of the first study’ (Morse, 2003:199). The dominant theoretical drive is qualitative since phase one of this study adopted a qualitative methodological approach (principles 1 and 2). The themes being explored were grounded in the data and thus emerged, indicative of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The second phase followed on from these findings to see how widespread these demotivators were across a larger sample of NQTs. In this instance, the purpose of this phase was measurement to test whether the concerns could be generalised. In line with the principles suggested by Morse (2003), the data for this phase was collected and analysed employing a quantitative method and thus a deductive perspective by employing a survey questionnaire to collect quantitative, numerical data. According to Morse (2003) since the dominant theoretical perspective was qualitative - the first phase drove the second phase of the study - it can be denoted as ‘QUAL’ and followed by
‘quan’. This can be represented as: $\text{QUAL} \rightarrow \text{quan}$. The capitals denote the dominant perspective adopted (Morse’s Notation System (1991) cited in Creswell et al, 2003:214). Consequently, since this was a confirmatory design which followed an exploratory study, the overall research project is a sequential exploratory design and can be shown as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{QUAL} & \quad \text{QUAL} & \quad \text{quan} & \quad \text{quan} \\
\text{Data} \rightarrow & \quad \text{Data} \rightarrow & \quad \text{Data} \rightarrow & \quad \text{Data} \rightarrow & \quad \text{Interpretation of} \\
\text{collection} & \quad \text{analysis} & \quad \text{collection} & \quad \text{analysis} & \quad \text{entire analysis}
\end{align*}
\]


However, also included in my survey instrument were open questions to obtain qualitative, textual data, which it was hoped, would illuminate the numerical findings and also surface any other concerns which had not been tested. This material was treated as qualitative data. However, since this qualitative data was collected simultaneously with the quantitative data using the same survey instrument, according to Morse’s principles for the multi-method design, it compromises the methodological integrity of the second phase as:

It is important not to violate the assumptions, sampling (appropriateness and adequacy of data), and so forth … it is the results of each project that are triangulated to inform the research problem, (Morse, 2003:199).

Thus my project design would appear to resonate with Morse’s definition of a mixed method rather than the multi-method design. However, Morse warns that there is a risk of being challenged for using the mixed method design and suggests employing the latter. This, of course, would offset the concerns raised about the incompatibility of approaches if these methods were intended
to triangulate findings but as I have discussed above, my rationale for mixing
methods was not that of triangulation, but instead assumes an integrative logic
(Mason 2006), which recognises that different types of data can inform the
other. However, there seems to be some debate about whether qualitative
and quantitative data collected through the same instrument:

...is really a true integration of mixing qualitative and quantitative
research because one will tend to be subordinate to the other,
(Bryman, 2006:103).

The basis of this debate rests on the principle that data should be collected in
line with the assumptions associated with the method. For example,
qualitative data should be collected through qualitative methods, if it is not,
then the data cannot be deemed as genuinely qualitative (and vice versa).
However, Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) question whether a mono-strand
study (one research method and hence one source of data) can be regarded
as a form of mixing methods, and Bazeley (2002) argues that separating
elements to conform to their own paradigms are ‘two separate studies which
just happen to be about the same topic’ (2002:3).

A review of some 232 social science mixed method studies undertaken by
Bryman (2006) found that researchers do consider data collected in open-
ended items on a survey instrument as qualitative data. Indeed, 27% of these
studies collected both qualitative and quantitative data through one survey
instrument; 20.7% of which used qualitative data from a self-administered
survey (the same method as I used). This type of design is described as a
within-stage mixed model (see Johnson & Onwuebbuzie, 2004). Incidentally,
Johnson and Onwuebbuzie’s define two major types of mixed method
research: mixed-model and mixed-method. The latter has resonance of
Morse’s description of multi-method design, whereas the former is more in keeping with Morse’s idea of mixed method. This illustrates some of the difficulties (and confusion) in the terminology for mixed research, and indeed one of the weaknesses.

Consequently, having established that this is predominantly a multi-method design according to Morse’s (2003) definition (acknowledging that collecting qualitative and quantitative data simultaneously through a survey instrument could be seen as comprising methodological integrity), it can also be described as a mixed-model design rather than a mixed-method design according to Johnson and Onwuebbuzie, (2004). This confusion highlights the importance of Bazeley’s call for mixed method researchers to clarify ‘what is being mixed and how it is being mixed’ (Bazeley, 2002:2).

My survey instrument was designed to collect both qualitative and quantitative data through closed questions and open comment sections so there was inevitably some integration during collection due to the approach (or mindset) of participants when they responded. Although the open comment section invites more individual responses, it could be argued that participants did not provide the depth or be as forthcoming as they might had they been interviewed. Of course, even in face-to-face interviews this level may vary depending on whether the interviewer was known to the researcher. Significantly, some of the respondents who were sent a questionnaire were known to me because I had taught them. Not only was I more likely to receive completed questionnaires but the responses in the open comment sections were often more open and frank. However, I also acknowledge that there may
be differences in the amount and potential richness of data due to comments being written rather than made verbally; many participants may have summarised their thoughts in the written form, whereas verbal communication would perhaps encourage more verbosity.

Integration also occurred during the interpretation stage of this study, although not to the extent that some mixed method studies have done. Day et al (2008) combined qualitative and quantitative methodologies in a 4-year study to explore variations in teachers’ work and lives and their effects on pupils. Case studies were developed which involved ‘qualitizing quantitative evidence, quantitizing qualitative evidence, and integrating the two’, (2008:333).

According to these researchers:

This interactive combination of data collection, ongoing analysis, tentative hypothesis generation, and testing and interpretation of results, provides greater mapping, analysis, interpretation, and holistic understandings of the research area than would be gained by relying on a single paradigm or approach, (Day, Sammons & Gu, 2008:333-4).

Although I analysed the qualitative data collected separately and did not convert this data using quantitative techniques (by analysing it using the SPSS software for example) which I did for the quantitative data, I suspect that there was still an element of ‘counting’ since it was difficult not to look for occurrences of ideas/themes in the data. Indeed, Olsen argues that qualitative analysis is not much different from that of quantitative analysis since:

We code the interview, we seek patterns, we summarize these in a one-page diagram or summary table, and we develop a line of argument which is rooted in the data and can be grounded in those data, (2004:8).
However, the concept of quantitizing, the strategy of transforming qualitative data into that of quantitative data by categorizing into numbers (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), is a step too far in my opinion. Taking a more situationalist stance than pragmatic (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005), I believe that both qualitative and quantitative methodological perspectives have merit. Consequently, for this study, I take the view that it is rather self-defeating to quantitize the qualitative data as there is a danger of losing its context and the ‘essence and ambience’ as argued by Berg (2009:3). As Bazeley (2002) points out:

When a qualitative theme code is quantitized, its meaning becomes fixed and single-dimensional, (2002:7).

The purpose of collecting qualitative data for this study was to illuminate the quantitative findings. It does not seem to me that much would be gained by quantitizing the qualitative data otherwise I could have employed closed questions throughout the survey and not invited open comments. However, that is not to say that I believe that data cannot be fluid since I looked for broad themes and target words to help me organise the qualitative data.

Another area where integration often occurs in mixed research is in the presentation of findings and the discussion. Indeed, many mixed method researchers would argue that failure to at least mix findings in the discussion would eliminate the research from being regarded as mixed research at all but rather two separate studies about the same phenomena. Indeed Bryman (2008) advocates presenting findings:

… thematically across the two sets of results, so that the findings are presented in terms of substantive issues rather than in terms of different methods, (2008:676).
The findings chapter in this study integrates the qualitative findings with the findings from the quantitative to provide contextual explanations for the data. This offers insights and understandings to add meaning to the numbers, which is one of the strengths of using and integrating mixed method approaches (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).
Chapter Four

Method

The last chapter outlined my position in the mixed method debate(s) and the methodological assumptions that I have adopted for this study. This chapter is concerned with the practicalities of undertaking this research: identifying the sample population, designing the survey instrument, the methods used to collect and analyse the data, in addition to describing the sample population. Since the study was performed in two phases, the first of which was the re-interrogation of data collected for the MA study (Matthews, 2003) to inform the second phase, this chapter will also provide a summary of the methods used to collect and analyse this qualitative data.

4.1 Collecting the Qualitative Data

The MA study was interpretative, adopting a qualitative method approach through two focus groups and analysis of personal narratives recorded in the reflective essays of six NQTs. Given my involvement in delivering one of the modules of the teacher training course at the University of Nottingham, sampling was convenient. Dates for the focus groups were arranged to take
place at the end of the course to avoid any conflict of interests with regards to
course achievement and subsequent awards. This was particularly important
since the reflective essays, which were used to triangulate findings, formed
part of the assessment for one of the modules of the course. The purpose of
these accounts was to encourage reflection of experiences in the field during
the work experience placement and I should point out that I was not involved
in the assessment of this particular work. Given the enforced time restraints,
it was less time consuming to hold focus groups rather than conducting
individual interviews.

An advantage for using focus groups with volunteers from the course was the
potential for candour and clarity since participants already knew me and each
other from working together on the course, and I anticipated that the group
interactions would yield a wider range of responses than individual interviews.
It would also avoid the backwards and forwards, question and answer
techniques between the participant and myself (Cohen et al, 2000) and allow
my involvement to be kept to a minimum.

A letter was sent out to trainees, who were completing the course and had
expressed an interest in my study (Appendix 1). The letter explained the aims
of the study; outlined the procedures for data collection and handling; assured
the participants of anonymity and confidentiality, and that they were free to
withdraw at any stage. Following guidelines for reasonably informed consent
as advised by Cohen et al (2000) I held a briefing meeting to outline how the
focus groups would be conducted and to offer participants the opportunity to
ask questions. They were assured that their participation in the study would
not affect their course results since their reflective essays had already been assessed. The participants completed a consent form (Appendix 2) which asked permission for their reflective statements to be photocopied and used in the study, and also whether any contributions from both the focus groups and the essays could be included in further research. Socio-demographic information was also requested.

Two focus groups were arranged to foster transferability within this particular population on 29th July and 11th August, 2003. Although eleven course participants volunteered, only six were able to attend the focus groups due to interview, holiday and/or work commitments. Consequently, two focus group meetings were held with three participants in each group. Thus the sample for the study was two men and four women, aged between 26 and 52, teaching history, English, sociology, psychology, special needs and basic skills.

Each focus group session lasted for approximately one and a half hours and was recorded using audio equipment. The consent forms, the audio tapes and copies of the reflective essays were stored securely at the University in line with the University of Nottingham’s ethical conduct and data protection guidelines (Dale, 2003). To preserve anonymity, each participant was given a code, which took the form of a number from 1-6, prefixed with the letter ‘A’ to indicate Phase 1 of the study (A1, A2 etc).

When running focus groups, Krueger recommends ‘few, few, few’ (1998:97); hold a few groups rather than one, with few people (he suggests four or five
people in each group) and ‘limit the discussion to about five or six questions’ (1998:98). Griffin used group discussions to study the transition of a sample of women from school to work and described these as:

… loosely structured around a series of key topics and questions to allow for a degree of flexibility, (1985, in Bryman, 1988:50).

The original aim of the MA project was to explore a positive expectancy profile to inform future recruitment to the course so five questions around three key topics – motivation for entering teaching, expectations of the career and training provision – were explored. During the discussions, since I was both the researcher and the moderator for these focus groups, I was able to clarify responses and seek verification from participants, to increase interpretive validity. In addition, as the participants and I had already established a relationship during the course, I did not feel that concerns relating to bias, misunderstandings, or trust about confidentiality, which could affect the validity of what was being disclosed, were a problem (see Krueger 1998:69). I had aimed to foster an open, non-threatening environment for discussions during the training sessions. However, I was also aware that because of this productive working relationship, there was a possibility of a reactivity effect occurring during the focus groups such as the Hawthorne effect but more appropriately in this instance the Pygmalion effect. Thus, I had to appear to neither agree nor disagree with comments to avoid the possibility that participants might alter/amend their comments so that I collected what they thought would be ‘good’ for my study. To further minimise this possibility of my influence on the research process, the findings were triangulated with the reflective statements as much as possible. This potential problem was even less of an issue when the data was re-interrogated for Phase 1 of this study as
the research question was different and the focus was on their experiences in
the field, rather than the course.

Cohen et al argue that focus groups are more successful if participants are
‘relative strangers rather than friends’ (2000:288). Since the participants had
worked together during the course, many may have indeed become friends.
However, as this was in the context of a classroom with plenty of activities and
discussions, arguably any friendship would be formed on the basis that this
operated within a working relationship where diversity of opinions was
commonplace. Indeed during both of the focus group sessions contradictory
views were expressed and I did not get the impression that participants were
‘groupthinking’ (McKeown, 1996). There was an occasion when one
participant voiced an opinion, which she wanted to remain confidential. Had
she not known and trusted the other participants, this issue may not have
been voiced.

Besides being useful for demonstrating concurrent validity of the data
collected during the focus groups and for triangulating responses, the 3,000
word reflective essays enabled an element of time triangulation, thus
diachronic reliability, as they had been written some weeks before the focus
groups took place. Since these essays encouraged reflective practice skills
for the trainees’ continued professional development (Schön, 1983), they not
only evidenced the formation of participants’ professional identities as
teachers but these narratives also disclosed their perceptions about the
working environment in further education. As Coffey and Atkinson point out:

Cortazzi’s evaluation of teachers’ narratives revealed that teachers’
stories have functions of self and cultural identity, entertainment, moral
evaluation and news. They provide media for reflecting teachers' cultural context in the work they do, (1996:62-3).

It was insight into their future work environment and the demotivators, which might affect their commitment to teaching, woven into the fabric of the data that became the focus for this PhD study.

4.2 Phase 1: Re-interrogating the Qualitative Data

When I re-interrogated the qualitative data for the first phase of this doctoral study, I had problems accessing the terminology for coding using the grounded theory approach. As Bryman (2008) points out there is inconsistent use of key terms with regards to concepts and categories. Strauss and Corbin discuss ‘sampling on the basis of emerging concepts’ (1998:73), whereas Charmaz talks of categories (2006). This becomes even more confusing with procedures for data analysis since the originators of the methodology outlined different processes for coding data. Glaser distinguishes between substantive and theoretical coding (1978, in Dey, 2004) and Strauss, writing with Corbin, refer to three phases of coding: open, axial and selective (1990). Charmaz, a key developer of the original Glaser and Strauss approach, makes the distinction between two main types of coding: initial (line-by-line) coding, and focused coding, which permits the separation, sorting and synthesis of large amounts of data (2006:11). In order to continue the 'flow of work' as Strauss and Corbin (1998:29) describe it, rather than get immersed in this ambiguous area of coding to define categories which could be translated into a quantitative measurement, I adopted an approach outlined by Dey (2004).
Dey adopted an affinity with the grounded theory approach, by using the metaphor of a patchwork mosaic.

The overall patchwork slowly developed into a more composite picture as further pieces became available. This metaphor – the picture slowly emerging as a patchwork mosaic – is perhaps a more apt way of conveying the process of analysis, since it does not distinguish so sharply between different phases of ‘coding’, (2004:86).

This metaphor appealed to me since the survey for the second phase was designed not only to measure prevalence of the demotivators identified but would also prompt further demotivators to emerge from the open questions. Thus it was hoped that further pieces for the patchwork would surface.

As outlined in Chapter Two, findings from this re-interrogation of the data suggested that the demotivators could be grouped into three main clusters, which pertained to the students, teacher autonomy and the environment in the institution. Arguably, this process of analysing the data conformed to the principles of grounded theory in the original work of Glaser and Strauss:

Generate general categories and their properties for general and specific situations and problems, (1967:30).

Within each of these clusters, elements emerged from the analysis which could affect achievement of the three psychological needs – autonomy, competence and relatedness – indicative of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985, 1992, 2000). The elements became the indicators and were interpreted using Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1959) to ascertain whether they were motivators or hygiene factors. As outlined in Chapter One, the balance between internal motivators and external hygiene factors is a complex one: increasing the presence of motivators will not increase satisfaction if the hygiene factors are poor; and improving hygiene
factors without increasing the presence of motivators will also be of no benefit (Herzberg, 1959). For example, within the student cluster, there were indicators relating to student ability, student motivation, discipline, attendance and achievement. If these indicators were found to be negative, they would affect the quality of NQTs’ feelings of competence and relatedness. Poorly behaved students could affect a NQT’s perceived competence in controlling his/her classroom and could also have a detrimental effect on the teacher-student relationship, as suggested in the study by Wallace (2002). This could jeopardise fulfilment of the relatedness and competence needs (SDT, Deci & Ryan, 1975) and evidence the presence of a hygiene factor (Herzberg, 1959) from poor interpersonal relationships. Similarly, if students had poor academic abilities which might affect successful achievement of a programme of study, this could affect a NQT’s feelings of competency as a teacher. Indeed, as the study by Wallis (2007) suggested, staff tend to hold themselves responsible for exam results and underperformance. Consequently, a teacher’s sense of achievement, a motivator according to Herzberg (1959), would not be reinforced.

This strategy for analysing the data was repeated for the cluster relating to teacher autonomy, which focused on teachers’ actual day-to-day work such as the administration duties attached to the job, the constraints of the syllabus, the design of teaching resources, delivery and assessment strategies. The remaining cluster pertained to the physical and physiological environment within colleges with emergent indicators relating to college facilities, support and class sizes.
Two indicators which did not emerge from the qualitative data but were also included in the institution cluster were feedback and career paths. At this stage in their careers, the participants had been more concerned about getting a job so it is perhaps not surprising that these issues did not surface. However, as outlined in Chapter One, according to Herzberg (1959) achievement, recognition in the work environment and advancement (or the potential for such) are motivators to encourage a positive attitude and Dörnyei (2001) cites an inadequate career structure as one of the factors that can erode intrinsic motivation.

A full breakdown of how the indicators were cross-referenced with the needs for Self-Determination (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985) and the findings from studies of trainees’ experiences of the sector outlined in Chapter Two (McKelvey & Andrews, 1998; Wallace 2002; Bathmaker & Avis, 2005; and Wallis, 2007) is presented as Appendix 3. This table also indicates whether the indicators could be deemed as hygiene factors or motivators as outlined in Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959).

Another key element of the grounded theory approach revolves around the pre-occupation with the sampling procedures as Dey describes it:

Instead of identifying a sample at the outset, grounded theory involves a process of ‘theoretical sampling’ of successive sites and source, to test or refine new ideas as these emerge from the data, (2004:80).

However, this provokes criticism as the process and the techniques tend to upstage the data; as Robrecht argues this encourages researchers ‘to look for data rather than look at data’ (1995:171 original emphasis, in Thomas & James, 2006). I would argue that this is perhaps an over-simplification since
for me it was the emergence of demotivators in the qualitative data, rather than the process, which became more important. This method is resonant of what Charmaz describes as ‘objectivist grounded theory’, which resides in the positivist tradition ‘and thus attends to data as real in and of themselves and does not attend to the processes of their production’ (2006:131). Although Charmaz is a proponent of ‘constructivist grounded theory’ which ‘sees both data and analysis as created from shared experiences with participants and other sources of data’ (2006:130), she acknowledges that Glaser ‘articulates crucial aspects of an objectivist position,’ (2006:132). This is perhaps not surprising given that in their original work, Glaser and Strauss (1967) stated that the method can use both qualitative and quantitative data. Indeed, Strauss and Corbin (1998) address combinations between qualitative and quantitative data and although they do not explain how to combine qualitative and quantitative procedures, they do stress the appropriateness of the interplay between the methods to emphasise ‘theorizing as comprising a complex flow of work’ (1998:29). An example of such a situation is described with a study examining tendencies towards juvenile delinquency. Strauss and Corbin explain that:

… qualitative data will not tell them [the researchers] the degree to which these conditions lead to delinquency, how they interact with each other, which conditions have a stronger relationship to the phenomenon than do others, and so on. By doing a quantitative study at this point, the researchers could use that information to build further hypotheses, (1998:33).

They argue that like the concepts, the design must also emerge from the research. The above situation describes my motivation for adopting a quantitative approach for the second phase since this enabled me not only to measure the extent of the demotivators with a larger sample but also to look
for patterns of prevalence with the aim of cross-referencing these with intentions of remaining in teaching.

4.3 Conducting Phase Two

Once the nature of the demotivators was identified, the next stage was to measure occurrences with a much wider population. The advantages of employing a survey questionnaire include, ‘providing structured, often numerical data, being able to be administered without the presence of the researcher, and often being straightforward to analyse’ (Cohen et al, 2007:317). However, there are criticisms aimed at surveys which de Vaus (1993) categorises as philosophical, technique based and political. These include the restrictions of surveys to adequately establish causal connections, to probe at meaningful social action in social contexts, as well as being too statistical and intrinsically manipulative. The prejudice against surveys, de Vaus argues, ‘is based on a misunderstanding of what survey research is and can achieve’ (1993:330). Indeed, surveys are widely used to measure attitudes and ‘are a prominent part of everyday life… and have tremendous effects’ (Weisburg et al, 1996:13). Addressing some of these criticisms, the indicators in my surveys have emerged from the analysis of qualitative data so in effect the participants in the MA study were instrumental in developing the questionnaire. In addition, the design of my instrument included an open comment section so that rather than manipulate potential participants, my instrument empowered them by giving them the opportunity to record information which they felt was important. These open comments would then be used to illuminate the statistics from the numerical data generated.
mixed method approach can maximise researchers' interpretations of the data; termed by Collins et al (2006) as 'significance enhancement'.

I took the decision to post the questionnaires which meant that participants would have to self-administer them. Although problems can arise from employing this method, such as a low response rate and errors or omissions in the responses, the advantage of having access to a much larger, national sample than I would have been able to poll outweighed the disadvantages.

4.3.1 The development of the survey instrument

Having identified the nature of the demotivators, which was the first research question for this PhD study, the survey instrument was designed to investigate the remaining research questions, namely: to what extent were these demotivators common to most NQTs across the sector? Were there patterns of prevalence and did most NQTs expect to remain in teaching? In addition, the instrument needed to accommodate open comment sections to enable the addition of further pieces to the patchwork mosaic depicting the nature of demotivators.

A variety of instruments were studied to get a feel for the medium such as the number and type of questions. Two instruments were particularly useful as they had been used to elicit data from teachers. These were the ‘Survey into the impact of Further Education Initial Teacher Training Bursaries’ (York Consultancy, 2003) undertaken for the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and ‘Becoming a Teacher’ (Hobson et al, 2003) funded by the DfES,
the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE) and the Teacher Training Agency (TTA). The first survey was aimed at FE teachers and the second was aimed at compulsory school teachers. Although my instrument eventually looked quite different, the examples were useful for deciding what biographical details would be pertinent for my instrument. However, there was a substantial difference in size between the two examples (the FE survey had 4 pages whereas the second survey had 15 pages). Mindful that a huge questionnaire might discourage potential respondents from completing the instrument, I aimed to keep the size down to 6 pages (excluding the cover).

My final survey instrument is attached as Appendix 4. It posed 46 questions in total and was designed in three sections: ‘about you’, ‘about your work’ and ‘your experiences in the field’ (in that order). The first section requested details to obtain profile information: respondents’ sex, age group, the highest qualification achieved and their ethnic group. Although de Vaus (1993) does not recommend starting with demographic questions first, and indeed neither of the examples outlined above started with sex and age questions, de Vaus does recommend that questions should be grouped into sections: ‘this helps structure the questionnaire and provides a flow’ (1993:95). It made sense to me to introduce the sections as I did to provide this flow for participants. Certainly, when the instrument was piloted, the presentation of the sections was not deemed a problem. However, the order of the sections did not follow the order of my research questions. The ‘experiences in the field’ section, which was presented last, elicited data to measure the extent of the demotivators. Data obtained from the ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’
sections was analysed for investigating potential patterns of prevalence and intentions to remain in teaching.

To identify the ages of the participants in the sample, I drew on the example by York described above, but amended some of the categories. The first group was 18-24 but I thought that it would be highly unlikely for someone younger than 20 to be working in the sector since people entering FE teaching would need to have experience in a vocation so they could teach, or be qualified in an academic subject, which would require education to degree level. Indeed, this category had to be recoded and amalgamated with the 25-34 group during the analysis as the sample was too small. I also introduced another group for over 55 (for some reason, the FE example omitted a group covering the 50+ ages). With regards to the highest qualification achieved prior to studying on the ITT course (question 3), I used the same groups as the FE example, but added GCSE/NVQ Level 2 as well as an ‘other’ option. This was because it is quite possible that some vocational teachers might only have needed to attain a NVQ Level 2 qualification in their subject, the rest of their expertise would accrue from their experiences.

In the ‘about your work’ section, there were 11 questions to establish a context for each of the respondents including the subject taught, the level, the age of their students as well as the type of institution they worked for. Given the diversity of teaching provision rather than list all the subjects that respondents might teach, the categories adopted by the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) were used (see OFSTED & ALI, 2003), which teachers should be familiar with.
Question 15 enquired whether the respondents expected to be teaching in 5 years' time. Responses to this question were key for exploring the impact of the demotivators. Although this was a multiple choice question (don’t know, yes, no), there was also a section for respondents to give a reason if they did not expect to be teaching. On reflection, I should have also asked respondents, who were unsure whether they would be teaching, an opportunity to explain why. Fortunately, some of these participants did anyway.

The section 'your experiences in the field' was devised from the findings of the re-interrogation of the qualitative data (see Appendix 3). Drawing on Dey’s patchwork mosaic metaphor (2004), the findings were organised into three clusters pertaining to themes around the students, teaching autonomy and the institution – the factors for this study – with five indicators for each factor. To measure the presence of poor hygiene factors and motivators, I employed an attitude scaling instrument with matched-paired statements asking respondents to rate their feelings. These Likert rating scales were strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly agree. I did not include a 'middle ground' such as neither agree nor disagree as the literature has shown that respondents have a tendency to opt for this middle ground or central tendency (Cohen et al, 2007). Although some might argue that respondents should be given this option, I felt that participants would have a feeling one way or another and thus this scale would encourage them to voice it. Although the decision to employ match-paired statements – one positive and the other negative – would double the number of questions in this section, it would enable the reliability of responses to be tested. For example, if a respondent
answered strongly agree to one of the statements, s/he should respond strongly disagree to the paired statement, provided that the statements were worded correctly so that they were the opposite of each other. The statements formed questions 16-45 and were randomised in the final questionnaire.

The final question (question 46) was an open section which invited participants to provide information that they felt was important.

Throughout the drafting of the questionnaire, research colleagues were invited to comment on the instrument to ensure that the questions were worded clearly and unambiguously, and also that the instrument had face validity. Although useful, face validity, a casual assessment of the item appropriateness, is not deemed a sound measure (Litwin, 2003). Another subjective measure is content validity, but Litwin argues that an ‘overall opinion of a group of trained judges… provides a good foundation on which to build a methodologically rigorous assessment of a survey instrument’s validity’ (2003: 33). Thus teachers working in FE and trainees on an ITT programme were asked for feedback following a pilot run of the instrument (see 4.3.3).

With regards to more rigorous assessment for criterion validity, in particular concurrent, measuring proved difficult. Since the studies in this area had all been qualitative, there were no established scales or ‘gold standard’, as Litwin (2003) calls it, to judge against. However, the factors and the indicators chosen for the instrument emerged from the qualitative findings so were therefore authentic. They had also been cross referenced with similar studies and the literature on motivators and demotivators affecting job satisfaction.
Measures to ensure the internal consistency of responses were taken with the data collected for the pilot and the main study (see 4.3.3 and 4.3.7).

4.3.2 Preparing the Code Book

I did not intend to quantitize the qualitative data which would be obtained from the open comment sections but rather use this data to illuminate the quantitative findings. However, the responses to the closed questions and the Likert scales would be analysed using the Statistics Programme for Social Scientists (SPSS) so the data had to be converted into a suitable format. For this purpose a code book was designed (see Appendix 5). Each item on the questionnaire was given a variable name and the possible responses were allocated a numerical code.

With the exception of responses to question 8 (which elicited numerical data since the length of time each participant had been employed as a teacher was re-calculated into months), responses to the questions in the first two sections (1-15) provided categorical data. Data from the open-ended questions in these sections was not coded until all the questionnaires had been received. The word-based data was then examined and categories were devised once all the options had been explored. For example, the responses to the open-ended question asking participants what they did prior to embarking on a career in teaching (question 5) were mapped against the curriculum areas in colleges as defined by OFSTED (OFSTED & ALI, 2003) which were the categories used for question 10 (categories to indicate the subjects taught). Additional categories were then devised from examining the remaining
responses. This procedure was also undertaken for questions 13 and 14 which related to the type of institutions at which participants were employed (college of FE, training centre, sixth-form, etc.) and their teaching context (college based, outreach and so forth).

The responses to questions 1–15 were coded into nominal and ordinal (categorical) data. However, responses to the statements in the 'experiences in the field' section with the Likert scales (questions 16-45) were given a score. Since these statements were measuring attitudes on an interval scale, according to Berman Brown & Saunders (2008), I could assume that there was an equal difference between the possible responses and therefore class these as interval variables.

4.3.3 Running the Pilot

Two quite different groups of people were asked to complete the pilot questionnaire: one group was made up of experienced teachers working in FE and the other was a class of trainees, who were currently undertaking the ITT programme. The reason for approaching these groups was because neither would be asked to take part in the main study since they were at very different stages in their careers to the population which would be sampled.

The questionnaires were administered on two occasions. Volunteers were sought after a staff meeting at a local college and volunteers from the current cohort of teacher trainees were approached after one of their classes. In total 35 participants completed the questionnaire. They were asked to make notes
against any question which they did not feel was clear. In addition, feedback was sought to assess the face and content validity of the instrument after administration. This was carried out by various one-to-one meetings and group discussions.

To ensure reliability of the data, the coefficient alpha test, Cronbach’s Alpha, was undertaken to measure internal consistency. This also tested construct validity as it demonstrated how well the five indicators for each factor measured what they were purporting to measure in addition to establishing whether respondents’ ratings for each match-paired statements were related and therefore reliable. The results for each of the factors were disappointing but I decided not to remove the statements which had contributed to a low Cronbach’s Alpha value since examination of the responses appeared to suggest that there was reliability in the responses (ie. respondents had answered negatively and positively to each of the match-paired statements). The reason for the low values may have been due to the sample being small so it was decided to keep all the statements in the knowledge that if necessary, responses to the weak statements could be extracted after administering the instrument. The Cronbach’s Alpha values for the main study did indeed suggest that the instrument was reliable (see 4.3.7).

In terms of predictive validity, the findings were as expected for a sample of respondents, who are on the whole satisfied in their work; the experienced teachers were already employed in the sector and therefore would know ‘how it is’ and the trainees who took part had yet to undertake their work placements. The experienced teachers were also preparing for an OFSTED
inspection. There had, apparently, been more staff meetings, discussions, teaching observations and feedback as preparation, which had fostered a positive relationship between staff and the institution concerned.

4.3.4 Sampling

The population for the main survey was identified as NQTs who had undertaken the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) for FE teachers during 2000-2004. The reason for stipulating this time period was that mandatory training provision for teaching in this sector had been introduced and courses were subject to the new national standards introduced by the Further Education National Training Organisation (FENTO, 1999). Therefore training offered by universities in England, whether pre- or post-92 institutions, would be comparable and unlikely to affect the findings. In addition, during this time these courses attracted the Initial Teacher Training Bursary introduced in 2000 by the government to offset skill shortages of teachers in the FE sector (see Chapter One).

Contact was established with the DfES to ask for help in approaching potential participants. At the time, unlike NQTs in compulsory education, NQTs in post-compulsory education were not registered. I was informed by the DfES that indeed, no such database of qualified teachers in the FE sector was in place, but the DfES contact agreed to forward a list of institutions that were providing the initial teacher training (ITT) pilot which attracted the bursary. This list supplied entry and exit dates of the institutions in this scheme, and the names of programme leaders. Since I wanted to obtain data to span across the four-
year period since the FENTO accredited programme had been introduced, only institutions involved in the programme since its initiation and were continuing to offer it at the time of data collection were contacted. This decision was taken in an effort to minimise other factors which may influence the data. For example, since the institutions concerned had been offering the training in the same time frame, the experiences of interpreting the FENTO standards for the curriculum, and subsequent programme evolvement, would arguably be similar.

Thirteen universities across England were involved in the pilot from its initiation in 2000 and were continuing to offer the programme in 2004. The programme leaders were contacted by email. In this correspondence, I explained that the DfES contact had supplied their names, outlined the nature of the study and requested their help in forwarding my questionnaire to the students who had successfully completed their programmes. I took the decision to take a different approach from the researchers at York Consultancy Limited who had undertaken research for the DfES into the impact of the bursaries (see Chapter One). For that study, institutions had contacted the trainees on their database to inform them about the planned study and requested that they contact them if they did not wish to take part. Names and addresses of trainees who did not decline were then forwarded to the researchers. I decided that it would be more cost and time effective to have the questionnaires sent directly to individuals by their host university. The universities still needed to print off address labels from their database but they did not need to produce the letters nor collate a database to forward. This reduced the administration time and resources involved for each
university and avoided issues of Data Protection. In correspondence with programme leaders, this method was definitely preferred. My approach also enabled potential participants the opportunity to see exactly what they would be asked, which I hoped would encourage more responses.

From the 13 universities approached, ten institutions agreed to help and were sent collated packs containing the questionnaire (Appendix 4), a covering letter and a pre-paid envelope addressed to me at the University of Nottingham. Postage was attached to each pack so that the institutions just needed to address them. The questionnaires were printed on different coloured paper for each institution so that I knew where they had originated. Completed questionnaires were coded to reflect this (ie. GN denoted a green questionnaire, which was followed by a participant response number). This enabled me to examine regional differences in the analysis. A total of 2,235 packs were boxed and sent out to institutions based in Yorkshire, the Midlands, the South-West, the South-East and London.

4.3.5 Anonymity and Confidentiality

In line with guidelines for reasonably informed consent (Cohen et al, 2007), the covering letter in each pack explained that the questionnaire had been forwarded to the recipients by their training provider so their identity was unknown to me. I also outlined the purpose of the study and offered to answer any queries by providing my email address. In addition, a date for returning the questionnaires was requested.
One further point relating to this area is the adherence to preserving the anonymity of the universities involved. None of these institutions have been named. In addition, names of students, colleagues, or colleges/institutions identified by respondents have been withheld.

4.3.6 Response Rate

Three hundred and eight questionnaires were returned from the total of 2,235 questionnaires distributed, giving a response rate of 13.8%. However, the data from 16 of the returned questionnaires was not included in the data-set since the respondents were still undertaking training and were therefore not NQTs. The participating universities were located in England and the returns from the valid 292 questionnaires were as follows: East Midlands 21%, South-West 28%, South-East 17%, and Yorkshire 34%. No responses were received from ex-students from the university based in London. From the remaining nine institutions, the response rate ranged from 11% to 18%, with the exception of one, which had a response rate of 30%. This was my institution and could account for the higher returns.

From the 292 questionnaires deemed valid for use, some respondents chose not to supply data for the profile section and some data from the ‘experiences in the field’ section (questions 16-45) was discounted if respondents had indicated a response on the border between the negative and positive statements. A category to indicate neither agree nor disagree with the statements had been deliberately omitted but clearly some of the respondents would have liked to have been offered the opportunity! Data which was
missing or not counted was recorded as 'missing'. There was a 72% response rate to the qualitative element of the instrument with 209 respondents participating.

There were four cohorts for this study: NQTs who qualified in the academic year 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04. Table 1 shows the response rates for each cohort.

Table 1 – Response rate by year participants qualified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of data-set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1 (2000-01)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2 (2001-02)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3 (2002-03)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 4 (2003-04)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>292</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7 Data Analysis

The quantitative data was analysed using the Statistics Programme for Social Scientists (SPSS). Nominal data collected in the ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’ sections was analysed for frequency distributions and nonparametric inferential tests were undertaken to ascertain if there was a relationship between the different variables. A table summarising the various combinations for each bivariate analysis is presented as Appendix 6. In each
cross tabulation I attempted to falsify the null-hypothesis (that there is no relationship between the variables) and Pearson’s chi-square tests were deemed valid if the following conditions were met: no cell had an expected count of less than one, and more than 20% of the cells had an expected count of less than five.

The correlation coefficient measure, Phi and Cramér’s $V$, was used to test the strength of association with the combination of variables, which rejected the null-hypothesis. Results were analysed by adopting the definition of Brace et al (2006): the value of $\Phi$ (phi) was considered equivalent to Pearson’s $r$, whereby $r$ values of 0 to 0.2 were considered weak; 0.3 – 0.6 moderate and 0.7 – 1.0 strong. Appendix 7 provides details of statistically significant results obtained from responses for the ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’ sections.

Responses to the statements with the Likert scales, in the ‘your experiences in the field’ section, were given the following scores: strongly agree was given a score of 4; agree was given a score of 3; disagree was given a score of 2 and strongly disagree was given a score of 1. To test the internal consistency of the data, Cronbach’s Alpha was used, which measured the mean correlation between each pair of statements and the number of items in the scale. The Cronbach’s Alpha value for each factor was greater than the minimum value of 0.7, which would suggest a reliable scale: the value for each item if deleted from the factor was greater than 0.8 in all instances for items pertaining to the student factor; was more than 0.7 but less than 0.8 with items relating to the teacher autonomy factor, and more than 0.7 but less than 0.9 for items relating to the institution (see Appendix 8.1).
Since the statements were match-paired, with one statement positive in nature and the other negative, the scores for the negative statements were reversed, and various analyses of the mean values for each of the factors were undertaken with the variables: sex, age groups, the year that participants achieved their teaching qualification and whether they expected to remain in teaching in five years using independent t-tests and ANOVA depending on the variable (see Appendix 8.2 for the only statistically significant result). The mean value for each positive statement and each re-coded statement was ranked to identify the statements to which participants felt most negatively about (see Appendix 8.3) and frequency distributions for all the statements were also analysed (see Appendix 8.4).

Cross tabulations were undertaken to test for relationships between the different variables from the ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’ sections (outlined in Appendix 6) with all the statements for each factor. Pearson’s chi-square tests were used to measure significance (see Appendix 9 for statistically significant results).

During the analysis, the data collected to indicate the type of qualification respondents taught was re-coded. This was because there were contradictory findings pertaining to indicators for the student factor and I suspected that this was due to the nature of the courses. As indicated in Chapter 3 (section 3.2), there can be an issue in the interpretation of labels (Sale et al, 2002), so the qualitative lens was employed to account for these contradictions. For example, a basic skills teacher would probably not be concerned about students’ level of basic skills given that they would be aiming to improve these.
Consequently, the National Qualifications Framework was used to allocate qualifications to two new groups: Vocational/Basic Skills and Academic. The categories, basic skills and/or key skills, general vocational (such as GNVQ, BTEC), vocational/occupational (such as NVQ) were amalgamated to the Vocational/Basic skills group, and general academic (such as GCSE/A Level) and Access to HE were merged into the Academic group. Although basic skills, key skills and vocational qualifications form separate strands of the National Qualification Framework, I felt justified in integrating these qualifications since students studying for a vocational qualification were also likely to be taking key skills classes. In addition, students studying basic skills, like those students taking vocational courses, would arguably foresee the immediate relevance of these courses to their work/life, which may not be so for students on academic pathways.

Data collected for the qualitative element of the survey instrument was analysed by employing the same technique outlined for re-interrogating the qualitative data during Phase 1 (see Chapter 4, section 4.2). Comments which pertained to the established clusters were used to illuminate the findings of the quantitative data, and new clusters were initiated following the presence of other demotivators, which had not previously surfaced during Phase 1.

4.3.8 Sample Description

Substantially more females (71%) participated in the study than males (29%) which was not surprising and supports the literature that the teaching occupation tends to attract females more than males (Sharpe, 1976; Lees,
The vast majority of the respondents for this study were white (93.5%) with only 5.5% belonging to other ethnic groups (3.8% Asian or Asian British; 1% Black or Black British; 0.7% of mixed ethnicity). Three participants (1%) chose not to declare their ethnic group. Given the very small percentage of non-white respondents, no further analysis was undertaken. In terms of age: 31.5% were aged between 20 and 34; 30.5% were between 35 and 44; 29.5% were between 45 and 55; 7.5% were over the age of 55. Three respondents did not respond (1%).

The majority of respondents were graduates with first degrees and above (86.2%). Sixty-five percent of respondents’ previous occupations prior to their initial teacher training (ITT) course mapped to the curriculum areas in further education as defined by OFSTED (2003), and an additional 8.2% were already in teaching. These results are illustrated in two sections in Table 2. The first section lists some of the curriculum areas but omits certain areas (the humanities, basic skills etc) which are not immediately associated with a vocation. Respondents who had teaching experience or had been in education were recorded separately in the second section (identified as ‘not mapped to OFSTED curriculum’ in Table 2). The highest proportion of respondents came from backgrounds in business administration, management and professional occupations. However, respondents whose occupation did not map to the curriculum tended to be students, they had worked in retail or involved in some form of education. The latter included teaching English abroad, working in either schools or colleges as learner support, or as part-time teachers.
## Table 2 – Respondents' occupation prior to ITT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation prior to ITT mapped to OFSTED curriculum</th>
<th>No. of participants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business administration, management &amp; professional</td>
<td>73 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, social care &amp; public services</td>
<td>39 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual arts, performing arts &amp; media</td>
<td>21 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, technology &amp; manufacturing</td>
<td>18 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality, sports, leisure &amp; travel</td>
<td>10 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; communication technology</td>
<td>9 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>6 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdressing &amp; beauty therapy</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-based provision</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation prior to ITT not mapped to OFSTED curriculum</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>26 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Sales</td>
<td>24 (8.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or teaching related work</td>
<td>24 (8.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>10 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after children</td>
<td>6 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy, Police</td>
<td>6 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temping/voluntary work</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various (given as answer)</td>
<td>4 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This area of enquiry was followed-up in the instrument asking for brief details of any experience of paid or voluntary teaching or teaching assistant work prior to the course (question 6). This qualitative data was re-coded into three categories: no experience, paid or voluntary teaching experience, and paid or voluntary teaching support. Fifty-five respondents (18.8%) had experience of
teaching support, which included working as teaching assistants in colleges and schools, helping out in schools as volunteers, and in-house training in their previous occupations. One hundred and sixteen respondents (39.7%) had teaching experience in colleges – usually as part-time teachers and as literacy or ESOL tutors. However, 121 respondents (41.4%) had no experience of teaching or support work, either paid or voluntary.

Respondents were asked which category would best describe the subject which they mainly taught. Figure 1 illustrates responses mapped to the teaching categories taken from the curriculum areas in colleges as defined by OFSTED (2003). A third of respondents were teaching basic skills and key skills, which was not surprising given that the Skills for Life initiative enabled substantial growth in this area (see Chapter Two). Indeed, only seven of the respondents had indicated that they had experience of either paid or voluntary work teaching in basic skills prior to their ITT. Subjects in the ‘other’ category included the school curriculum, sewing techniques, parenting skills, personal development, Early Years’ development and HE programmes which did not fit into the college curriculum areas.
Results also indicate that approximately a third of the respondents (34%, n=101) were not teaching in an area which related to their previous occupation. This is quite surprising since, as indicated in Chapter Two, people entering FE to teach tend to perceive themselves as specialist practitioners (in Lucas, 2004), which implies a strong association with a vocation. The following figure (Figure 2) illustrates respondents’ employment status at the time of data collection.
Twelve (4%) of the respondents, who were not currently working, reported that they could not find positions teaching their preferred subjects. A higher proportion of men were teaching full-time rather than teaching part-time or fractional: 51.2% of the male respondents were teaching full-time compared to 34.3% of the total of female respondents; this was found to be statistical significant ($x^2 = 12.434 \ (df = 3, \ n=286) \ p = .006$), although the strength of the association was deemed weak ($\Phi = .209$) with sex accounting for 4.3% of the variance in modes of employment. In addition, there was a statistically significant relationship between the respondents’ age and their current employment status ($x^2 = 23.484 \ (df = 6, \ n = 285) \ p = .001$). The association was of a weak to moderate strength ($\Phi = .287$) and thus the age of respondents accounted for 8.2% of the variance in current employment status. Younger respondents, aged between 20 and 34, were more likely to be teaching full-time compared to the other age groups. Perhaps not surprisingly, a slightly higher proportion of respondents in the older age group, age 45 and over, were teaching full-time compared to respondents aged between 35 and
44. Since the majority of the respondents in the sample were female, I suspect that other modes of working would suit family responsibilities for respondents in the 35-44 age group. Indeed, respondents in this group were spread fairly evenly between full-time, part-time and sessional working.

Those respondents, who were working in some capacity, were mainly teaching in a further education college (61.3%), although 13.7% had used the training to teach in the compulsory sector and 5.1% were teaching in higher education. The remaining respondents were teaching in independent training centres. Respondents mainly taught students over the age of 16 (46.2% taught students aged 16-19; 44.5% taught students over the age of 19); the remaining respondents taught 14-16 year-olds but these particular respondents were teaching in a college rather than a school, reminiscent of an Early Entrants programme (Attwood et al, 2004) cited in Chapter One.

The type of qualification taught tended to be basic and/or key skills (30.8%). Teaching general academic qualifications, such as GCSEs and A Levels, accounted for 23.3% of the findings with general vocational qualifications, GNVQs and BTEC, accounting for 17.5%. Significantly, only 10.6% of respondents taught vocational/occupational qualifications such as NVQs. In addition, there was a statistically significant relationship between the regions and the type of qualification taught ($x^2 = 59.980$ (df =15 N = 280) $p = .000$). The association was of moderate strength ($\Phi = .463$); where respondents taught (region) accounted for 21% of the variance in what type of qualifications they taught. A higher percentage of respondents in Yorkshire and the South West taught basic and/or key skills than those in the East.
Midlands and South East, who mainly taught general/academic qualifications such as GCSE and A levels.

This chapter has outlined the methods employed for collecting and analysing the qualitative and quantitative data for both phases of this investigation. It has also described and examined the characteristics of the sample population. Chapter Five presents the findings from the analysis of the data collected from this sample.
Chapter Five

Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents and discusses the findings from the analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data collected for this PhD investigation. Findings indicated factors which might affect newly-qualified teachers' continued motivation to teach in the post-compulsory sector during 2000-2004. The demotivators were identified and the extent and impact of these on intentions to remain in teaching were measured.

These findings are presented in two sections. The first section identifies the nature of the demotivators and the extent to which these were common to NQTs across the sector. Patterns of prevalence were also identified. The second section presents the findings of the effects of these demotivators on NQTs' intentions to continue working in the sector for a further five years. Findings are compared to those of the research studies reviewed earlier to add to the literature concerning this period. Possible explanations to account for my findings are discussed within the framework of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985, 1992, 2000) and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959).
5.1 The Demotivators

Findings to identify the demotivators from the re-interrogation of the qualitative data collected for the MA study during the first phase of this investigation had been clustered into three factors pertaining to the students, teacher autonomy and the institution. Fifteen areas were investigated for the second phase and addressed issues pertaining to: students’ motivation, ability, behaviour, achievement and attendance; teacher autonomy in terms of learning resources, teaching styles, the syllabus, assessment procedures and administration workload; and conditions in the colleges including class sizes, facilities, the general climate, opportunities for feedback and career advancement. Findings revealed that there were four demotivators, which were common to most NQTs working in the sector during 2000-2004. The majority felt that most of their teaching time was spent motivating students to engage with learning; they thought that the administrative demands/duties were excessive and unreasonable; they were concerned by students’ levels of basic skills for their course of study; and did not feel that their work linked to a clear career path (see Appendices 8.3 & 8.4).

There were, however, other demotivators, which were dependent on employment status (whether NQTs worked part-time, full-time etc); the age and sex of the NQTs; the type of subject taught (vocational training/basic and key skills or an academic subject) and whether they intended to remain in teaching in five years’ time. The corresponding contingency tables can be

---

3 There also appeared to be regional differences; NQTs from the South-East were generally more positive about remaining in teaching (see Appendix 7).
found in the appendices; their whereabouts are indicated in the text. In addition, a table, summarising these particular findings, is attached as Appendix 10.

The following discussion integrates the findings from the analysis of the both the qualitative and quantitative results. In addition, other potential demotivators, which did not emerge during the first phase of the investigation and consequently, were not measured in the survey, are outlined.

Respondents to the survey, who were not intending to stay in teaching, rated the institution the most negatively out of the three factors (see Appendix 8.2) and there were many accounts relating to the conditions in the colleges:

When I began, I was very much thrown in at the deep end. The department was undergoing a third audit with the risk of closure. I was not informed of this at interview. We got through the audit. Other members are on long-term sick on and off, and this is not sufficiently covered. I, in turn, take on more duties and responsibilities than my L1 post affords. I am still at the bottom of the pay scale for L1. We are currently without a CM or CL so myself (L1), a L2 and two part-time ‘fractionals’ cover everything. I am at present looking for other work. I am a good teacher and get grade 2/3 for inspections but the job is too demanding and I have a family to consider, (Y036).

I was thoroughly put off by my experience of teaching in a FE college by the working atmosphere and conditions. Everyone was over-worked and consequently very stressed and negative, even at normal working times. Once exams and an OFSTED inspection arrived, the stress levels and workload went through the roof. With 26 contact hours a week, you don’t have time to be creative in your teaching. Our French counterparts only teach 18 hours a week so in the UK we do the equivalent of an extra day. It’s madness and badly paid madness at that. I would never go back into teaching as a career, (Gn260).

Throughout the qualitative comments, there was a real sense of the pressures put onto institutions, and thus by default on the teaching staff, from the
government’s initiatives and accountability measures:

I specialised in ESOL, which is undergoing great changes constantly. The government’s steps are unrealistic, the curriculum unhelpful and the expectation of teachers to retrain without appropriate remuneration for training for an extra qualification unreasonable, (W038).

Over the last two and a half years my college has had two mock inspections and one real one. Even though the college got a two in the real inspection, the college is having a mock one this year. Tutors are under constant pressure, (Y205).

The pressure on colleges to grow, increase student numbers and find ways to maximise student income (McDonald and Lucas, 2001) were also evident, yet some participants seemed resigned to this:

At present, class sizes are too large and administration work is excessive. My colleagues are supportive and there is an appraisal system in place which works well. I do enjoy teaching but feel tired, worn down and a little disillusioned with the workload involved. In college at present, it is very short staffed and this seems to put everyone under pressure. Students come a definite second to administration during times like this, (Y147).

I have developed a cynical attitude, which I expected to happen, just not this quickly. My aim is to accept these mini-frustrations as part and parcel of this vocation, (C012).

Although some NQTs commented that class size was an issue, the quantitative findings were contrary to findings in the study by McDonald and Lucas (2001). Rather than finding that class sizes were too big or small for managing effective learning – thus putting strain on health and safety issues and syllabus coverage – participants in my study were generally positive, and teachers of vocational and basic skills were even more positive. My finding might be due to the heavy concentration of NQTs teaching basic skills in the sample as the Skills for Life initiative enabled substantial growth in this area. Increased levels of funding, not only enabled new teaching appointments and teaching materials but also class expansion.
Although a clear career path did not emerge as a demotivator during the first phase of this investigation, but was added in light of the literature, this was clearly a demotivator for participants who were not currently teaching, teaching on hourly-paid or sessional contracts (see Appendix 9.3). For these participants, the reason for this appeared to be based on the difficulty in obtaining a more substantial contract:

The college that I work for has been very stubborn and slow in offering a fractional post even though I run the first year of a diploma course and deliver AS level and all three key skills myself. To be a jack of all trades is key to sustaining a place on a course team, (Pp098).

My experience of teaching in this sector is the difficulty of moving from being employed on an hourly basis to having a fractional or full-time contract. This is despite having worked in the same institution for over two years. I believe this is to be the most common obstacle to career advancement in the post-compulsory sector, (Pp099).

As a sessional teacher, I have found very little support from colleges and feel that sessional staff are viewed as cheap labour when the college cannot afford full-time staff. Career progression is very limited and is down to the individual, (W105).

These accounts tend to support the findings of McKelvey and Andrews (1998), with regards to the lack of job security, and those of Shain and Gleeson (1999) who reported that the dismantling of the ‘Silver Book’ agreement in 1993, had enabled colleges to make economies around staffing issues including pay and contracts. This casualization of the sector in 1995-6 reported by Hillier (2006) was still very much in evidence and for NQTs aged 35 and above, it was a particular problem (sees Appendix 9.5). Findings also indicated that NQTs, who did not intend to remain in teaching in five years’ time and those who were unsure, did not feel that their work lead to future career advancement (see Appendix 9.1). This suggests that the extrinsic rewards achieved through career advancement are just as important as intrinsic rewards to sustain motivation since participants felt that the ‘contingent path’ identified by
Raynor (1974, in Dörnyei, 2001) to enhance achievement-related motivation, was lacking:

The college makes sure that it employs a few full-timers, keeping the rest of us on annualised hours – a concept I had not encountered until FE. None of us feel valued. Management is aggressive and partisan. Previous experience in work makes me wonder how the college manages to get away with it. Hourly pay is reasonable but the cap on number of hours worked makes it impossible to earn a living. Less than 17K a year for a qualified teacher is laughable, (Gn003).

This comment would support the claims of Young et al (1995) and McDonald and Lucas (2001) that colleges increasingly rely on part-time teachers to reduce staffing costs in an effort to grow and maximise income.

Another demotivator pertaining to the institution factor was the climate within institutions. Results indicated that NQTs, who intended to leave, and those, who were not currently teaching, did not feel that their colleges were supportive. The qualitative comments suggested that this was mainly due to the conflict between managers and teachers, replicating the findings of Elliot (1996), McKelvey and Andrews (1998) and Wallace (2002). Not only did participants feel that managers were unsupportive but they lacked sufficient understanding of the NQTs’ work:

Support from other people I work with is a big factor – not very much support at managerial level. I feel they are out of touch with ground level issues especially as they do little teaching and have a policy of the more ‘bums on seats’ the better financially. The college sector is de-motivating due to the lack of financial rewards for work; we are paid a lot less than school teachers, (Y212).

The reason why so many staff leave my college is due to poor, or even, malicious management treatment. Staff turnover was 23% last year! (G278).

FE expected me to cope instantly as a course leader. Colleagues were supportive; management were clueless about the ‘shop floor’, (Y168).
On the surface my work environment is perfect but the leadership/communication skills of the management are a problem. Morale is very low and there seems to be no concept of motivating or encouraging staff, (B234).

The last comment illustrates the constraints of relying on closed quantitative methods as the college environment can be interpreted in a number of ways which include support and good relationships with colleagues in addition to management support and leadership. Qualitative findings suggested that NQTs, on full-time contracts, were positive about their relationships with colleagues, but this was not always the case with those on part-time or sessional contracts:

As a sessional worker I often feel isolated. I haven't been notified of team meetings. I cannot access the college intranet and people forget to include me sometimes when memos are circulated, (B236).

I find that teaching adults creates a very isolated existence with non-contact with other fellow tutors due to classes often scheduled for evenings [sic], (Gn56).

Diversity of contact among tutors was reported by Coffield et al, (2007) and the narratives above were definitely on the end of the continuum towards isolation. In terms of motivation the environmental dimension is central to the process of internalization and the functions of relatedness and competence (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985). As Deci and Ryan argue, people need to feel a sense of belonging to a group with a similar goal. Therefore, although the sessional teachers had the same objective – teaching the college students – isolation from their colleagues and not feeling part of a team could eventually affect their internal motivation.

Fulfilment of the need to feel competent was often challenged through lack of mentor support, an issue also highlighted by Avis & Bathmaker (2006).
Indeed, there was evidence of ‘hands-off’ mentoring described by Butcher (2003):

I have been teaching for eight weeks… I feel that no-one tells me I’m doing a good (or bad) job. I have little senior management support, and no guidance, (C230).

At present I have been teaching since September [2 months] and feel that I have been left to fend for myself. Therefore I feel very lonely with regards to my performance and teaching style. However, I’m sure that this will develop in the future, when hopefully support will be given, (Gn249).

I felt enormous pressure during the first year. There was very little support – I met my mentor two times! I was asked to cover an AS economics – not a subject I am qualified in – I had one course book and no resource material. By the end of the year I had produced lesson plans, overheads, exercises, games, CD Rom support, back-up materials etc. for the whole course and left the materials for the next incumbent! This is an unreal level of work imposed on teaching-staff – especially part-time or temporary staff – with little or no management support just expectancy that the work will be completed! I felt too much emphasis was placed upon cost cutting, image and accountancy and not enough on the quality of the students’ education, (Gn043).

In a year of teaching (paid work) I have received no formal feedback from any member of the management team. My only observed sessions were those that were part of my PGCE practice, (B236).

The need to feel competent can be enhanced by positive feedback, as long as it is informational rather than controlling or amotivating. However, since these participants have received very little, if any feedback, this constitutes to a poor hygiene factor (Herzberg, 1959) and the absence of the recognition motivator (Herzberg, 1959), which can undermine an individual's perceived competence, as in the case of this participant:

I was a very good teacher and am only able to express this because I was told how fantastic I was by staff and students upon deciding to leave. If I was told this during my time teaching I may not have decided to leave. On reflection I thoroughly enjoyed my short-lived teaching career (3 years). The stress and marking were often too much at times and I often thought that my not coping was due to the fact that I wasn’t a good teacher. I had little support from my already over-worked line managers who did their best. I truly feel that if I had
a mentor and was encouraged and told how good I was from time to
time, particularly when embarking on my teaching career, I would still
be doing a great job of inspiring young people to learn, (Y013).

Ironically, one participant’s perceived level of competence was enhanced by
feedback from a source which would normally be viewed by Deci and Ryan
(1985) as a controlling event:

I still feel a little unsure of the ‘do’s and don’ts’ of classroom
management especially with the younger disillusioned students
receiving EMA. However, having had very positive feedback from a
senior OFSTED inspector, I do feel confident and am pleased with my
progress, (W285).

However, the above event appeared to be an exception:

Failing an OFSTED inspection has had a very negative effect on my
teaching experiences. Far too much of my time is spent on activities to
please OFSTED next time, while I feel I still need to devote all my
efforts to the core task of developing a scheme of work which matches
my style and my students’ abilities, (P024).

Lack of support from managers or mentors appeared to be a common theme.

One participant was driven to create her own support network:

Some positive and some negative experiences but on the whole I feel
completely unsupported as a newly qualified teacher and have found I
have had to generate a support network within the college for
colleagues with similar experiences as myself, (W152).

Given that the majority of the participants came from a background in
business (section 4.3.8), there was evidence of a culture shock. By
comparison the private sector appeared much more supportive and less
bureaucratic:

The main area of concern for me is the lack of support for newly
appointed teachers. I have felt totally unsupported in every direction
from personnel, finance, resources, everything. I find the whole
teaching profession unprofessional in the approach of support… I have
come from a very supportive background in industry where training is
vital for support, motivation and staff morale, (Gn263).
Teaching has been a challenge, particularly due to the massive cultural change moving from a commercial business into education. I still find the length of time for decisions to be made frustrating. Therefore I tend to be a bit of a maverick and challenge the norms. This is not always appreciated by my colleagues but I see my key objective as enabling my students to learn and be able to better themselves through a challenging career path, (Gn011).

Another demotivator which surfaced from analysis of the qualitative data and would pertain to the institution factor was the lack of activities for continued professional development:

Problems with uncertainties about funding make planning new courses difficult. Lack of funding also means resources are very limited and there is no money for professional development, (Gn057).

I am enjoying teaching English in a FE college (on the whole). We do not get much CPD that directly enhances the teaching of English. This is frustrating. I have therefore started a MA in the Teaching of English…but I have to fund this myself, (G068).

I am concerned by the lack of security as a sessional worker and the lack of professional development and further training, (Gn54).

Given that one of the main intrinsic components for entering teaching is the rewards gained from continuous engagement with their subject and the potential for lifelong learning (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997 in Dörnyei, 2001; Mckelvey & Andrews, 1998; Matthews, 2003), this lack is a serious challenge for continued motivation. The participant’s account of having to fund her development did not come as a surprise and supports the findings of Harwood and Harwood (2004), who reported that teachers in the sector often had to fund their own higher degree courses and undertake them in their own time.

Overall participants were more positive about statements pertaining to the autonomy factor, which investigated teaching practice in terms of autonomy over the syllabus, in producing resources and in delivery to accommodate various learning styles (see Appendices 8.2 & 8.4). The vast majority of
participants were positive about having freedom to produce their own teaching resources and materials. However, this 'freedom' was seen as a double-edged sword since this task was often undertaken in NQTs' own time and therefore not accounted for in their pay. Although this was raised by participants on sessional contacts, it was also a problem highlighted by those on full-time contracts:

Teaching is very rewarding and stimulating but the time required to produce material is not sufficient to allow for the development of new ideas or methods. Consequently I find the hours very long, (Gn286).

I feel the college does not allow enough time for preparation and consequently much of this work is done at home in evenings and weekends – time when I should be relaxing and resting. It is better this year but not because I now have resources in place, but because I have pulled back on my input to less contact time. I feel a bit guilty about this but I felt it necessary for my health's sake, (Gn055).

I'm learning the subject as I go along, which coupled [with] a MA in historical research is proving time consumptive. The exercises and resources are much more difficult to produce. I know I need to spend more time on them and hope to combine the Christmas recess with creating more imaginative tasks and learning/teaching aids, (W289).

These comments support the findings of Coffield et al (2007) with regards to the rise of 'underground working' whereby teachers regularly work in their free time above contracted hours. Participants described their average working week as 80-90 hours (G023, W290, P223). Another issue which aggravated this problem was the necessity to teach courses for subjects outside of their discipline. Analysis of the quantitative data revealed that a third of participants were not teaching in an area related to their previous occupation (see section 4.3.8 in Chapter Four) and qualitative accounts reflected this:

In the last three years of teaching the most significant experience has been the problems I have had with the variety of subjects I am supposed to teach. Although I have a sociology and social policy degree, I have taught history, media, housing and psychology. This has caused much stress in terms of limited prep time and skills. It would be nice to just teach one subject in future, (Y150).
I was employed at my current place of work to teach art and design. Since then I have also taught pottery, digital imaging and drama, none of which I had any technical knowledge or experience in! I find it absurd that specialists with a teacher training qualification are expected to then become jack of all trades… I also feel it is unfair on students who expect their teacher to know more about the subject than them! (Y081).

This finding was particularly surprising since normally teachers entering FE are regarded as occupational experts (Robson, 1998; Lucas, 2004) and indeed the Silver Book agreement had been introduced to attract these practitioners. For the NQTs, this situation put more pressure on their time and affected their ability to plan the lessons the way they would wish:

I have been teaching for eight weeks, full-time. I teach students with various learning difficulties. I feel that the various constraints and pressures placed on us/me limit and hinder my ability to plan and prepare a good lesson. There never seems to be enough time to prepare and this makes planning a lesson to suit the range of learning styles almost impossible, (C230).

Not all the NQTs were positive about assessment procedures; polarisation occurred in the findings between participants teaching vocational subjects or basic skills with those who were teaching academic subjects (see Appendix 9.4). Some of the qualitative comments shed light on the problems:

As the majority of my students are aged 40+, I have few problems with student motivation or classroom discipline. However, current funding structures mean that students must undertake a vocational course with assessments even though many would be better suited to a non-vocational course. This results in students having to undertake course elements that are poorly suited to their own particular needs – resulting in a number of students struggling to achieve assessments for which they see little point, while at the same time, we are unable to acquire funding for subject areas that our students would find more interesting and useful, (B153).

I have found that pressures on colleges to meet end results lead to students in classes that are unsuitable. Assessment procedures are ineffective due to pressure on staff to pass all students within a time limit or they face criticism that they are not getting results. The system has endeavoured to improve teacher performance but unfortunately
the result has been teachers pushing students through assessment to ensure a pass result at the end of year, (Y187).

The pressures appear to be related to the funding lever (Steer et al, 2007) and highlight the change from the definition of quality being focused on the teaching process to one based on performance indicators (Shain & Gleeson, 1999). However, the effect of these efficiency indicators in practice appeared to undermine the government's policy to encourage much stronger links with industry. The following narratives suggest that even the NQTs were not confident about their students’ achievements, let alone future employers:

I will not be teaching in five years’ time. Indeed, once my student loan is paid, I will be returning to the family firm, as I have become increasingly cynical about the NVQ system. The emphasis is ‘bums on seats’. Many students are unable to pass the basis screening test yet they are still put through the system. The ‘knock on’ effect is prospective employers having no faith in the validity of the NVQ qualification. As a fourth generation stonemason, I for one, would not send an apprentice on a NVQ course, (Y191).

I felt qualifications were given away irrespective of student abilities, (Y172).

Emphasis appears to be on the number of students enrolled on courses rather than their actual ability to achieve. Education in the FE sector appears to be becoming more of a business than a service, (Y200).

This finding did not appear overtly in the literature but it is a serious issue as the comments suggest challenges to notions of being a professional and taking a pride in what one does – not only as a teacher but also as an industrial expert. One of the challenges of enforcing teacher training courses was that teachers did not necessarily see the need since they were more concerned about their industrial credibility (Robson, 1998; Lucas, 2004). Yet, both teacher professionalism and ‘industrial’ professionalism appear to be compromised to meet the pressures of the funding lever. This issue can potentially threaten the fulfilment of all three needs postulated by Deci and
Ryan (1975, 1985) for continued motivation. It would not be difficult to imagine that a NQTs' sense of belonging to their vocational/occupational ‘community’ would be challenged; notions of autonomy would be comprised due to the pressure of obtaining results – arguably regardless of the consequences – which in turn would affect their sense of teaching and personal efficacy. The latter is compromised further when students are adversely affected by this pressure since it is their best interests that NQTs are trained to accommodate:

I have taught in two different colleges since qualifying in 2001. Teaching in FE seems (over the last two years) to have changed considerably. It’s all too well pushing students to achieve, only to pressure them into dropping out as they know (and we, as teachers know,) that some students will never achieve what the government is asking for. This makes us feel more pressurised into getting ‘things right’ and questions your own role as a teacher when these learners don’t achieve, (W001).

Findings revealed notions that students were perceived as commodities (McDonald & Lucas, 2001) evidenced through the ‘bums on seats’ strategy (Hillier, 2006) resulting in enrolment on courses that were often inappropriate for students in terms of their ability and interests:

On the whole teaching has proved to be a positive experience. The main concerns are the level of basic skills the students enter college with. Many are on courses too high for their ability to ensure ‘bums on seats’, (Y020).

I found that college was all about keeping 16-19 year-olds off the street. They were considered beyond help, but needed to be kept there so that the college did not lose money. Even though the students saw it as a way to meet friends and socialise, they had no interest in learning, were very disrespectful and didn’t want to be there. I was given no support by the college, (Y192).

At BTEC level it is concerning to see the very low levels of student motivation and low levels of skills in written English. This makes assessment a huge challenge as students find it almost impossible to do the required work. There seems to be a big difference on some programmes between the course demands and the skills assumed to be present at the point of admission! (W288).
These findings support those of Finlay and Finnie (2002) that meeting learner needs were often neglected in favour of funding, but this had a detrimental effect on student motivation. Having to spend much of their time motivating students was found to be a particular demotivator for the all the NQTs (see Appendix 8.3) and further analysis revealed that this was a demotivator not only for participants, who were not intending to remain in teaching and those who were unsure, but also for the NQTs, who intended to stay:

Students have terrible trouble motivating themselves to do anything, including turning up. They have very poor basic skills, no self-discipline and fight my help all the way. It is hard work just trying to control the class and they are supposed to want to be here, (Y217).

This would support findings by Wallace (2002) and Bathmaker and Avis (2005) and illustrate the mismatch between NQTs’ expectations about students and the reality of the classroom (Chambers et al, 2002). The pressure of getting ‘bums on seats’ and the government’s initiatives to encourage young people back to the classroom through the EMA and New Deal options, could lead to students feeling pressurised into attending college. The NQTs, who had decided to leave the profession, thought that this was the case (Appendix 9.1). Indeed, if students are undertaking courses that they are not interested in nor capable of, it is not surprising that these students become demotivated. If they have already ‘failed’ at school, being unable to achieve in post-compulsory education will continue this pattern of feeling incompetent. The threat of another poor performance could potentially lead to inappropriate behaviour in an effort to maintain a sense of self-worth. This engagement in self-handicapping is evidence of Attribution theory developed from the expectancy and value motivation constructs, outlined in Chapter One, whereby students manage their behaviour so that they can attribute an
unsuccessful result to lack of effort rather than their ability (Covington, 1992 in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). This situation is difficult for NQTs to address and may affect their own sense of competence in terms of their teaching efficacy (Ashton, 1985 in Dörnyei, 2001) as well as preventing them from fulfilling their initial altruistic motive since how can one support students if they appear unwilling to learn? This demotivator was an issue in teaching across all the subject categories. However, although the majority of participants felt that much of their time was spent motivating students, the majority was not so convincing with responses from those teaching in vocational/basic skills (see Appendix 9.4). Since the NQTs teaching basic skills were generally more positive about their students, this finding may well be attributed to the inclusion of teaching key skills in this category:

The most challenging [teaching experience] was with a group of electrical installation students. I was supposed to teach key skill communications. The lack of motivation due to their mystification as to why there were doing ‘English’ when they were training to be electricians made this difficult, (G037).

Creative students in my opinion are finding the key skills very difficult as some creative students are not able to think in a mathematical manner. Due to this they are unhappy and unmotivated. Perhaps the education system does not cater for left-brain thinking, (Gn267).

This finding is also resonant of expectancy and value motivation theories and underlines the importance of the perceived valence of an activity by an individual for motivation to be initiated and sustained (Lewin 1935, in Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). If students do not see the relevance and thus the value of learning key skills, they will be unmotivated. This problem appeared to be aggravated by the way in which these subjects are taught in the sector to comply with the National Curriculum – an issue raised in Phase One of the
My teaching experiences within the Navy have been nothing but positive. Students are well supported in terms of physical resources and staff time/commitment. Key skills are taught alongside practical work skills and there is consistency and rigour in the approach. I have had experience of teaching key skills to a similar age group within a college setting and I have to say I found the experience to be frustrating, mainly due to the lack of time and the chaotic approach. Maths and English can be dull and boring subjects for teens/young people and a degree of 'coercion' is helpful! (Gn019).

NQTs teaching basic skills also faced challenges since some students had learning difficulties:

I think that the government’s policy about basic skills/Skills for Life is unachievable. Many of the adult learners have learning difficulties and it is impossible for them to achieve level 2 in literacy and numeracy, (Y166).

I am really enjoying teaching but being employed by a small college entails being asked to teach groups I am not qualified to teach (eg. a dyslexia support workshop when I have no experience of dyslexia). Although we have small classes, they may comprise of learners with abilities from E1 to Level 1, 2. Challenging! (Y163).

Findings about students’ levels of basic skills being appropriate for the course of study were significant across the sample. The majority of participants who were unsure about remaining in teaching were concerned about their students’ abilities (Appendix 9.1). This finding was contrary to the feelings of NQTs, who were staying in teaching and most surprisingly, to the feelings of those who intended to leave teaching. There was also polarisation in the findings with regards to the subject areas taught; NQTs teaching academic subjects indicated this as a demotivator (Appendix 9.4). This was also found to be the case for NQTs, who were not currently teaching or teaching full-time (Appendix 9.3). However, NQTs, who were working part-time, either on fractional contracts or sessional agreements, were more likely to disagree (Appendix 9.4). I suspect that these findings reflect the characteristics of the
sample since a large proportion of the NQTs teach basic skills and are employed in a part-time capacity, be it on a fractional contract or on an hourly-paid/sessional arrangement (see section 4.3.8 in Chapter 4). There was also polarisation between the sexes; findings suggest that males were concerned about students’ abilities but this was not a demotivator for the females. In addition, although overall the quantitative findings for the sample would suggest that participants were generally positive about discipline in the classroom, the male NQTs were less positive (see Appendix 9.2), which made me wonder if there were gender differences in terms of expectations of students. Also, NQTs, who had decided to leave teaching, were clearly very divided about students’ behaviour. Unusually, the analysis revealed an equal 50% split (Appendix 9.1). The qualitative findings, however, were more in keeping with the observations made by the participants’ in the study by Wallace (2002):

Disruptive students are a big problem and one of the main causes of stress in the job. The college policy is to keep these students even though often the ‘nicer’ students withdraw from the course because they cannot stand the disruption and unpleasant atmosphere in the lesson, (Y205).

Kids are generally unruly, rude and ill-disciplined. If I quit teaching this would be the main reason why, (C228).

Problems within classroom: violence against staff; bad language; students unmotivated to learn, (Y206).

Many of the participants highlighted the ineffectiveness of their teaching course, supporting the findings of Harkin et al (2003), who reported that training had not sufficiently addressed teaching the diverse range of learners, including dealing with disruptive and non-motivated students. In addition, there was evidence to support the findings of Attwood et al (2004), which
highlighted inadequate training for teaching school excludees or young people with statements of special needs or behaviour problems:

My teaching course spent very little time in covering issues relating to classroom discipline. My first full-time teaching post has been at a special school. As a result, I was severely under-equipped to deal with behavioural difficulties, (Gn042).

The PGCE did not equip me for the types of students I now teach. There was nothing in special needs on the programme. I am also now expected to teach children aged 14-16 who are ex-young offenders and are sent to the college as no-one else will have them. I have found this extremely difficult as I have received little help or training from the college. Some of my students can be threatening and although I have asked for training in this area, none has been forthcoming, (Gn061).

I do think that the PGCE fails to consider basic skills, learning disabilities, physical disabilities and inclusive practices/policies, (W104).

Working under the Skills for Life/widening participation banners means that my students have a variety of issues that make it difficult to take up opportunities in learning and work. There was very little discussion around this area on the course, (Gn292).

These findings were of concern since, as Pop and Turner (2009), and Watt et al, (2012) argue (see Chapter One), if new teachers find themselves in situations for which they are unprepared, this will undermine their confidence in their ability, and they will be unlikely to fulfil their motivations and needs of autonomy and competence (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985). Only three participants, who addressed their teacher training in their comments, had been positive; two of these had used their qualification to obtain employment in the higher education sector:

I have found everything I learnt to be invaluable. Professionalism is an issue that rears its ugly head frequently and our coursework has helped to establish an even surface on which to work, but it’s not been easy, (W289).

The PGCE qualification has really been a springboard for me. I have since done a MSc and now am in my second year of a PhD. I teach within the department and enjoy this aspect of my work. My future
career pathway is to gain a lectureship at a more local university, (W106).

I am fortunate. Although I worked in FE for a couple of years, I am now with HE and believe me, we are talking chalk and cheese. My current job is wonderful, (G063).

However, some participants found that using their qualification to transfer to the compulsory sector was not straightforward:

Until recently I taught in a FE college. I started teaching in a sixth-form section of a school...Because I and my colleague have done a PGCE in FE and therefore don't have QTS, we are paid as 'unqualified' teachers despite the fact that I and my colleague have taught for several years, (B119).

I think it unfair that people who qualify on the PGCE post-compulsory and switch to secondary have to re-train to obtain QTS. This is exploitation and not necessary when the structures are similar. I am qualified to teach 14+ under my PGCE post-compulsory and teach 14+ only at school but still had to complete a gruelling QTS programme! (G067).

As well as the lack of recognition for their FE teaching qualification, participants also highlighted the difference in remuneration, not only between the further education and the compulsory education sectors but also compared to teaching for the local government:

Pay is also a concern as we fall further behind secondary education each year. This creates a desire to move away from FE, (Y020).

I have changed from FE to secondary teaching because of the pay scale and there were more opportunities for advancement in my career, (W109)

I chose to join a local authority as a basic skills tutor as the salary of £21,255 although not commensurate with my qualifications was considerably higher than what was on offer in FE colleges ie. £16 - 18K. (Y148).

These comments reinforce the ‘Cinderella’ label attached to the sector in comparison with the other sectors and findings suggested that participants were not oblivious to the differences in terms and conditions reported by
Edward *et al* (2007). Although studies undertaken in the post-compulsory sector did not highlight salary as being a key motivator for entering teaching, an inadequate salary is evidence of a poor hygiene factor (Herzberg, 1959). One could argue that if you enjoy your work, your salary should be less important, but as these participants’ emotive stories demonstrate, it is not always possible:

Working under 30 week contracts, paid only for actual teaching hours, with no pension plan, holiday or sick pay is proving to be unsustainable. Pressure to move students onto accredited pathways is not in the interests of students, many of whom already have a sense of failure in education, but only in the interests of government targets. Also, the amount of information I am expected to collect from students for a 2-hour a week lesson is unreasonable and seriously eats into valuable teaching time as well as adding to my hours of work, giving me very little free time. I find it hard to believe the amount of work I have put in since the start of this term and my monthly wage for October was £640. I am very disappointed that I have found a job I enjoy, believe in and love but am having to ask myself if it is sustainable. I am frequently coming up with the answer that it isn’t, (Gn025).

My teaching career so far has been on a fairly ad hoc basis. I found that the one course which I taught throughout last year involved me doing two days’ work at home in preparation (due to lack of resources etc). I used my own materials and went in early on the day to photocopy. The end result was that I committed at least two days’ prep and was paid for one and a half hours – grand sum of £26. Why does anyone do this? Marking was also done in my time at home. Now [I am] only doing some odd supply cover, (B118).

This dilemma of having to balance practical necessities with a vocational desire to teach illustrates just how complex motivation and job satisfaction has become. However, further analysis of the above narrative labelled GN025, indicates that it is not just the poor salary and contract terms which are demotivating. There was also evidence that the participant’s professional values, in terms of her responsibility to her students, were being challenged. Furthermore, there was evidence to support the findings of Jephcote *et al*,
(2008) that data collection for audit diminishes the time for teaching activities. Findings from the quantitative data analysis revealed that as a group, the NQTs thought that the administration duties were unreasonable, echoing findings of McDonald and Lucas (2001). This excessive workload was clearly a demotivator for NQTs, who intended to leave and those who were unsure (Appendix 9.1). NQTs’ employment status was also an indication that this was a demotivator; NQTs, who were not currently teaching, teaching full-time and those on part-time sessional contracts, agreed that administration demands were excessive. Surprisingly, NQTs on hourly-paid and sessional arrangements were more likely to disagree (see Appendix 9.3). This may be accounted for by different teaching duties attached to their roles, which was revealed in the qualitative narratives in addition to illustrating the extent of the problem:

I work a 37½ hour week as a tutor. Surprisingly I only teach for 8 hours as the rest of the time is taken up with administration, (Gn283).

The atmosphere at work is one of being threatened. All administration work has to be signed and the feeling is that for any errors you will be disciplined. No training is provided into course management, personal tutor’s responsibilities and examining bodies’ paperwork, (Gn286).

The situation in FE is one of lack of finance/resources. I have also taught in sixth-form college which seems to be far better equipped. In addition, there is far less administrative support in FE, (G275).

Having taught for a year at a higher education institution where paperwork and admin was kept to a minimum, I am now dismayed by the amount of paperwork that needs to be completed for the adult education community/leisure art courses which are supposed to be ‘fun’ courses. I spend more time on paperwork than I do on teaching, (Gn247).

However, it would appear that to offset this problem some colleges had actively reduced participants’ teaching duties:

As a full-time tutor I now find I spend only 9 hours per week in a classroom situation. The remainder of my time is spent on key support duties and admin. The philosophy in FE seems to be that full-time staff
arrange and organise teaching and get part-time staff to do the ‘hands-on’ teaching, (Y158).

Several colleges do not encourage creative teaching but simply want a sessional tutor to teach ‘the way it’s always been done’! Most students expect a certain style of teaching and are quick to complain if they don’t receive it. Overall it is easy to see why so many people are leaving education! (W105).

Since intrinsic rewards are gained from the actual process of teaching and the interaction with students – cited as the other key motivator for entering teaching (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997 in Dörnyei, 2001; McKelvey & Andrews, 1998; Matthews, 2003) – taking teachers out of the classroom removes the possibility of fulfilling these motives. As the following comments illustrate, for some NQTs, it is the engagement with students which helps them deal with the demotivators apparent in the sector:

Many of the students in FE have huge problems so it may be impossible for them to perform as well as they should and this is frustrating. I love the bonds one develops with each student to guide them through their course; to see their confidence grow (and some of them are very disadvantaged) is like watching a flower open, (P223).

Basic skills at pre-entry level seem to be regarded as the compost heap of FE provision. To me it is a place full of genuine growth and opportunity to develop as a practitioner, (W104).

Furthermore, as the comment labelled W105 suggests (above), suppressing creativity would indicate that there were also challenges to notions of professionalism. Threats to professional autonomy, knowledge and responsibility (Robson, 1998) were echoed by other participants:

As lecturer we are on the front line – being the only contact with students – however we are not perceived as being important enough to be involved in important matters and often find out decisions very last minute, (Y198).

I really want to teach! My time is eaten away by the enormous administrative work that I am expected to deal with. I feel that teachers’ professionalism is being eroded and that morale is low. Many tutors in FE feel like second-class citizens due to the lack of
resources, funding and the divide between salary scales in comparison with other teachers, (Y213)

Although the literature suggests that the erosion of teachers’ professionalism was mainly due to the accountability measures following Incorporation (Robson, 1998; Shain & Gleeson 1999) and clearly the NQTs believed that the work associated with these measures were excessive and interfered with the actual teaching, there was no indication that the auditing model had made them feel that they were not trusted to do their jobs properly. This finding was contrary to those of Scott et al, (2001) and Robson (1998). Only one participant commented on this and that was to indicate a lack in her college:

As a ‘new’ teacher within the FE sector I am still on a steep learning curve. It does not help that I have been made course tutor and mentor to two colleagues as adapting to teaching 24 hours a week is challenging enough. I am amazed at the lack of accountability that is obvious with some management and my peers [sic], (C227).

However, although some might argue that this could be perceived as a being positive, there is the feeling in this narrative that this NQT has been given too much responsibility with inadequate support from the institution.

This section has outlined the findings identifying the nature of the demotivators for NQTs during 2000-2004. These were generally related to the students’ lack of motivation and ability; the workload; and the institution in terms of inadequate career pathways and an unsupportive climate. Other demotivators emerged from the qualitative data and highlighted problems with management, lack of continued professional development activities and mentor support. These findings can be attributed to the policy levers outlined by Steers et al, (2007) as funding, targets, planning, inspection and government initiatives to widen participation have increasingly put pressure on
colleges. As a consequence, the impact of these on the NQTs was found to include all five factors, which Dörnyei (2001) argues can erode the intrinsic character of teacher motivation (Chapter One, 1.2.2). There is evidence to suggest that NQTs are stressed; their teaching autonomy has been inhibited, particularly through the ‘bums on seats’ strategy to meet funding targets; there is evidence of insufficient self-efficacy due to the lack of appropriate training to deal with disruptive and amotivated students or to teach students with special learning requirements. In addition, due to funding restraints, there were limited opportunities for intellectual development; those who were taking further programmes of study had to self-fund. There was also evidence of the fifth factor - that of inadequate career advancement (Dörnyei, 2001). Many of the NQTs were forced to work in a part-time capacity, and their teaching qualification was not recognised by other educational sectors. The following section presents the findings of intentions to remain in teaching and thus identifies which of the demotivators were sufficiently demotivating to become reasons for leaving.
5.2 Intentions to continue working in the sector

Participants were asked if they expected to be teaching in five years’ time. Just over half of the respondents (53.4%) indicated ‘yes’, 32.2% did not know and 13% indicated the ‘no’ response. Four respondents did not respond (coded as missing data) which accounted for the remaining 1.4%. Figure 3 shows these results.

Figure 3 – Expectations of remaining in the profession in 5 years

These results do not support findings by Nash (1996), who suggested that six out of ten teachers wanted to leave the profession in 1996. Indeed the findings suggest that these figures improved in 2004 with respect to NQTs at least, since only three in ten wanted to leave and five out of ten NQTs wanted to stay in the profession; the remainder of NQTs were undecided. It might be tempting to believe that since 39.7% of the participants had some teaching experience in colleges (either paid or voluntary) before they undertook teaching training that this might account for the more positive findings.
Arguably, these participants would have a better idea insight into the conditions in the sector before they trained but analysis of this data was not significant. My findings also suggested that participants’ expectations to be teaching in five years’ time did not appear to be affected by the length of time they had been working in the sector. However, assuming Jones (2003) is correct in that the first three to four years will determine whether NQTs stay in teaching, this finding was inconclusive since 83.6% of participants in the sample had less than three years’ teaching experience. Only 16.4% of the sample had been teaching three years or more. The response rate for this cohort (2000-2001) was disappointing and may be due to a variety of factors; NQTs might have already left the profession and thus, did not feel inclined to complete the survey or, they did not have the time due to work commitments. Indeed, three non-completed questionnaires were returned with an explanation to this effect.

Participants, who indicated that they intended to leave, were asked to give a reason. However, more participants, than those to whom this question was addressed, provided responses. In a few cases these were caveats to the ‘yes’ responses to remaining in teaching and included ‘if not done in by stress’; ‘only if I can continue to cope with paperwork’; ‘hopefully’; ‘provided workload and stress levels don’t kill me first!’ and ‘if I can get full-time work – none so far’. Two respondents hoped to be teaching in the five-year time frame but not in further education. The caveats that were posted with the affirmative responses reinforced the finding that excessive administrative demands were demotivating, as outlined in the previous section.
Findings also revealed that even the NQTs who wanted to remain in teaching as well as those who had decided to leave or were unsure, had found difficulties in finding posts. The qualitative comments illuminated some of the problems:

I am not teaching at the moment for two reasons. I want to work near to my home. I have a family to consider and there is very little teaching work in my area. The work that is available is temporary and part-time, neither of which are very helpful when a mortgage and regular bills need to be paid. I am disappointed by what is available to teachers, (B117).

Hundreds of applications made over approximately four years did not secure a proper teaching position – unfortunately, (B077).

After nine months looking for work, I’ve now gone back to freelance design/photography, (Gn059).

Disappointed that I’ve gone to teach in an area where there is ‘supposedly’ a lack of qualified teachers and found this to be far from true – if anything there is a shortage of work, (B120).

Due to the difficulty of finding work in FE, many participants had been forced to transfer to teaching in compulsory education:

I love teaching!! Unfortunately finding work in FE (Art and Design) has been very difficult to the point of depressing. Therefore I have resorted to becoming a supply teacher, (Y159).

I am a supply teacher [school] and find plenty of work. I haven’t had much success in finding full-time work in colleges of FE, (W037).

I am not actually teaching in the FE sector, as I could not get a job there… there are few decent opportunities in FE in my area and the conversion process to secondary is not worth the hassle. I also remind myself that at 3.15 I can walk away from the school and away from meetings, lesson preparation and marking and all the other periphery administrative burdens that teachers have, (Y164).

Given this problem of finding employment participants often had to resort to part-time or sessional work:

I have really enjoyed my work since qualifying. I work in two places on part-time basis equalling full-time work, (Y143).
Since completing the PGCE I have found it difficult to find a secure, permanent job. This seems to be the nature of the FE sector. I really enjoy teaching but I don’t want to go through life on temporary contracts, wondering where the next post will crop up, (Y218).

These findings of the difficulty in obtaining work might account for the low percentage of the sample, who were teaching full-time (38%) and the much higher percentage (45.5%) who were teaching in a part-time capacity. Given the government’s incentives to recruit new teachers to the sector through the Initial Teacher Training Bursary initiative which was introduced in 2000 and would therefore have been offered to the all the participants in this sample, it would not be unreasonable for these NQTs to have expected to find employment. Only one participant, out of the nine who wrote comments about this incentive was positive:

Generally my transition from my previous career into teaching has gone well. The PGCE course was good and my TP experience formative. I had no trouble finding employment and I am enjoying what I do. I see myself staying in this profession for while. The government inducements to enter teaching were clearly part of the attraction of going into teaching, (P222).

The findings from the research undertaken to examine the effects of this bursary (York Consultancy Ltd, 2004), suggested that there was a ‘glut’ of NQTs specialising in the arts, social sciences and humanities and some NQTs were struggling to find posts in the non-shortage subject areas. The problem of finding work might explain why only 34% of NQTs were teaching a subject which related to their previous occupation. However, as Table 2 and Figure 1 illustrated (Chapter Four), the highest proportion of NQTs had come from a background in business administration and management (25%), not normally associated with the arts, social sciences or humanities, yet only 10.6% were teaching in that area. The highest proportion of NQTs were teaching basic...
and key skills (32.2%) even though only 8.2% of the NQTs had indicated prior experience in that area. Conversely, one respondent, who could not find work, specialised in maths – a shortage subject area. The qualitative data revealed that some had taken advantage of the government’s Golden Hello incentive to increase recruitment of teaching in shortage subject areas.

However, as these narratives indicate there was ‘small print’ to this incentive:

I would like to take the opportunity to say that I am angry that teachers in Adult/Community learning are not being allowed to receive the Golden Hello. I think we are discriminated. After all whether you are teaching adults in a college or any other type of institute should not make a difference – as long as you are teaching adults. I am teaching 18.5 hours at an adult education centre which is part of the city council. I got this job because it was where I did my teaching practice since there have been no vacancies anywhere else, (W018).

The Golden Hello scheme is a con – nowhere does it state that you must be working in a college to receive the payment. I am now (at least temporarily) a support worker, working a shorter week for more pay than many of the cohort I went through university with. Moreover, the job requires no formal qualifications; the government seriously needs to look at conditions in the post-16 sector if they actually want an ‘up skilled’ workforce, (Y091).

I did not get the £4K Golden Hello because I went into a LEA rather than FE. I did however receive the £6K bursary to study for the PGCE – no consistency in the government’s attitude! (Y148).

Although the LSC is committed to working with the voluntary sector in order to engage with the hard to reach groups, there is a long way to go before the sector is supported both financially and in recognition [sic]. For example, the ‘Golden Hello’ was meant for all FE provision. We are a fully funded main stream deliverer of ESOL, funded via a voluntary consortium given college status but our staff do not qualify to apply, (Gn053).

This disenchantment with the sector was more fully explained in the responses from the participants who had decided to give up teaching.

Besides the difficulty in finding work, which would account for the finding that the lack of career advancement was a demotivator for NQTs, other reasons included: appalling/unacceptable terms and conditions; low pay with no
recognition or appreciation for teachers; management not having adequate skills to manage effectively and in the interests of teaching; the time required for lesson preparation, planning and research encroaching on personal time and not adequately financed; too many classes and reports that work was too stressful.

Significantly, the demotivators outlined in the previous section associated with the students, were not reasons provided for intending to leave the profession. This would suggest that although lack of student motivation, questionable motives for students to attend college, and possible problems of discipline can affect NQTs’ continued motivation for remaining in teaching, these factors did not appear to be the prime reasons for deciding to leave. Since the intrinsic rewards gained from the actual teaching and interaction with students were one of the two most cited motives for entering teaching (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997 in Dörnyei, 2001), this would imply that the NQTs were still able to gain some sense of achievement. As illustrated in the previous section, there appeared to be mismatch between their expectations about students and the reality of the classroom, supporting research by Chambers et al (2002) but there was also an acknowledgement that these students had problems, some of which were due to the ‘bums on seats’ strategy. It would appear that the NQTs did not necessarily blame the students for their lack of motivation and ability. Indeed, as the comments from some participants suggested (see P223 and W104 in section 5.1), the growth of students in spite of these problems was motivating. I would suggest that feelings of competence and relatedness outlined by Deci and Ryan (1975, 1985) would not only be fulfilled but be
particularly enhanced when students achieved results, however small, under such adverse conditions.

Adult learners are not always there because they want to be. Teaching practice can never prepare you for what lies ahead. The paperwork is over the top ridiculous. You are judged on retention and achievement not on your skills as a teacher. The money is not enough for the amount of the stress you have to deal with. I find the job satisfying when a student shows progression for the subject and this is the only reason I shall do it, (W114).

Consequently, although issues associated with the students were found demotivating, it was the demotivators pertaining to workload, career advancement and the climate in the colleges which were cited as reasons for leaving. Workload has featured prominently throughout the analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data (see 5.1) and the findings reported earlier in this section may account for lack of career advancement. These factors will not be discussed further.

However, the climate in the colleges needs further discussion. An unsupportive and uninspiring climate was found to be a demotivator for the NQTs, who indicated that they would be leaving and those, who were undecided. As highlighted in 5.1, the qualitative findings illuminated why this was felt to be the case. NQTs complained that managers were unsupportive and lacked sufficient understanding of teaching, replicating the findings of Elliot (1996), McKelvey and Andrews (1998) and Wallace (2002). Repeatedly, it was stated that the goals of management were at odds with those of the NQTs. Management appeared to be interested in numbers and attracting funding, which many NQTs felt were not in the best interests of the
students and were contrary to their values:

It is evident within the college sector that the focus is towards funding and business ethics yet the focus should be the students. For teachers, students must come first, (G74).

In addition, NQTs felt that they were not seen as ‘being important enough to be involved in important matters’ (Y198), which would not only challenge feelings of competence but would also threaten notions of professionalism, as indicated by Robson (1998). Evans (1976) argues that the prestige of the profession and attitudes towards reform and improvement are important considerations for teachers, whether they have teacher- or student-centred values (see Chapter 1.2). Feelings of being perceived as ‘second-class citizens’, as one participant described it (Y213), was exacerbated when NQTs compared their working conditions with teachers in other sectors. Of particular distress were the differences in pay and the lack of recognition for their teaching qualification when transferring to teaching in schools. Given these experiences, it is perhaps not surprising that appalling/unacceptable terms and conditions; low pay with no recognition or appreciation for teachers were cited as reasons for leaving.

Comparing my findings with those of Smithers and Robinson (2003), who investigated reasons for teachers leaving compulsory education, would suggest that there are similarities. Excessive workload, the prospect of a new challenge, the school situation (which included poor pupil behaviour), and salary were the main factors which influenced decisions to leave, according to Smithers and Robinson (2003). Although at this stage in their careers the NQTs in my study were not looking for a new challenge, the problem for many was finding full-time work in spite of the government’s incentives encouraging
people to teach in the sector. However, like the school teachers, the NQTs, who intended to leave, cited excessive workload, salary and the college situation (as opposed to the school situation) in terms of ineffective management, as reasons for their decision. What is significant, however, is that poor student behaviour, although found to be a demotivator, was not given as a reason for leaving as it had by the school teachers, and salary was cited as being poor in comparison to salaries offered in the compulsory school sector!

It could be argued that the findings are specific to the sector during the period 2000-2004. However, some of the demotivators, which surfaced during this study, are being discussed at the time of writing (2012) and outlined in the following chapter. Clearly, these are factors which are fundamental for continued motivation and are therefore not confined to a particular time.
Chapter Six

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate factors which might affect NQTs’ continued motivation to teach in the post-compulsory sector during the period 2000-2004. The specific questions that this study sought to address were: what was the nature of demotivators? To what extent were these demotivators common to most NQTs across the post-compulsory sector? Were there any patterns of prevalence? And, did most NQTs expect to remain in teaching, and if not, what are the possible explanations to account for this? My findings would indicate that there were four demotivators, which were common to most NQTs during this time. The majority felt that most of their teaching time was spent motivating students to engage with learning and they were concerned by their students’ levels of basic skills for their course of study. Accounts suggested that this was due to students being persuaded onto courses that they were not interested in or were capable of studying and appeared to be linked to the ‘bums on seats’ strategy to meet targets and funding as reported by Hillier (2006) and Spours et al, (2007). This caused particular problems for NQTs teaching more academic subjects, and findings also revealed that NQTs did not think that their teacher training had prepared them to deal with disaffected and/or amotivated students, nor those who had learning difficulties. Dissatisfaction was also expressed about the lack of further continued professional development opportunities. However, these demotivators were not cited as factors for leaving.
Lack of career advancement was found to be both demotivating and a reason for leaving and appeared to be due to the difficulty in gaining full-time or even fractional contracts (especially for NQTs aged 35 and over), suggesting that the ‘casualized FE sector’ reported by Shain and Gleeson (1999) in 1999 was still the case five years’ later. Indeed, the sector appeared to be relying on more part-time teachers than Hillier (2006) reported in 1995-96, and those who had obtained teaching work, were not necessarily teaching in areas which related to their previous occupation. Findings reflected the growth of basic skills teaching through the Skills for Life agenda.

Excessive administrative demands were also found to be demotivating and cited as a reason for leaving teaching. There was evidence of ‘underground’ working described by Coffield et al, (2007), as NQTs struggled to cope with the administration duties which detracted them from their actual teaching practice, indicative of the findings by McDonald and Lucas (2001) and Jephcote et al, (2008).

For the NQTs, who were not currently teaching or had decided to leave, another demotivator and a cited reason for leaving, was the climate within the colleges. Findings revealed that this was primarily due to ineffective management, indicative of the findings of Elliot (1996) and McKelvey and Andrews (1998). Another reason for leaving which surfaced in the qualitative findings was the negative prestige of the career, in terms of pay and conditions, especially when compared to the compulsory sector. These findings supported those of Spours et al, (2007) and Edward et al, (2007). Although salary was not one of the initial motives for entering teaching, given
the difficulty in finding full-time work, the excessive administration demands, the lack of career advancement and conflict with managers, being paid equivalent to their colleagues in the compulsory sector did not appear to be unreasonable. This deprofessionalisation of teaching in post-compulsory education also extended to perceptions about the quality of the teaching qualification for this sector reinforcing notions of the Cinderella label. NQTs, who had transferred to the compulsory sector, reported that their qualification had been deemed insufficient, and had been required to undertake additional training or had to settle for less pay.

My hypothesis for this study was that the tension described by Scott et al (2001), between the motivation to enter teaching and the ‘issue of control’ to account for the dissatisfaction in compulsory education, would also exist for experienced teachers in the post-compulsory sector. Indeed as the literature reviewed indicated, the effects of Incorporation had lead to ‘a significant, depressing effect on commitment, job satisfaction and work performance’, (Hill, 2000:67). However, I did not believe that this tension would be felt to the same extent by NQTs since the research conducted by McKelvey and Andrews (1998), Wallace (2002) and Wallis (2007) suggested, trainees appeared to be positive. Their work placements had given them an idea of what this career would entail and were choosing to take on the job, whereas the experienced teachers had to adapt to the various policy levers, which arguably, changed their work considerably. According to Robson (2006), it was the loss of autonomy which was felt particularly hard and might explain why six out of ten teachers wanted to leave (Nash, 1996). However, my study revealed that the number of NQTs wanting to leave was only three out of ten.
Although there were similarities between the findings since the NQTs highlighted threats to their professional autonomy due to the pressures of funding, meeting targets and preparing for inspection, these were in the context of the impact on the character of the student body and on their workload. The findings did not reveal that NQTs thought that the auditing and accountability model implied that they could not be trusted to do their job as found by Robson (1998) and Scott et al (2001).

However, even though NQTs did not feel the extent of this tension, conditions in the sector were far from positive during this time. As indicated in the findings, there was evidence of all five of the main factors which erode the intrinsic nature of teaching outlined by Dörnyei (2001) and achievement of the competence, relatedness and autonomy needs purported by SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985) was being impeded. There were also indications of poor hygiene factors and a lack of motivators as identified by Herzberg (1959), and evidence to suggest that the perceived intrinsic rewards gained from entering teaching had been challenged by the character of the student body and the lack of continued professional development for lifelong learning.

Attempts to re-professionalise the sector in terms of initial teacher training, continued professional development and professional prestige have been undertaken since this study was carried out. Following the government policy document ‘Equipping our Teachers for the Future’ (DfES, 2004), new standards and qualifications were introduced from 2007: the Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTLLS), which was the PGCE or Cert Ed equivalent; an introductory award called Preparing to Teach in the
Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS); and the Certificate to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (CTLLS) aimed at Associate Teachers. In addition to acquiring these qualifications, teaching staff were required to join the Institute for Learning (IfL) to be professionally registered and licensed to practice either by applying for Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills status (QTLS) or Associate Teacher Learning and Skills status (ATLS) if holding the CTLLS, (LLUK, 2010). As a requirement of the mandatory registration, all teachers had to undertake at least 30 hours of CPD each year (LLUK, 2006), and all trainees had to undertake 150 hours of teaching during their course, (LLUK, 2010). This increased and prolonged engagement for both full-time and part-time trainees appeared to support the ambition for ‘a fully-professionalised, well qualified, responsive, modern workforce capable of operating in a demand-led skills environment’, (LLUK 2007:19). In addition, the Education (School Teachers’ Qualifications, England) Regulation 2003 was amended in 2012 so that IfL members with the QTLS status could teach in schools (HMSO, 2012).

However, in reality, in-services trainees were unable to gain the wide experience required to teach in a diverse range of contexts. Employers, conscious of student retention and achievement through the funding and policy levers, were reluctant to allow staff to engage in such activities, especially if this experience could only be gained from outside of the college (Maxwell, 2009). In addition, the teaching qualifications were deemed to be ‘over-complicated’ and when the government withdrew funding for the IfL in 2009 and introduced fees, there was a major drop in membership. Mandatory teaching qualifications for school academies were abolished in July 2012 and
since the number of secondary schools who apply for academy status is expected to rise, the transferability of QTLS status is unlikely to be of practical value (BIS, October 2012).

At the time of writing, the Final Report of the Independent Review of Professionalism in Further Education, led by Lord Lingfield (BIS, October 2012), recommends that the teaching qualifications should be simplified and include a preparatory award contributing to probationary periods; a Certificate in Further Education at Level 5, which would be optional, except for teachers teaching basic skills and/or teaching students with learning difficulties; and a Diploma in Further Education at Level 7 (BIS, October 2012). The report also recommends that the professionalism of the sector should be promoted and supported by a proposed FE Guild and owned by the sector – employees and employers (BIS, 2012):

There is a confidence deficit in the professionalism of the further education sector, as well as a structural deficit… Should the proposed Guild prove effective, it will address the former, giving lecturers and institutions a forum in which important matters of mutual interest in relation to professional development might be resolved equitably; offering the sector enhanced status; and uniting its position in dealings with external agencies, (BIS, October 2012:13).

This proposed FE Guild, it is envisaged, would also be the vehicle for an agreement on CPD activities and further qualifications. These would include obligations for teaching staff to undertake such opportunities and corresponding obligations for employers to give ‘tangible’ support (BIS, 2012:4). The report also acknowledges the fall in the salaries and conditions

4 The FE Guild was re-named the Education and Training Foundation when it was incorporated on 22 May 2013 and registered to the Association of Colleges’ (AoC) London HQ.
of service for teachers in the sector over time and recommends that this issue is also addressed by the Guild.

Another significant feature in the report is the suggestion that ‘the vocational role of FE should be regarded as having primacy’ (BIS, October 2012:2). The report is critical of the remedial provision and states that the expenditure of ‘so much public money and effort to duplicating work already done in schools is wasteful’ and should ‘gradually cease as a major function of FE…leaving schools to deal more effectively with foundation skills’, (BIS, October 2012:2).

Given that students’ abilities and motivation were found to be demotivators for NQTs, it will be interesting to see how the government’s reforms affect the character of the student cohort. One would surmise that the impact of the HM Treasury Spending Review of October 2010 with the introduction of student fees would have some effect: students aged 24 and over, wanting to study for a Level 3 qualification are expected to pay their tuition costs through a government backed loan and students over the age of 25 lost their entitlement to free tuition for a Level 2 qualification.

The Spending Review also outlined the Coalition government’s plans to reduce bureaucracy by simplifying the funding system to a single contact point, and abolishing central targets (HM Treasury, 2010:52-53). Although this would appear to give colleges more freedom, these benefits came at a price since ‘colleges will be expected to make savings through greater efficiencies and pay restraint,’ (2010:53). Since poor salary was cited as a reason for leaving, this situation does not appear to be improving anytime soon and one wonders where efficiencies have been made. Since many students have to
pay for their tuition, competition in the sector, I suspect, is (or will be) even
dicher and in order to survive colleges will need to offer attractive learning
experiences, which begs the question, how will these be funded? Short-sighted
management teams may make cuts to CPD activities for teaching
staff. There may be an even greater reliance on part-time staff and even more
polarity between managers and teaching staff. Will the proposed Guild be
able to deal with this?

One area that does not appear to have been addressed in the Independent
Review by Lord Lingfield (BIS, October 2012) is the excessive workload.
However, ‘public accountability for high standards of capability and conduct’
(BIS, October 2012:22) features as one of the criteria which underpins
professionalism. Whilst accountability was not deemed as a threat to the
NQTs’ perceptions of autonomy, it became a problem when the administration
involved hindered their actual teaching. According to the report, standards of
service to students are more comparable across the country since
Incorporation and governance ‘has improved dramatically’ (BIS, October
2012:20). Furthermore:

The Review panel is of the view that the road to more enhancement of
professionalism in FE lies in fostering a flexible, enabling environment
…and that this will involve the government in doing less, not more,
(BIS, October 2012: 21).

Will this involve more auditing measures, or are the processes in place
sufficiently sophisticated?

Certainly, these are questions which need investigating. If I continued
researching in this area, I would be keen to study the impact of the Spending
Review (HM Treasury, 2010) and the proposed Guild, once it takes shape, on the demotivators which have surfaced in this study - namely opportunities for CPD activity, support from management teams and mentors, and the effect on teachers’ workload and the student body. I would adopt the mixed method approach again, although I found that acquiring the additional skills and knowledge necessary for both qualitative and quantitative methodologies was very time consuming as predicted by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004). In addition, there was much to consider in terms of the epistemological assumptions associated with the two approaches and the different terminology adopted by different mixed method researchers was confusing at times.

I would recommend including an open comment section in a survey instrument as the wealth of qualitative data I collected not only illuminated results of the statistical analyses but also raised issues which were not addressed in the quantitative element of the survey. However, there were limitations in attempting to identify all potential demotivators through the use of focus groups. Since ineffective management, the lack of CPD activities and the negative prestige associated with teaching in this sector did not emerge in the first phase of this study, the extent of these as demotivators was not measured. There were questions that I would omit from the instrument as there was duplication of the data. For example, I would omit one of the questions which asked participants how long they had been teaching and when they had completed their training. Since responses elicited similar data, only one of these would be necessary. I would also remove the question which asked participants where they mainly taught (college based, outreach and so forth) as this data did not add anything to the findings once the type of
institution had been established from another question. However, I would introduce a follow-up question pertaining to participants’ current employment status and ask if this was by choice. I would also include a question asking if participants had chosen to teach in the subject that they were teaching. Both of these additional questions would have open comment sections so that participants could give their reasons. With regards to writing match-paired statements, there were two instances where findings contradicted each other. On reflection, the wording for these statements was not as accurate as it might have been as there seemed to be some slippage in interpretation. Although this issue did not arise during the pilot, this is something to think about.

In conclusion, this doctoral study identified factors which affected newly-qualified teachers’ continued motivation to teach in the post-compulsory sector during 2000-2004. The aim was to add the NQTs’ perspective to the body of research undertaken during this period, and also contribute to the discussion about the fragility of teaching in this sector. What is clear from the message of the Independent Review of the Professionalism in Further Education (BIS, October 2012) is that the demotivators affecting NVQs when I collected data at the end of 2004 are just as problematic today. Until the sector is re-professionalised through improved terms and conditions comparable to colleagues in other sectors; teaching staff receive more support from managers; and there is less emphasis on targets to the detriment of students’ interests so that teachers’ needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness can be fulfilled (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985), the demotivators identified in my study will continue to impact on continued motivation to remain in teaching in this sector.
Appendix 1 – Invitation to participate in Phase One study

24 June 2003

Dear Colleague

As part of my MA in Research Methods course here at the University of Nottingham, I will be undertaking a research project to investigate the motivation, expectations and attitudes of newly-qualified teachers.

The focus of the project is to address the question: What is it like to be a newly-qualified teacher? Since you are now coming to the end of your teaching training, your feelings and ideas would be much appreciated to inform this study.

Information will be collected through a recorded group discussion and follow-up interviews. In collecting the data, I will be working to the University’s guidelines for research conduct and to the Data Protection Act. Data collected will be stored at the University until after the completion of assessment for the research project. The data will be then deleted in a secure manner.

Unless you would wish your views to be identified to you personally, the data will be analysed and reported in such a way to preserve your anonymity. You may also withdraw at any stage.

If you would like to be included in this study, please complete the tear-off slip below to give your consent.

Thank you

Lynnette Matthews
Room C17 Education Building
Jubilee Campus
Wollaton Road
Nottingham NG8 1BB
Home Telephone: 0115 8497856
Email: taxlm4@nottingham.ac.uk

Exploring the Teaching Experience: A Research Project

Name: …………………………………………………………………………………
I agree to take part in the above-named research project.

Signed …………………………………… Date ……………………………
Telephone: …………………………… Email: ……………………………
Appendix 2 – Consent form for the Phase One study

Exploring the Teaching Experience: A Research Project

Name..................................................................................................................................................

Date of birth ...................................................... Ethnic group ..............................................

Subject specialism
(teaching)............................................................................................................................................

Educational/training qualifications achieved
..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................

Previous careers
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

As you are aware this project is an exploratory pilot study for my PhD research. Please indicate if you would like to participate in the future.

• I consent to my contribution being included in L Matthews’ PhD study. *

• I would like to be invited to participate in the above study. *

(*Delete as appropriate)

Signed ............................................................ Date .................................................

My sincere thanks for your support and contribution.
Wishing you well in your new career!

Lynnette Matthews 28 July 2003

I consent to my reflective essay about my experiences during my teaching placement, submitted as part of the PGCCE course, to be photocopied and used in the research project undertaken by Lynnette Matthews.

Signed ............................................................ Date .................................................
Appendix 3 – Breakdown of the Factors and Indicators for Phase 1

This table outlines the three factors and their corresponding indicators following Phase 1 and demonstrates how these components map to the theoretical frameworks used for this study – Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1975, 1985, 1992, 2000) and Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory (1959). It also indicates where these indicators have been discussed in findings from studies investigating the experiences of trainees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Needs - SDT</th>
<th>Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene</th>
<th>Discussed in studies of trainees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Competence, Relatedness</td>
<td>Hygiene (interpersonal relations)</td>
<td>Wallace, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Motivator (achievement)</td>
<td>Wallace, 2002; Wallis, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>Hygiene (interpersonal relations)</td>
<td>Bathmaker &amp; Avis, 2005; Harkin et al, 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Motivator (achievement &amp; interest)</td>
<td>Wallace, 2002; Bathmaker &amp; Avis, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Motivator (achievement)</td>
<td>Wallace, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Hygiene (company policies/admin)</td>
<td>McKelvey &amp; Andrews, 1998; McDonald &amp; Lucas, 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Motivator (responsibility)</td>
<td>McDonald &amp; Lucas, 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching resources</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Motivator (responsibility)</td>
<td>McKelvey &amp; Andrews, 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching styles</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Motivator (responsibility)</td>
<td>Bathmaker &amp; Avis, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Motivator (responsibility)</td>
<td>Bathmaker &amp; Avis, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class sizes</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Hygiene (working conditions)</td>
<td>Wallis, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; resources</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Hygiene (working conditions)</td>
<td>McDonald &amp; Lucas, 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>Hygiene (interpersonal relations)</td>
<td>McKelvey &amp; Andrews, 1998; Bathmaker &amp; Avis, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 – The survey instrument for Phase Two

The Learning and Skills Sector: The Newly Qualified Teachers’ Perspective

© Lynnette Matthews
2004
Please tick the appropriate box or write brief comments where required.

About you

Q1  Sex

[ ] Male

[ ] Female

Q2  Age

[ ] 20-24

[ ] 25-34

[ ] 35-44

[ ] 45-55

[ ] Over 55

Q3  What is the highest qualification level you obtained prior to studying on the teacher training course?

[ ] Degree

[ ] NVQ Level 4

[ ] A Level

[ ] NVQ Level 3

[ ] GCSE/NVQ Level 2

[ ] Other (please specify below)

Q4  To which of the following groups do you consider you belong?

[ ] Asian or Asian British

[ ] Black or Black British

[ ] Chinese

[ ] Mixed

[ ] White

[ ] Other (please specify below)
About Your Work

Q5 What did you do prior to embarking on a career in teaching?

Q6 Before starting your teacher training programme, did you have any experience of paid or voluntary teaching/teaching assistant work? If so, please give brief details.

Q7 When did you complete your PGCE/Cert Ed (FE) teacher training course?
   Date: Month Year

Q8 Since qualifying, how long have you been employed as a teacher?
   Months Years

Q9 Which of the following describes your current employment status?
   - I am not currently teaching
   - I am teaching full-time
   - I am teaching part-time – fractional
   - I am teaching part-time - hourly paid/sessional

Q10 Please indicate which category would BEST describe the subject which you MAINLY teach (tick ONE only).
   - Science & mathematics
   - Land-based provision
   - Construction
   - Engineering, technology & manufacturing
   - Business administration, management & professional
   - Information & communication technology
   - Hospitality, sports, leisure & travel
   - Hairdressing & beauty therapy
   - Health, social care & public services
   - Visual arts, performing arts & media
   - Humanities
   - English, languages & communication
   - Learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities
   - English for speakers of other languages
   - Literacy & Numeracy
   - Other (please specify below)
Q11  Please indicate the age of students which you MAINLY teach (tick ONE box only).

- 14-16 year olds
- 16-19 year olds
- over 19 years old

Q12  Please indicate the type of qualification which would BEST describe the course on which you MAINLY teach (tick ONE box only).

- Basic skills and/or key skills
- General/Academic (such as GCSE/A Level)
- General Vocational (such as GNVQ or BTEC)
- Vocational/Occupational (such as NVQ)
- Access to HE
- Other (please specify below)

Q13  What type of institution do you MAINLY work for (eg college of FE, training centre etc)?

Q14  In what context do you MAINLY teach (eg college based, outreach etc)?

Q15  Do you expect to be working in teaching in 5 years’ time, or not?

- Don’t know
- Yes
- No (please give a brief reason below)
Your experiences in the field

Please tick the appropriate box to indicate how you feel about the following statements:
SA = strongly agree, A = agree, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I do not have problems with discipline in the classroom.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Even with my help, students will not achieve their goals.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Many of my students are pressured in some way to attend college.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The syllabus is flexible enough to allow me to respond to students’ interests.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Assessment procedures do not allow for individual differences between learners.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My current work links to a clear career path.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I am able to adapt my teaching to individual students’ preferred styles of learning.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Students’ levels of basic skills are appropriate for their course of study.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Class sizes are conducive to learning.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Discipline is a problem in the classroom.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My students are self-motivating.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My current work does not appear to lead to future career advancement.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The syllabus limits my ability to respond to students’ needs.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have few opportunities to use different teaching styles.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The college does not operate a performance feedback policy.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The administrative duties attached to my work are reasonable.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I have the freedom to choose and/or produce my own teaching resources and materials.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The college’s facilities and resources are appropriate and accessible.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The general climate within the college is unsupportive and uninspiring.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My teaching resources and materials are prescribed.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I am concerned by students’ levels of basic skills for their course of study.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>On the whole my students attend college voluntarily.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The administrative demands made upon me are excessive.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The classes are too big/small for managing effective learning.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I can negotiate assessment procedures to meet learners’ needs.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The college provides feedback on my performance.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The general climate within the college is positive and encouraging.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Much of my teaching time is spent motivating students to engage with learning.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The college has inadequate facilities and resources.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The students will be able to achieve their goals with my help.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And finally ... Please write below any comments you wish to make about your teaching experiences.

Thank you
## Appendix 5 – Code Book for the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SPSS Variable name</th>
<th>Coding Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification number</td>
<td>index, instit</td>
<td>Number assigned to each questionnaire. Colour to denote institution: W = white, Gn = green, Y = yellow, C = cream, G = grey, B = blue, Gd = gold, Pp = purple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 – Sex</td>
<td>sex</td>
<td>1 = Male, 2 = Female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 – Age</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>1 = 20-24, 2 = 25-34, 3 = 35-44, 4 = 45-55, 5 = Over 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 – Highest qualification</td>
<td>qual</td>
<td>1 = Degree, 2 = NVQ Level 4, 3 = A Level, 4 = NVQ Level 3, 5 = GCSE/NVQ Level 2, 6 = Other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 – Ethnicity</td>
<td>ethnic</td>
<td>1 = Asian or Asian British, 2 = Black or Black British, 3 = Chinese, 4 = Mixed, 5 = White, 6 = Other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 – Experience of teaching prior to ITT</td>
<td>exp</td>
<td>Code qualitative responses: 0 = None, 1 = Teaching, 2 = Teaching support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 – How long employed</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>Calculate in number of months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 – Employment status</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>1 = not currently teaching, 2 = teaching full-time, 3 = teaching p/t – fractional, 4 = teaching p/t – hourly paid/sessional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 – OFSTED subject category</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>1 = Science and mathematics, 2 = Land-based provision, 3 = Construction, 4 = Engineering, technology, manufacturing, 5 = Business admin, management, professional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q10 continued | 6 = ICT  
7 = Hospitality, sports, leisure, travel  
8 = Hairdressing, beauty therapy  
9 = Health, social care, public services  
10 = Visual arts, performing arts, media  
11 = Humanities  
12 = English Languages & communication  
13 = Learning difficulties, disabilities  
14 = ESOL  
15 = Basic skills  
16 = Other |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Q11 – Age of students | studage 1 = 14-16  
2 = 16-19  
3 = over 19 |
| Q12 – Qualification taught | typequ 1 = Basic/Key skills  
2 = General/academic (GCSE/A)  
3 = General vocational (GNVQ, BTEC)  
4 = Vocational/occupational (NVQ)  
5 = Access to HE  
6 = Other |
| Q15 – Working in 5 yrs | teach5 1 = don't know  
2 = yes  
3 = no |
| Q16 – 45 | Ques16…45 1 = SD (strongly disagree)  
2 = D (disagree)  
3 = A (agree)  
4 = SA (strongly agree) |
Appendix 6 – Analysis of ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’ data

**KEY:** Cross tabulations undertaken to test for relationships between variables (marked as X). X denotes results which indicated statistical significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Region</th>
<th>Sex of participants</th>
<th>Age of participants</th>
<th>Highest qualification achieved</th>
<th>Previous occupation to ITT</th>
<th>Teaching experience prior to ITT</th>
<th>Year of ITT completion</th>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>Subject area taught</th>
<th>Age of students taught</th>
<th>Type of Qualification taught</th>
<th>Type of employing institution</th>
<th>Expectation of remaining in teaching in 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Region</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of participants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of participants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation prior to ITT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience prior to ITT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of ITT completion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current employment status</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area taught</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of students taught</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification taught</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of employing institution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of remaining in teaching in 5 years</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 – Significant results from ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’ sections

This appendix shows the statistically significant results following cross tabulation analysis of the data collected from the ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’ sections outlined in Appendix 6. These results pertained to regional differences, sex and age.

7.1 Regional differences in respect of expectations of remaining in the profession in 5 years’ time

The relationship between regions and expectations of remaining in the profession was statistically significant ($X^2 = 14.16$ (df = 6, N = 288) $p = .028$). There was a weak association ($\Phi = .222$) and thus where NQTs were based accounted for 4.9% of the variance in expectations of remaining in teaching. Although the
The majority of respondents from Yorkshire expected to remain in teaching, the highest proportion of respondents who do not anticipate remaining in teaching were also from this region. Respondents from the South-East appeared to be generally more positive since findings show that this region had the lowest proportion of respondents who are either unsure or who do not expect to stay in teaching.

### 7.2 Type of qualification taught by regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Basic &amp; key skills (%)</th>
<th>General/ Academic (GCSE, A levels) (%)</th>
<th>General/ Vocational (GNVQ, BTEC) (%)</th>
<th>Vocational/ Occupational (NVQ) (%)</th>
<th>Access to HE (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a statistically significant relationship between the type of qualifications taught and the different regions ($x^2 = 59.980$ (df = 15, n = 280) $p = .000$). The association was of moderate strength ($\Phi = .463$); thus, where respondents taught accounted for 21% of the variance in what type of qualifications they taught.
7.3 Current employment status by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time/ Fractional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly paid/ Sessional</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a statistical significant relationship found between men and women’s responses to their current employment status ($\chi^2 = 12.434$ (df = 3, n=286) $p = .006$), although the strength of the association was deemed weak ($\Phi = .209$) with sex accounting for 4.3% of the variance in modes of employment.

7.4 Current employment status by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>20-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time/ Fractional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly paid/ Sessional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference was found in responses in terms of participants’ age and their current employment status ($\chi^2 = 23.484$ (df = 6, n=285) $p = .001$). The result of Phi and Cramer’s V was found to be of weak to moderate strength ($\Phi = .287$) and thus the age of respondents accounted for 8.2% of the variance in current employment status.
### Appendix 8 – The Factors

#### 8.1 Result of reliability analysis for the three factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>26.209</td>
<td>5.11945</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher autonomy</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>20.469</td>
<td>4.52426</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>27.664</td>
<td>5.25965</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach’s Alpha value for each factor was greater than the minimum value of 0.7, which would suggest a reliable scale. The value for each item if deleted from the factor was greater than 0.8 in all instances for items pertaining to the student factor; the Cronbach’s Alpha value was more than 0.7 but less than 0.8 with items relating to the teacher autonomy factor; and more than 0.7 but less than 0.9 for items relating to the institution.
8.2 Factor Analysis

A statistically significant result was obtained from employing ANOVA to compare the three responses (yes, no, don’t know) to the question ‘do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?’ with each of the factors.

Factors * Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Mean for factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results were highly significant on all counts since the $F$ value was more than 1 ($df = 2, 277$) and $p < 0.005$ for all the conditions. The highest mean score pertained to the autonomy factor in relation to respondents who intended to remain in teaching. The lowest mean score was returned to the institution factor by the group of respondents who did not intend to stay in teaching.
8.3 Rank order of statements: Lowest mean

Since the responses (values) had been coded to a numerical scale, calculating the arithmetic mean would show the average value for each of the statements. However, to be able to rank these, the values for the negative scores had to be reversed (this procedure affects the meaning of the statement – indicated as ‘recoded’\(^5\)). The median is 2.5, which would suggest a random selection of responses. A mean score of 3.0 and above suggests positive responses. The following table shows the statements with the lowest mean and thus negative responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My current work links to a clear career path</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Recoded] I am concerned by the students’ levels of basic skills for their course of study</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Recoded] The administrative demands made upon me are excessive</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrative duties attached to my work are reasonable</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Recoded] Much of my teaching time is spent motivating students to engage with learning</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) Consequently, the recoded statement can be interpreted as its opposite ie. I am not concerned by students’ levels of basic skills. However, a mean of 2.35 suggests that participants are concerned as indicated in Appendix 8.4.
### 8.4 Response percentages for the statements in each factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements relating to the students</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/ Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly agree/ Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students will be able to achieve their goals with my help.</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even with my help students will not achieve their goals.</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have problems of discipline in the classroom.</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline is a problem in the classroom.</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the whole my students attend college voluntarily.</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of my students are pressured in some way to attend college.</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ levels of basic skills are appropriate for their course of study.</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned by students’ levels of basic skills for their course of study.</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students are self-motivating.</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much of my time is spent motivating students to engage with learning.</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements relating to the institution</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/ Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree/ Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class sizes are conducive to learning.</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classes are too big/small for managing effective learning.</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college’s facilities and resources are appropriate and accessible.</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college has inadequate facilities and resources.</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general climate within the college is positive and encouraging.</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general climate within the college is unsupportive and uninspiring.</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college provides feedback on my performance.</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college does not operate a performance feedback policy.</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current work links to a clear career path.</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current work does not appear to lead to future career advancement.</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements relating to Teacher Autonomy</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/ Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree/ Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have the freedom to choose and/or produce my own teaching resources and materials.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching resources and materials are prescribed.</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to adapt my teaching to individual students’ preferred styles of learning.</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have few opportunities to use different teaching styles.</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The syllabus is flexible enough to allow me to respond to students’ interests</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The syllabus limits my ability to respond to students’ needs</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can negotiate assessment procedures to meet learners’ needs.</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment procedures do not allow for individual differences between learners.</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrative duties attached to my work are reasonable.</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrative demands made upon me are excessive.</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative statements are in colour. Figures in **bold** show the majorities.

---

6 These paired statements revealed contradictory results. This may be due to a problem with the wording of the statements.

7 As above.
Appendix 9 – Statistically significant results for factor statements and participant variables

This appendix shows the significantly statistical results referred to in the main text from cross tabulations analysing the negative statements in the ‘experiences in the field’ and the variables from the ‘about you’ and ‘about your work’ sections.

9.1 Expectations of remaining in the profession

9.1.1 Expectations of remaining in the profession with problems of discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
<th>Discipline is a problem in the classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 12.865 \) (df = 6, n = 277) \( p = .045 \) Inspection of the data revealed that the majority of those participants who were either unsure or wished to remain in teaching did not find discipline a problem. However, there was a 50%-50% divide among the participants who had decided to leave suggesting that for half of these NQTs problems of discipline could be a demotivating factor.
9.1.2 Expectations of remaining in the profession with concern for students’ ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(x^2 = 13.883\, (df = 6, n = 270)\, p = .031\) The majority of participants who were unsure about remaining in teaching did not think students’ levels of basic skills were appropriate for their course of study (56.2%). Conversely, 60.1% of participants who were staying in teaching and 57.6% of those who answered ‘no’ were more positive about their students’ abilities and either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.
9.1.3 *Expectations of remaining in the profession with having to motivate students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((x^2 = 14.451 \text{ (df} = 6, \text{ n} = 272) \ p = .025)\) The highest percentage of responses for all the groups was in agreement with this statement. However, the majority for agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement was not as large for the group of participants who were expecting to remain in teaching (57%) than it was for the other two groups, which was more than 75% in both cases (75.8% for ‘no’ group and 76.2% for ‘don’t know’ group).
9.1.4 Expectations of remaining in the profession with students pressured to attend college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4% 35.2% 41.8% 7.7% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.0% 36.0% 36.0% 6.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1% 15.2% 45.5% 30.3% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.2% 33.2% 39.1% 9.5% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(x^2 = 24.954\) (df = 6, n = 274) \(p = .000\) 75.8% of participants recording a ‘no’ response for remaining in teaching strongly agreed/agreed that students are pressurized to attend college. 58% of participants who expected to remain in teaching did not think that this was the case and although 50.6% of participants, who were unsure about remaining in teaching, also disagreed with this statement, it was a very small majority. If students are pressured to attend college, this could account for some of the problems of discipline in the classroom.
9.1.5  *Expectations of remaining in the profession with lack of career advancement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 27.707 \ (df = 6, \ n = 269) \ p = .000 \) 68.8% of participants, who did not intend to stay in teaching and 60.7% of participants who were unsure about remaining in teaching strongly agreed/agreed that their work does not appear to lead to future career advancement. However, the majority of participants who intended to remain in teaching did not agree with this statement (68.2%), suggesting that they thought that their work would lead to career advancement.
### 9.1.6 Expectations of remaining in the profession with excessive administration demands

The administrative demands made upon me are excessive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($x^2 = 12.908$ (df = 6, n = 274) $p = .045$) Although as a full cohort, the majority of participants strongly agreed/agreed that administrative demands are excessive (51.8%), there was polarisation between the groups: participants who were unsure and those who had decided not to remain in teaching were much more likely to strongly agree/agree (61.1% and 63.6% respectively). However, the majority of participants who were planning to remain in teaching, disagreed with this statement (56.3%).
### 9.1.7 Expectations of remaining in the profession with unsupportive college environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Do you expect to be teaching in 5 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($\chi^2 = 41.101 \text{ (df = 6, n = 272)} \ p = .000$) Overall, the majority of participants disagreed with this statement (66.6%). However, further analysis revealed that there was polarisation between participants, depending on their intentions to remain in teaching: 63.6% of participants, who intended to leave, agreed or strongly agreed with this statement suggesting that for this group, the climate in their colleges was unsupportive and uninspiring.
9.2 Sex of respondents

9.2.1 Sex of respondents with problems of discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of respondents</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Sex of respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 10.807 \) (df = 3, n = 278) \( p = .001 \) Although the majority for both sexes strongly disagreed/disagreed that discipline is a problem in the classroom, the male majority (57.3%) was not as convincing as the majority for the females (75%).

9.2.2 Sex of respondents with concern for students’ ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of respondent</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Sex of respondent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 16.960 \) (df = 3, n = 272) \( p = .001 \) The majority of men in the data-set were concerned by their students’ levels of basic skills for their programmes of study; 71.3% either agreed or strongly agreed to statement 36, whereas the majority of the women, (51.6%) either strongly disagreed or disagreed (polarisation).
9.3 Employment Status

9.3.1 Employment status with concern for students’ ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>Not currently teaching</th>
<th>Teaching full-time</th>
<th>Teaching part-time - fractional</th>
<th>Teaching part-time - hourly paid/ sessional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Current employment status</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Current employment status</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned by students’ levels of basic skill for their course of study</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( x^2 = 20.804 \text{ (df = 9, n = 270 p = .014)} \) Respondents who were not currently teaching or were teaching full-time were more likely to agree or strongly agree that they were concerned by students’ basic skills (66.7% and 61.7% respectively). However, respondents who were working part-time, either on fractional contracts or sessional agreements, were more likely to disagree (53.2% and 53% respectively).
### Employment status with lack of career advancement

\( \chi^2 = 29.983 \) (df = 9, n = 268) \( p = .000 \)  
Respondents who were either teaching part-time in an hourly paid arrangement or not currently teaching strongly agreed/agreed that their work does not appear to lead to future career advancement (54.5% and 82.1% respectively). However, 67.7% of NQTs working full-time and 64% of NQTs on fractional contracts strongly disagreed/disagreed with this statement, implying that their work would lead to future career advancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>My current work does not appear to lead to future career advancement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching</td>
<td>Count % within Current employment status</td>
<td>2 7.1%</td>
<td>3 10.7%</td>
<td>16 57.1%</td>
<td>7 25.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching full-time</td>
<td>Count % within Current employment status</td>
<td>15 13.5%</td>
<td>60 54.1%</td>
<td>26 23.4%</td>
<td>10 9.0%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching part-time - fractional</td>
<td>Count % within Current employment status</td>
<td>10 20.0%</td>
<td>22 44.0%</td>
<td>13 26.0%</td>
<td>5 10.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching part-time - hourly paid/sessional</td>
<td>Count % within Current employment status</td>
<td>11 13.9%</td>
<td>25 31.6%</td>
<td>30 38.0%</td>
<td>13 16.5%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count % within Current employment status</td>
<td>38 14.2%</td>
<td>110 41.0%</td>
<td>85 31.7%</td>
<td>32 13.1%</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 9.3.3 Employment status with unsupportive college environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within group</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching part-time -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fractional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching part-time -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hourly paid/sessional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( x^2 = 36.263 \ (df = 9, \ n = 271) \ p = .000 \)

68.7% of participants who were not currently teaching strongly agreed/agreed that the general climate within the college was unsupportive and uninspiring. However, the other groups who were teaching in some capacity strongly disagreed/disagreed with the statement (69.6% hourly-paid; 70% full-time; 78% participants on fractional contracts).
9.3.4 *Employment status with excessive administrative demands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment Status</th>
<th>The administrative demands made upon me are excessive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current employment status</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching full-time</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current employment status</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching part-time – fractional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current employment status</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching part-time - hourly paid/sessional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current employment status</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Current employment status</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($x^2 = 18.159$ (df = 9, $n=273$) $p = .033$) Although overall the majority of NQTs (52%) felt that administrative demands are excessive, it is notable that the majority of participants teaching on an hourly paid or sessional arrangement strongly disagreed/disagreed with the statement suggesting that work practices may be dependent on employment status. The remaining groups strongly agreed/agreed that administration is excessive (65.6% not currently teaching; 58.2% full-time; 52% on fractional contracts).
9.4 Subject Area Taught

9.4.1 Subject area taught with concern for students’ ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects Taught</th>
<th>Vocational/Basic skills</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Students’ levels of basic skills are appropriate for their course of study</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = 14.014 \text{ (df = 3, n = 273 } p = .003) \) Polarisation occurred in this analysis.

Participants teaching academic subjects were more likely to strongly disagree/disagree with this statement (57.3%) suggesting that students’ levels of basic skills are not appropriate for their course of study. However, the majority of participants teaching vocational or basic skills strongly agreed/agreed with the statement (64.3%).

9.4.2 Subject area taught with having to motivate students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects Taught</th>
<th>Vocational/Basic skills</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Much of my time is spent motivating students to engage with learning</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2 = 8.906 \text{ (df = 3, n = 275 } p = .031) \) Although the majority of participants strongly agreed/agreed with this statement, the size of the majorities for each
group varied. Only 59.8% of participants teaching vocational or basic skills felt that much of time was taken with motivating students compared to a majority of 72.7% of the participants teaching academic subjects.

### 9.4.3 Subject area taught with restrictive assessment procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects Taught</th>
<th>Vocational/Basic Skills</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within GROUP</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Basic Skills</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(x^2 = 24.448\) (df = 3, n=280) p > .005) The majority of participants in the vocational/basic skills teaching group (69%) strongly disagreed/disagreed with the statement, whereas those in the academic teaching group (51.2%) strongly agreed/agreed that assessment procedures do not allow for individual differences between learners indicating polarisation.
9.5 Age

9.5.1 Age with lack of career advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age re-coded</th>
<th>Count % within Age recoded</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($\chi^2 = 20.869 \text{ (df = 6, } n = 269) \ p = .002$) It would appear that the older the participants, the less likely they are to perceive a clear career path; 57.9% of NQTs aged between 35-44 and 67.3% aged 45 and over strongly disagreed/disagreed to this statement, whereas the majority of the younger participants were positive about the statement – 55.3% agreed and strongly agreed.
## Appendix 10 – Summary of patterns of prevalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Expecting to be teaching in 5 years’ time</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Subject area taught</th>
<th>Age of participants</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not currently teaching</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned by students’ levels of basic skills for their course of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much of my time is spent motivating students to engage with learning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline is a problem in the classroom</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of my students are pressurised in some way to attend college</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrative demands made upon me are excessive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment procedures do not allow for individual differences between learners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current work does not appear to lead to future career advancement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general climate within the college is unsupportive and uninspiring</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓* - results of the cross tabulation indicated that respondents who did not intend to remain in teaching were divided 50%-50% on this issue.
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