Published online 2017 in *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2017.1306804>

**Motivation to become a teacher: A Norwegian validation of the Factors Influencing
Teaching Choice Scale**

Katrine Nesje^{1*}, Christian Brandmo¹, and Jean-Louis Berger²

¹Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo, Norway

²Swiss Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training, Switzerland

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Professor Helen M.G. Watt, Monash University, Australia, for valuable comments to an earlier draft of this article. The authors would also like to thank the research group Teacher Professionalism and Educational Change: Practices, Purposes, Policies (TEPEC) at the Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo, Norway, for funding this study.

*Corresponding author.

E-mail:

Phone:

Katrine.Nesje@ils.uio.no

+47 95769090

Christian.brandmo@ils.uio.no

+47 90208596

Jean-Louis.Berger@sfivet.swiss

+41584582231

Abstract

The act of newly qualified teachers leaving the profession is a growing challenge, both in Norway and internationally. To address recruitment difficulties, there is a need for further knowledge of prospective teachers' career motivations. The current study validated a Norwegian translation of the Factors Influencing Teaching Choice (FIT-Choice) Scale. Using a sample of 635 preservice teachers, confirmatory factor analyses were conducted. The results indicated that the translated scale offers a valid measure of Norwegian students' motivation to become teachers. Self-perception of teaching-related abilities was one of the main motivational sources, together with the desire to shape the future of children and adolescents and an interest in teaching. Findings are discussed in relation to previous studies based on the FIT-Choice scale in other countries.

Keywords: preservice teacher motivation, FIT-Choice scale, teacher education, validation

Motivation to Become a Teacher: A Norwegian Validation of the Factors Influencing Teaching Choice Scale

Introduction

Teachers are of great importance for pupils in all levels of the school system. Thus, the recruitment of capable candidates in teacher education and the retention of teachers in the profession are significant priorities. Low retention rates among beginning teachers is a common challenge both in Norway and internationally (Tiplic, Brandmo, & Elstad, 2015). Moreover, Norwegian educational authorities intend to increase the student–teacher ratio in lower secondary schools. The number of hours that pupils spend in school at levels 1–10 has also increased in recent years. In addition, a large proportion of Norwegian teachers are 50 years or older (Vibe, Aamodt, & Carlsten, 2009). All this contributes to a growing demand for qualified teachers (Ministry of Education and Research, 2014; Munthe, Malmö, & Rogne, 2011), and it has been estimated that Norway will lack up to 38,000 teachers by 2025 (Gjefsen, Gunnes, & Stølen, 2014). This calls for further research on student teachers' motivation for choosing to teach. Insights into motivations for entering the teaching profession are of particular significance because these motivations are essential in explaining why (student) teachers decide to stay or leave teacher education or the teaching profession (Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Roness, 2011; Watt & Richardson, 2007, 2012). Research on student teachers' career motivations could also be of importance for teacher education programmes, for instance by assessing the connection between student teachers' motivations and the working realities in schools (Meijer, Graaf, & Meirink, 2011). Research on teacher motivation may thus help to prevent burnout and loss of commitment to the profession (Bruinsma & Jansen, 2010; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2008).

Research on teachers' motivation to teach has suggested different reasons that people are attracted to the field. Altruistic values, such as a desire to work with children and shape future generations; intrinsic interests, such as a sense of pleasure derived from teaching, a desire for challenge, or a need for self-development; and personal utility reasons, such as salary, job security, working hours, and vacation time, have emerged as influencing teachers' professional motivation (König & Rothland, 2012; Kyriacou & Coulthard, 2000; Roness & Smith, 2010). Research findings about preservice teachers' reasons for becoming teachers have suggested that the most powerful motivators for teaching are altruistic reasons (Jungert, Alm, & Thornberg, 2014; Kyriacou & Coulthard, 2000; Pop & Turner, 2009). In a study on the relationship between teaching motivation and teaching-related outcome variables, Jungert et al. (2014) uncovered a strong negative significant relationship between altruistic motivations and dropout, mediated by academic engagement. On the basis of the findings, the researchers concluded that, in order to obtain high retention rates in teacher education, student teachers need to have altruistic motivations because these are negatively related to dropping out of teacher education programmes (Jungert et al., 2014). However, international reviews have also implied that intrinsic and altruistic reasons are not the only reasons preservice teachers state for choosing teaching as a career (Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Watt et al., 2012). For instance, research on students in one-year post-graduate teacher education programmes (Kyriacou, Coulthard, Hultgren, & Stephens, 2002; Roness, 2011; Watt, Richardson, & Morris, in press) as well as Bachelor programmes (Watt et al., in press) has suggested that interest in the subject matter is an important motivational factor.

Although numerous studies have investigated teacher motivation, a great deal of this research suffers from limitations. First, individual researchers have shared little understanding of what constitutes intrinsic, extrinsic, altruistic, or other motivations (Watt et al., 2012). For instance, some researchers have included altruistic motivations as part of the

intrinsic motivations, arguing that “the desire to help others is an internally referenced motivation because the desire is located within the individual, even if the desire is expressed in relationships with others” (Sinclair, Dowson, & McInerney, 2006, p. 1138). Varying operationalisation of motivation has resulted in challenges related to conceptual precision and overlapping categorisations of motivational constructs (Watt & Richardson, 2007). Prior research has until recently been primarily empirically driven and lacked a unified theoretical and analytical framework (Watt & Richardson, 2008). This theoretical and methodological inconsistency has hampered the comparison of data on teacher motivation gathered in different educational contexts. This was the point of departure when Watt and Richardson (Richardson & Watt, 2006; Watt & Richardson, 2007) developed the Factors Influencing Teaching Choice framework and scale (FIT-Choice scale), thus bringing the well-established expectancy-value theory (EVT) of educational and occupational choice into the research on teacher motivation. Today, the FIT-Choice framework and scale is internationally acknowledged; since the first studies in Australia, the FIT-Choice scale has been translated and tested with scalar invariance established in an initial four-country comparison (Watt et al., 2012), and it has been validated in a number of countries (for a summary see Watt & Richardson, 2012).

In Norway, a limited amount of research exists on preservice teacher career choice motivations (Dæhlen, 2005; Roness & Smith, 2010). One of the exceptions is a comprehensive study conducted by Roness (2011) and Roness and Smith (2010) concerning preservice teacher motivations for conducting university-based teacher education in different universities in Norway. Conventionally, Roness (2011) found that intrinsic and altruistic motivations were the most common reasons for Norwegian students to enter into teacher education. This finding corresponds with results from other studies indicating that students in client-centred educational programmes (teacher education, nursing, etc.) tend to adopt

altruistic values (Dæhlen, 2005). This prior research has provided valuable insights into the motivational characteristics of Norwegian student teachers and newly qualified teachers (Roness, 2011; Roness & Smith, 2009, 2010). However, it suffers from similar weaknesses as the majority of prior international research in that it is primarily empirically driven and lacks a theoretical framework. Therefore, the present study aimed to fill this gap in the research on teacher motivations in Norway. On the basis of a large sample of Norwegian student teachers, the purpose of this study was to examine the structure and reliability of the Norwegian translation of the FIT-Choice scale.

The FIT-Choice Framework

The FIT-Choice framework (see Figure 1) is based upon EVT (Eccles et al., 1983), social cognitive career theory (Lent, Lopez, & Bieschke, 1993), and the key findings in international research on student teachers' career motivations (Watt & Richardson, 2007; Watt et al., 2012). The EVT proposes different classes of values and expectancy of success as the main determinants of educational and occupational choices and behaviour (Eccles, 2009). In line with EVT, the FIT-Choice model introduces three main value classes (intrinsic value, personal utility value, and social utility value) and self- and task-perceptions that are related to the choice of teaching. This constitutes a core part of the model (see the right middle section of the model in Figure 1). *Intrinsic value* refers to the enjoyment of and interest in teaching. *Personal utility value* refers to extrinsic motivations such as job security, job transferability, and time for family. *Social utility value* refers to altruistic motivations like shaping the future of children and adolescents, enhancing social equity, and making a social contribution. Individuals' perception of their teaching abilities is also a part of this model, as are task-perceptions such as demands (difficulty and required expertise) and returns (salary and social status) related to the teaching profession. The model also contains the maladaptive motivation to select teaching as a fallback career, as well as more underlying socialisation

influences on career choices such as an individual's prior teaching and learning experiences and the influences of significant others. As an outcome variable, the model presents satisfaction with the choice of teaching (Watt & Richardson, 2007, 2012) and subsequently additionally professional engagement and career development aspirations (PECDA; see Watt & Richardson, 2008).

The different psychological mechanisms involved in the choice to become a teacher are assumed to work together in influencing people's decision-making and their further engagement and perseverance. For instance, people are likely to choose an education and career for which they expect to have the necessary abilities and skills, an option they personally value, and a choice that does not involve excessive demands (Watt & Richardson, 2007; Watt et al., 2012). The validity of the FIT-Choice scale has been empirically investigated in several cultural contexts, such as Australia, Turkey, the United States, the People's Republic of China, the Netherlands, Croatia, Germany, and Switzerland (for a summary, see Watt & Richardson, 2012).

For example, Fokkens-Bruinsma and Canrinus (2012b) examined the suitability of the FIT-Choice scale in Dutch university-based teacher education, and found a significant relationship between various scales from the FIT-Choice model (i.e., motivation to work with children and adolescents, prior teaching and learning experiences, ability and time for family) and student teachers' self-efficacy, professional commitment, and retention intentions. In another study, Fokkens-Bruinsma and Canrinus (2012a) identified adaptive and maladaptive motivations for teaching based on the FIT-Choice subscales. These motivations related to student teachers' engagement and commitment to their profession positively and negatively, respectively. Adaptive motivations included as a desire to enhance social equity or work with children and adolescents (social utility values); maladaptive motivations included a desire to become a teacher because of social influence or the belief that teaching is a fallback career

(Fokkens-Bruinsma & Canrinus, 2012a). Among their continuing longitudinal study in Australia, Richardson and Watt (2014) assessed positive vs. negative consequences of initial teaching motivations with dimensions of professional engagement and career development aspirations (PECDA) and own reported teaching style upon early career entry several years later. On the basis of robust longitudinal data from representative samples, they identified social influence and fallback career motivations as maladaptive, interpreting the former in terms of self-determination theory, wherein choosing a career for reasons of social influence would be regarded as a rather controlled motivational source.

Jugović, Marušić, Pavin Ivanec, and Vizek Vidović (2012) examined the validity of a Croatian version of the FIT-Choice model, and found relations between personality traits and the motivations for choosing teaching as a career. The researchers discovered that extraversion and agreeableness were significant predictors of intrinsic career value, but also of the satisfaction with the choice of teaching as a profession. Agreeableness also showed positive relations with social utility value motivations, while extraversion predicted ability (Jugović et al., 2012). These examples of studies utilising the FIT-Choice scale show the importance of motivation for various constructs. The studies also demonstrate the importance of examining whether the structure of the scale is similar in the Norwegian culture, to ensure the comparability of findings when relating the FIT-Choice scale to other outcome measures, such as professional commitment.

Watt et al. (2012) examined the FIT-Choice scale in a comparative study with future teachers from four countries, including Norway (the other three were Australia, Germany and the United States). The comparative study demonstrated the construct validity of the FIT-Choice scale in the different settings; although, the Norwegian sample consisted of only 131 future secondary teachers, who were asked to fill out only the motivations part of the scale, using the original English version.

According to Watt and Richardson (2012), the scale has demonstrated acceptable reliability and construct validity across various settings. To suit different contexts, adaptations have included replacing the original Australian construct “job transferability” items referring to travel “overseas”, with items that reference travel elsewhere (see Watt & Richardson, 2012). Overall, the FIT-Choice scale has shown good fit in the reported studies, which mainly used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to investigate how the scale performed according to the prior theory and empirical evidence (Watt & Richardson, 2012).

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

The FIT-Choice scale

The FIT-Choice scale measures a range of motivation constructs and perceptions about the teaching profession (Watt & Richardson, 2012). The motivation constructs refer to the importance of different motivations in the participant’s choice of a teaching career. Motivational factors include socialisation influences (social dissuasion, prior teaching and learning experiences, and social influence), self-perceptions (perceived teaching abilities), intrinsic career value, personal utility values (job security, time for family, and job transferability) and social utility values (shape the future of children and adolescents, enhance social equity, make social contribution, and work with children/adolescents). The scale also measures the maladaptive motivation of having chosen teaching as a fallback career, representing the perceptions of teaching as a career that is not a first choice. The measures of the perceptions of the teaching profession include perceived task demand (expertise and difficulty) and task return (social status and salary). The model also includes satisfaction with the choice of teaching as a career.

In prior research, quality of life issues, such as having time for family and having a secure job, have frequently been labelled as extrinsic motivations (Kyriacou & Coulthard,

2000). The FIT-Choice model identifies these motivations as personal utility value factors. The concept of personal utility value distinguishes some extrinsic motivations (having time for family and a secure job) from other extrinsic motivations, such as social influences and task-perceptions (Watt & Richardson, 2007). In prior research, the socialisation influences of former good teachers, and other positive prior teaching and learning experiences, have been connected with choosing a teaching career (Huberman, 1989/1993; Lortie, 1975; Watt & Richardson, 2007). The intrinsic career value factor has similarities with the intrinsic motivation referred to in other motivational theories (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The social utility value factors are comparable to the altruistic motivations commonly referred to in the teacher motivation literature, but with a more fine-grained perspective (Kyriacou & Coulthard, 2000; Müller, Alliaa, & Benninghoff, 2009; OECD, 2005).

The Norwegian Context

The population of Norway slightly exceeds five million people. The country has developed into one of the richest countries in the world due to its vast natural resources, particularly oil. The educational system is mainly public, with 97% of the children and adolescents in public primary and lower secondary schools, and the remaining 3% in private schools (Statistics Norway, 2013). In Norway, education is free at all levels, including upper secondary and higher education. The school system includes 10 years of compulsory primary and lower secondary education and an additional three years of optional upper secondary education. Primary and lower secondary school covers education for children aged 6 to 15, and upper secondary school covers education for adolescents aged 16 to 18. In compulsory education (grades 1 to 10), the same curriculum is employed in all schools across the country. Upper secondary education provides three years of general education or four years of vocational education and training after the 10-year compulsory education. The norm of

apprenticeship training is two years of vocational training in upper secondary education followed by one or two years of practical training in the industry (Statistics Norway, 2013).

The Norwegian system provides several routes to becoming a teacher. The colleges offer a four-year integrated teacher education programme specifically designed to qualify for a teaching career in grades 1–7 and 5–10. Universities offer integrated teacher education programmes for grades 8–13, except for one university, which provides integrated teacher education programmes for grades 1–7, grades 5–10, and grades 8–13. The universities and colleges also provide a one-year Post-Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE), following the study of subjects or disciplines. There is no differentiated PGCE: The same programme qualifies for teaching in all grades from 5 to 13.

The Current Study

This article had one primary concern. We aimed to investigate to what extent future teachers in Norway endorse the motivations for teaching specified by the FIT-Choice scale. This entailed examining the psychometric properties of the FIT-Choice scale and reporting the CFAs we performed in order to replicate the FIT-Choice scale in the specific Norwegian context. A starting point for our investigation was the CFA conducted by Watt et al. (2012) on a small Norwegian sample ($N = 131$) of student teachers. In line with their findings, we expected that it would be possible to differentiate the various subscales of the FIT-Choice scale on a larger sample of Norwegian student teachers. Prior research on student teachers' motivations to teach in Norway has revealed that interest and altruism are primary motivational sources (Roness, 2011). We anticipated that our data would show the same. Accordingly, the research question guiding this study was: *Does the current Norwegian version of the FIT-Choice scale represent a valid measure of teachers' career motivation?*

The research question implies an understanding of validity as a matter of interpretation and degree, and not as a dichotomy between valid and not valid. This means that an instrument's scores will reflect the underlying construct more accurately or less accurately, but never perfectly (Cook & Beckman, 2006). In examining the construct validity (Messick, 1995) of the FIT-Choice scale, we studied the internal structure of the FIT-Choice scale by exploring the convergent and divergent validity of the scale. Accordingly, in this article, we aimed to investigate to which degree the correlations between the latent variables were consistent with theory and prior evidence.

Method

Instrument Translation to Norwegian

The FIT-Choice scale items were translated from the original English version into Norwegian by this paper's first author and a bilingual expert of educational research (see Appendix A for the actual items). The items were then translated back into English by a bilingual third party. The first author then compared the original items with the back-translated items. After discussions of the translations with bilingual experts in educational research, the survey was piloted with a sample of 95 PGCE (post graduate certificate in education) students to assess the relevance of the items for this population and the quality of the translation. All of the items appeared to have relevance to the Norwegian context, and only minor adjustments were made (see the discussion section); one of the items in the teacher morale subscale had to be deleted due to mistranslation (C5; also problematic in the study of Watt et al., 2012 due to the same mistranslation issue as in the present study).¹

Sample and Procedure

¹ The concept "morale" was confused with the concept "moral" in the translation of the item.

The sample comprised 635 student teachers; 400 students (3 cohorts) attending the PGCE programme and 235 students (1 cohort) attending the five-year integrated teacher education programme. The sample was from a single university in the country's largest city. The participants ranged in age from 23 to 57 years ($M = 28.46$, $SD = 8.46$). With regard to gender, 413 (65%) participants were female and 218 (35%) male, while 4 participants did not report gender.

The first author administered the questionnaires at one timepoint per cohort in the autumn and spring semesters of the 2013/2014 academic year. The students filled out the questionnaires during lectures at the university (response rate was about 95% for all cohorts). The first author stressed that participation was voluntary, that the survey was anonymous, and that the data would be used only for research purposes.

Analytic Approach

In this study, we treated the scale responses as continuous variables. Initially, the descriptive statistics were calculated in order to study the distribution at a univariate level. Subsequently, CFAs were conducted by means of Mplus 7.1 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012) to assess the dimensionality and to identify the latent factors that accounted for the variation in the set of indicators. We elected to perform CFAs because the data were collected using a strongly theorised and previously empirically validated scale. In addition, the internal consistency for each factor was estimated in the form of a scale reliability coefficient for latent variables (ρ) (Brown, 2015) and Cronbach's alpha (α) (Cronbach, 1951). Finally, the intercorrelations between the latent factors were examined in order to assess divergent and convergent validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

To assess how well-fitted empirical data are to a theoretical model, a variety of fit indices are used. Different indices capture different aspects of the analytic situation, such as model complexity, sample size, and estimation method. In the present study, we used chi-

square statistics and the fit indices reported in Mplus: the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the comparative fit index (CFI), and the standardised root mean square residual (SRMR) to evaluate the overall fit of the model. After reviewing the literature concerning cut-off criteria for goodness of fit (Bentler, 1990; Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Hu & Bentler, 1998, 1999; Marsh, Hau, & Wen, 2004; Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003) and considering the current analytical situation (e.g., model complexity), we adopted the following criteria for model evaluation: $RMSEA \leq .08$, $CFI \geq .90$, and $SRMR \leq .09$ to qualify the model as having an acceptable fit, while $RMSEA \leq .05$, $CFI \geq .95$, with $SRMR \leq .06$ representing a good fit.

On the construct level, the model was evaluated by examining factor loadings, error variances, factor determinacies, and reliabilities. Specific cut-off criteria for factor loadings were not chosen due to the lack of agreed cut-off criteria in the literature (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), the confirmatory nature of CFA, and the fact that the FIT-Choice scale has been validated in several other countries. Item content and loading as well as the content and loadings of related items and psychometric utility were examined before any items were rejected. Factor determinacies were estimated as a measure of validity, with values ranging from 0 to 1, and larger values indicating a better measurement of the factor by the observed variable. A factor determinacy coefficient of $>.80$ suggests strong correlations between the items in their respective factor, indicating high internal consistency (Gorsuch, 1983). In addition, we estimated reliability by Cronbach's alpha (α) and the scale reliability coefficient (ρ).

Convergent validity refers to the degree to which two measures of constructs that theoretically should be related in fact are related, while *discriminant validity* refers to whether two measures of constructs that are not supposed to be related are in fact are unrelated. In order to examine construct validity, Campbell and Fiske (1959) stressed the importance of

using both discriminant and convergent validation techniques when assessing new measures. In the current study, no other scales comparative to the FIT-Choice scale were included. Therefore, we examined the convergent and discriminant validity by investigating the internal structure of the current scale; more specifically, we examined the correlations between the first-order factors with reference to relevant theories (e.g., expectancy-value theory or social cognitive theory). Next, we evaluated the correlations in relation to the FIT-Choice framework. For instance, we examined whether constructs that the framework posits cluster together in higher-level constructs (e.g., social utility values; refer to first psychometric evaluation study by Watt & Richardson, 2007) actually were correlated. Finally, we compared the intercorrelations among the constructs with results from prior studies using the FIT-Choice scale (e.g., Fokkens-Bruinsma & Canrinus, 2012b; Jugović et al., 2012; Kılınç, Watt, & Richardson, 2012; König & Rothland, 2012; Lin, Shi, Wang, Zhang, & Hui, 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007; Watt et al., 2012). One can expect some variation in these correlations across studies due to cultural and contextual factors (Watt & Richardson, 2012; Watt et al., 2012).

Results

In addition to the observed means and standard deviations, the standardised values of skewness and kurtosis are reported. As seen in Table 1, a few items tended to be peaked (B31 had the highest kurtosis of 2.67). Therefore, the null hypothesis of the normal distribution was rejected. As a result, we used robust statistics (robust maximum likelihood estimation) for further analyses (Yuan & Bentler, 2000). To deal with missing data (0.85%), we used full maximum likelihood estimation (Allison, 2001).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

In the first CFA, all 60 items (see Appendix A for an overview of the items) that were intended to represent the 18 first-order factors were included. As a starting point for the analysis, we utilised the original FIT-Choice scale validated by Watt and Richardson (2007). The CFA revealed that the model had an acceptable fit to data according to most indices: χ^2 (1557) = 3732.936, $p < .001$, RMSEA = .047, 90% CI [.045, .049], CFI = .865, SRMR = .066. However, there were several concerns related to the factor loadings. In what follows, we present the subtle modifications we made to improve the model fit: The item B13, “I want a job that involves working with children/adolescents”, part of the *work with children/adolescents* factor, had a proper factor loading, but, the modification indices indicated the item was even more strongly associated with the factor *shape future of children/adolescents*. We tried to cross-load item B13 between the two factors, resulting in the effect of item B13 disappearing from its original factor, leading to a decision to exclude item B13. Item C5 (“Do you think teachers have high morale?”) from the *social status* factor was excluded due to low standardised factor loading (.27) as a result of mistranslation as “moral” mentioned earlier. Item B7 (“I have always wanted to be a teacher”) was excluded from the *intrinsic value* factor due to its factor loading (.32). Finally, items B4 and item B18, part of the *time for family* factor, had relatively lower factor loadings (.49 and .45, respectively) than other items in the same subscale. The conceptual starting point for the original Australian validation had entailed that these two items were measuring “bludging”, colloquial for describing people adopting the laziest approach possible or choosing what they believe to be an easy option (Watt & Richardson, 2007, p. 16). In the Australian validation study these items were unable to be empirically distinguished from *time for family* items, interpreted by the authors that people who endorsed reasons to teach such as a short working day, did so for important quality of life reasons rather than to take an easy career option (Richardson & Watt, 2006). However, in our analyses we found that both the factor loadings

and the overall model fit significantly improved when separating the two items as a separated *bludging* factor. These minor modifications constituted the final model, which resulted in an improved model fit: $\chi^2 (1368) = 2715.567, p < .001$; RMSEA = .039, 90% CI [.037, .042]; CFI = .910; SRMR = .050. Table 1 presents the loadings and factor reliabilities.

Correlations and Mean Scores of the Scales

Table 2 presents intercorrelations based on the latent factors in the final solution. The correlation analysis indicates that the convergent and divergent validity of the FIT-Choice scale was acceptable. The patterns of intercorrelations between similar measures were expected to be high, indicating convergent validity. Likewise, it was expected that unrelated constructs could be easily differentiated. It appeared that the majority of the motivations for teaching were significantly inter-correlated, and the highest correlation was between *perceived teaching abilities* and *intrinsic value* (.78), similar to the correlation reported by Watt et al. (2012) for their Norwegian sample (.80). Relatively high correlations were found between the social utility component factors *shape future of children/adolescents*, *enhance equity*, and *make social contribution*. Similar to the Watt et al. (2012) study, highest correlations among the perception of the teaching profession factors occurred between *expert career* and *high demand* (.52).

Table 2 shows that the highest-rated motivation factors were *intrinsic career value*, *shape future of children/adolescents*, *perceived teaching abilities*, *make social contribution*, and *job security* (scores above 5 on the 7-point Likert scale). The factors for which mean ratings were below the scale midpoint of 4 were *social dissuasion*, *job transferability*, *time for family*, *bludging*, *social influence*, and *fallback career*. One of the lowest-rated factors was *social influence* (with a score of 3.1), indicating that the preservice teachers made autonomous career choices and were less influenced by peers and relatives in making a choice of profession. The lowest-rated factor was *fallback career* (with a score of 2.6),

indicating that the teaching profession was the primary profession choice among the preservice teachers in the sample.

Among the factors measuring the perceptions of the teaching profession, the highest mean scores related to the *high demand* and *expert career* factors, while *social status* and *salary* were rated lower. The preservice teachers in the sample were highly satisfied with their choice of becoming teachers (with an average score of 5.5). However, it is important to note that they may rationalise their choice given that they have just made the decision to become a teacher, and had little experience yet to change their minds.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Discussion

This study's aim was to examine the structure, reliability and sample scores for our Norwegian translation of the FIT-Choice scale. Overall, the results indicated that the present Norwegian version of the scale provides an adequate measure of motivation to become a teacher, with the exception of item C5 that was mistranslated, and separation of *time for family* from *bludging* items. In the following discussion, we share some of the experiences and issues met.

Issues Related to the Dimensionality and Psychometric Properties

Results from the CFA indicated support for the construct validity of the Norwegian version of the scale with the deletion of B7 from *intrinsic career value*, B13 from the *work with children/adolescents* and C5 (which could be retranslated in future research in the Norwegian setting) from the *social status* subscales. A possible reason why item B7 in the *intrinsic career value* factor showed a low loading in the CFA (.32) might be the item's time framing. The two other items in the subscale (B1 and B12) are related to present perceptions of interest, while B7 taps past perceptions (B7: "I have always wanted to be a teacher").

Interestingly, *time for family* and *bludging* could be distinguished into two factors within our sample, as originally proposed by the scale authors (see Richardson & Watt, 2006), although they could not empirically distinguish these in their Australian sample. The factorial structure of the scale revealed an acceptable fit with 13 motivation factors, not the 12 factors in the Australian scale. In the present analysis, *time for family* and *bludging* were revealed as two distinct factors² and not a merged factor as seen in both the original study and other validation studies (Berger & D'Ascoli, 2012; Jugović et al., 2012; Lin et al., 2012; Richardson & Watt, 2006).

The construct validity of the Norwegian version of the FIT-Choice scale was supported by acceptable to strong scale reliabilities, with minor deficiencies associated with the subscales *fallback career* ($\rho = .64$), *high demand* ($\rho = .66$), and *social dissuasion* ($\rho = .70$), in addition to the newly separated subscale *bludging* ($\rho = .64$). Cronbach's alpha values were similar to previous validations of the scale, and the subscales of *fallback career* and *social dissuasion* showed similar reliability scores in previous studies (König & Rothland, 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007; Watt et al., 2012). One reason for the lower reliability scores might be the breadth of these two constructs and weaker redundancy among the items. A potential solution would be to add some items to assess these two constructs, in order to improve the factor definition and increase the subscale reliability.

Another issue regarding reliability related to two other subscales, *work with children/adolescents* and *salary*, that revealed strong subscale reliabilities ($\rho = .89$ and $.92$, respectively) with a small number of items. The former is one from which we had excluded an item (B13) which improved its reliability; the latter was measured only by two items

² To scrutinise whether the time for family and bludging were distinct factors, we tested an alternative merged model, and a second-order model. However, these worsened the fit, supporting the solution of two distinct factors.

indicating some item redundancy (Boyle, 1991), although this may be unavoidable for such a very specific construct. A scale that consists of many items that are repetitions of each other may appear like a “bloated specific” in factor analysis (Boyle, 1991; Cattell, 1978). This may be a threat to the construct validity. Consequently, a criticism of some of FIT-Choice’s subscales might be that they are redundant.

Needless to say, empirical research is context-specific and not all constructs may be generalizable to other contexts. It is reasonable to assume that differences in educational systems and policies lead to different motivations to become a teacher. Several studies have enriched the scale with items measuring context-specific motivations (e.g., Suryani, Watt, & Richardson, 2016). The scale authors have discussed how studies in diverse settings can benefit from such type of additions based on the study context (Watt, Richardson, & Smith, in press; see also Butler, in press) to encompass a more culturally comprehensive picture of teacher motivation in that setting. Research on future upper secondary teachers in Norway (Roness, 2011) has suggested that an interest in the subject matter is an important motivation. This is an example of a context-specific motivation that was added to the FIT-Choice scale in 2006 (see Watt et al., in press). That said, the underlying structure of the scale has been replicated in several contexts, providing a good basis for comparing teacher motivations across samples and cultures, with possible addition of culturally important constructs where needed.

Language and Translation Issues

An English version of the FIT-Choice scale was previously employed with a small Norwegian sample (Watt et al., 2012). Although an English version can be used in Norway, cultural and linguistic differences can entail problems with comprehension and interpretation of English items, resulting in a benefit for a Norwegian language version. In the work with the translations, we conducted a pilot study ($N = 95$) as recommended in the literature

(Creswell, 2014). Educational experts performed the examinations of all of the translated items. This process resulted in a reformulation of one of the items in the *social status* subscale C5 (“Do you think teachers have high morale?”). In the present CFA, this item showed a low loading (.27), indicating problems related to the translation. After further investigation, we discovered that the concept morale (with an “e”) has a different meaning than the concept moral (without an “e”). This distinction is not present in the Norwegian language, and the nuance was noticed neither by this article’s first author nor by the translators. The mistake in the translation of item C5 is responsible for the non-significant loading of this item.

In the present examination, another item (B22) from the *job transferability* factor performed relatively low on the CFA (.53). There is reason to believe that this result is also related to the translation of the item. The original wording of item B22 is, “A teaching qualification is recognised everywhere.” The translation of the English verb “recognise” into the Norwegian word “*anerkjenne*” is a potential problem since this word can also be understood as “acknowledge.” On the basis of this, it is suggested that in further research with the Norwegian version of the FIT-Choice scale, item B22 should be translated into, “*Lærerutdanning er anvendelig overalt.*” This can be back-translated as, “A teaching qualification is applicable everywhere.”

Correlations—Convergent and Discriminant Validity

In this study, the theoretical structure of the FIT-Choice scale was replicated using a sample that was much larger than the sample of Norwegian future teachers included in the initial Norwegian FIT-Choice study by Watt et al. (2012). We studied the convergent and discriminant validity of the scale by examining the correlations between the latent variables. In this study, the correlations were similar to those reported in other validation studies of the scale. The correlation between *perceived teaching ability* and *intrinsic value* was strong (.78);

these two factors correlate strongly in all of the reported FIT-Choice studies (for summaries, see Watt & Richardson, 2012; Watt et al., 2012). We also expected the relatively strong positive correlations among the factors *shape future of children and adolescents*, *enhance social equity*, *make social contribution*, and *work with children and adolescents* which together comprise the higher-order social utility value factor. The positive correlations indicate that the sub dimensions of the second-order factor, which resembles altruism, interrelated without too much overlap, supporting the convergent validity of the factors.

High and Low Scores

After examining and replicating the factor structure of the FIT-Choice scale, we then examined the associated descriptive statistics. The motivation factors about which Norwegian future teachers agreed most strongly were *intrinsic value*, *shape future of children/adolescents*, *perceived teaching abilities*, *make social contribution*, and *job security*. The Norwegian educational authorities' efforts to recruit students into teacher education place great emphasis on increasing the status of the profession and highlight the altruistic aspects of the profession. This is in line with some of the key motivators for choosing a teacher education. However, scores yielded by the FIT-Choice scale revealed *intrinsic career value* and *perceived teaching abilities* as also highly important in this sample's decision to become a teacher. Employers and educational authorities might profitably give this more attention in recruitment strategies.

In international studies, the motivation to work with children/adolescents has been rated among the five most important factors (König & Rothland, 2012; Watt et al., 2012), while, in this sample, it was not highly rated. Note however that our scale is made of only two of the three original items. The results from this sample differed in this respect from the results from international comparisons (Watt et al., 2012).

The principles of unity and equality are important aspects of the Norwegian educational system. We thus expected that there would be a less perceived need for interventions and actions to target structural, educational, and social inequities and that the preservice teachers would be less motivated to choose a teaching career due to social utility aspects (as suggested earlier by Watt et al., 2012). This may explain why, in this sample, the desire to enhance social equity was rated even lower than previous studies in other countries (Jugović et al., 2012; Kılınç et al., 2012; Lin et al., 2012).

Social dissuasion, job transfer, and time for family motivation factors were rated low in our sample. However, personal utility motivations, such as having time for family commitments, might become increasingly relevant during teacher education, as many preservice teachers might begin thinking about starting a family. *Bludging, social influence, and fallback career* – the three maladaptive factors – were rated the least important. All motivations were rated above the scale midpoint except these three. The rating of *social influence* among the least important motivations indicates that Norwegian preservice teachers make autonomous career choices. The low ratings of *bludging* and *fallback career* indicate that Norwegian preservice teachers consider the teaching profession a prioritised career choice, similar to other published studies that have applied the FIT-Choice scale across diverse contexts.

In Norway, teacher salaries are rather low compared to other professions, and the teaching profession is not among the occupations with the highest social prestige (Caspersen, Aamodt, Vibe, & Carlsten, 2014; With, 2016). The preservice teachers' perceptions of teaching salaries reflect this fact. Interestingly, the informants viewed teaching as a highly demanding career requiring expert knowledge. The demand factors can presumably act as incentives for choosing teaching as a career for individuals who wish to develop their competence in a challenging environment (Watt & Richardson, 2007).

These findings show that student teachers in this sample were highly motivated to work as teachers, and recognised the teaching profession as being demanding, having low status, and low pay. They also reported that they did not choose a teaching career to have something to fall back on; instead, they rated teaching as their primary choice. When the high dropout rates from the teaching profession are considered (Tiplic et al., 2015), there is reason to believe that there must be conditions within the professional practice that the prospective teachers are not prepared for. In recent years, following the introduction of the Knowledge Promotion Reform in Norwegian schools, the accountability demands, requirements for documentation of pupils' assessment and monitoring, have become high (Mausethagen & Granlund, 2012). Many teachers experience this as increasingly bureaucratic and perceive accountability demands of teachers' work as a drain on their workday (Jordfald, Nyen, & Seip, 2009). In further research on motivation to teach, it is important to investigate how these work conditions affect teachers' experience of autonomy and control in their professional practice, and how this relates to their motivation to continue practising their profession (see Richardson & Watt, 2014).

As in other studies that have made use of the FIT-Choice scale, the informants in this study rated their *satisfaction with choice of teaching as a career* relatively high (5.5). Demanding work, low salaries, and low status have been emphasised in previous research as reasons for the high dropout rates of newly qualified teachers in Norway. These findings indicate that the preservice teachers in this sample already recognise that teaching is a highly demanding career with low status and low salaries, even at the start of their education. This resembles findings across other contexts using the same scale (Watt et al. 2012), and challenges the existing understanding of teacher dropout and retention. Savickas et al. (2009; Savickas, 2012) suggested that career choice, development, and construction are the management of possibilities. They claimed that, while earlier employment patterns were

based on long-term perspectives, mutual loyalty, and security, today's employment is based on mutually recognised win-win situations, short-term goals, and restricted mutual obligations. Instead of a single occupational choice, the task of career construction and identity formation has become a continuing responsibility for many people. This could be an interesting perspective in further investigations and studies of individuals' career choice and development.

Limitations and Further Research

As in all studies, this study has some limitations. First, the sample is of moderate size ($N = 635$) in relation to the number of factors being considered in this model, which can influence the stability of the results. Second, the data were obtained from a single university. Although this university is highly representative for the Norwegian teacher education system compared to similar institutions in Norway, the sample came from the country's largest city and from a primarily urban population. This setting may be limiting in generalising the results. Third, the sample consisted of preservice teachers from a university-based, upper secondary teacher education programme. Preservice teachers in primary and secondary teacher education might have different motivations, beliefs, and expectations of the teaching profession. This may also be limiting in generalising the results. Fourth, there were aspects of problematic translations of items from English to Norwegian discussed above (for "morale" in C5; and "recognised" in B22). Finally, the FIT-Choice scale is a self-report measure of student teachers' motivations to teach. Self-report measures provide no guarantee for honesty. The results may therefore be influenced by what participants think is a socially desirable answer. This implies that further research should test the scale with other samples of preservice teachers in Norway. Our investigation of the FIT-Choice scale indicated a slightly modified structure in Norway compared to the original scale, in terms of the separation of *time for family* and *bludging* items. Further research should conduct additional

investigations to check whether these constructs can be elsewhere distinguished. The scale concerns why people choose the teaching profession; further research is needed to investigate why people choose not to stay in the teaching profession, or do not consider the teaching profession as an option at all.

Conclusion

Results of the present study provide support for the validity of the Norwegian version of the FIT-Choice scale. Knowledge about the motivation for becoming a teacher is important for several reasons. Educational authorities, teacher education institutions, and the public have different beliefs about what motivates people to become teachers. These perceptions may be stereotypes that are both negative and inaccurate, and they may affect recruitment to the teaching profession. However, using a validated instrument to measure motivation to become a teacher and to uncover knowledge about core values, beliefs, and expectations that make people choose the teaching profession can provide useful information. A valid measuring instrument makes it possible to examine the similarities and differences among various cultural contexts. Such comparisons can provide valuable information on how to understand the particular Norwegian context, as well as provide new perspectives on motivation for becoming teachers in other cultural contexts.

References

- Allison, P. D. (2001). *Missing data* (Vol. 136). Sage publications.
- Authors (2016) [blinded for peer-review purposes]
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(2), 238–246. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(3), 588–606. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(3), 588–606. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588
- Berger, J. L., & D'Ascoli, Y. (2012). Motivations to become vocational education and training educators: A person-oriented approach. *Vocations and Learning*, 5(3), 225–249.
- Boyle, G. J. (1991). Does item homogeneity indicate internal consistency or item redundancy in psychometric scales? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12(3), 291–294.
- Brookhart, S. M., & Freeman, D. J. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(1), 37–60.
- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bruinsma, M., & Jansen, E. P. (2010). Is the motivation to become a teacher related to pre-service teachers' intentions to remain in the profession?. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 185-200.

- Butler, R. (in press). Why choose teaching and does it matter? In H. M. G. Watt, P. W. Richardson, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Global perspectives on teacher motivation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81–105.
- Caspersen, J., Aamodt, P.O., Vibe, N. & Carlsten, T.C. (2014). *Kompetanse og praksis blant norske lærere [Competence and practices among Norwegian teachers]*. NIFU Rapport 41/2014
- Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioural and life sciences*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Cook D. A., & Beckman T. J. (2006). Current concepts in validity and reliability for psychometric instruments: Theory and application. *American Journal of Medicine*, 119(166), e7–e16.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. New York, NY: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. doi:10.1007/bf02310555
- Dæhlen, M. (2005). Change in job values during education. *Journal of Education and Work*, 18(4), 385-400.
- Eccles, J. S. (2009). Who am I and what am I going to do with my life? Personal and collective identities as motivators of action. *Educational Psychologist*, 44(2), 78–89.
- Eccles J., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., et al. (1983). Expectations, values and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Perspective on*

- achievement and achievement motivation* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., & Canrinus, E. T. (2012a). Adaptive and maladaptive motives for becoming a teacher. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 38(1), 3–19.
- Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., & Canrinus, E. T. (2012b). The factors influencing teaching (FIT)-choice scale in a Dutch teacher education program. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 249–269. doi:10.1080/1359866X.2012.700043
- Gjefsen, H. M., Gunnes, T., & Stølen, N. M. (2014). Framskrivinger av befolkning og arbeidsstyrke etter utdanning med alternative forutsetninger for innvandring [Analyses of the population and workforce by education with alternative preconditions for immigration]. *Statistisk sentralbyrå, Rapporter 2014/31* [Statistics Norway, Reports, 2014/31].
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, 3(4), 424–453. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.424
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- Huberman, M. (1993). *The lives of teachers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. (Original work published 1989).
- Jordfald, B., Nyen, T., & Seip, A. A. (2009). *Tidstyvene. En beskrivelse av læreres arbeidstidssituasjon*. [Time Thieves. A description of teachers' working situation]. Oslo FAFO-report 23.

- Jungert, T., & Alm, F. (2014). Jungert, T., F. Alm and R. Thornberg. 2014. Motives for becoming a teacher and their relations to academic engagement and dropout among student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 40 (2), 173–185.
- Jugović, I., Marušić, I., Pavin Ivanec, T., & Vizek Vidović, V. (2012). Motivation and personality of preservice teachers in Croatia. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 271–287.
- Kılınç, A., Watt, H. M., & Richardson, P. W. (2012). Factors influencing teaching choice in Turkey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 199–226.
- Kyriacou, C., & Coulthard, M. (2000). Undergraduates' views of teaching as a career choice. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 26(2), 117–126.
- Kyriacou, C., Coulthard, M., Hultgren, Å., & Stephens, P. (2002). Norwegian university students' views on a career in teaching. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 54(1), 103–116.
- König, J., & Rothland, M. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: Effects on general pedagogical knowledge during initial teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 289–315.
- Lent, R. W., Lopez, F. G., & Bieschke, K. J. (1993). Predicting mathematics-related choice and success behaviors: Test of an expanded social cognitive model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42(2), 223–236.
- Lin, E., Shi, Q., Wang, J., Zhang, S., & Hui, L. (2012). Initial motivations for teaching: Comparison between preservice teachers in the United States and China. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 227–248.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *The school teacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.-T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 11(3), 320–341. doi:10.1207/s15328007sem1103_2
- Mausethagen, S., & Granlund, L. (2012). Contested discourses of teacher professionalism: Current tensions between education policy and teachers' union. *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(6), 815–833.
- Meijer, P. C., de Graaf, G., & Meirink, J. (2011). Key experiences in student teachers' development. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 17(1), 115-129.
- Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment. Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist*, 50(9), 741.
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2014). *Lærerutdanninger i endring. Indre utvikling – ytre kontekstuelle og strukturelle hinder* [Teacher educations in change. Internal development - external contextual and structural obstacles] Rapport fra Følgegruppen til Kunnskapsdepartementet. Rapport nr. 4
- Müller, K., Alliata, R., & Benninghoff, F. (2009). Attracting and retaining teachers: A question of motivation. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(5), 574–599.
- Munthe, E., Malmo, K. A. S., & Rogne, M. (2011). Teacher education reform and challenges in Norway. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(4), 441–450.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. (1998–2012). *Mplus user's guide* Version 7. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Paris, France.

- Pop, M. M., & Turner, J. E. (2009). To be or not to be... a teacher? Exploring levels of commitment related to perceptions of teaching among students enrolled in a teacher education program. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 15(6), 683-700.
- Richardson, P. W., & Watt, H. M.G. (2006). Who chooses teaching and why? Profiling characteristics and motivations across three Australian universities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1), 27-56.
- Richardson, P. W., & Watt, H. M. G. (2014). Why people choose teaching as a career: An expectancy-value approach to understanding teacher motivation. In P. W. Richardson, S.A. Karabenick & H. M. G. Watt (eds). *Teacher motivation: Theory and practice*. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Roness, D. (2011). Still motivated? The motivation for teaching during the second year in the profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 628-638.
- Roness, D., & Smith, K. (2009). Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) and student motivation. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(2), 111-134.
- Roness, D., & Smith, K. (2010). Stability in motivation during teacher education. *Journal of Education and Teaching*, 36(2), 169-185.
- Roness, D. (2011). Still motivated? The motivation for teaching during the second year in the profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(3), 628-638.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Savickas, M. L. (2012). Life design: A paradigm for career intervention in the 21st century. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 90(1), 13-19.
- Savickas, M. L., Nota, L., Rossier, J., Dauwalder, J. P., Duarte, M. E., Guichard, J., . . . Van Vianen, A. E. (2009). Life designing: A paradigm for career construction in the 21st century. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75(3), 239-250.

- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23–74.
- Sinclair, C., Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2006). Motivations to teach: Psychometric perspectives across the first semester of teacher education. *Teachers College Records*, 108(6), 1132–1154.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of educational psychology*, 99(3), 611–625.
- Statistics Norway. (2013). *Utdanning 2013 – fra barnehage til doktorgrad* [Education 2013 – from kindergarten to PhD]. Holmseth (red). Statistical analyses. Statistics Norway Oslo-Kongsvinger.
- Suryani, A., Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2016). Students' motivations to become teachers: FIT-Choice findings from Indonesia. *International Journal of Quantitative Research in Education*, 3 (3), 179–203.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Tiplic, D., Brandmo, C., & Elstad, E. (2015). Antecedents of Norwegian beginning teachers' turnover intentions. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 45(4), 451–474.
- Vibe, N., Aamodt, P. O., & Carlsten, T. C. (2009). *Å være ungdomsskolelærer i Norge. Resultater fra OECDs internasjonale studie av undervisning og læring* [To be a lower secondary teacher in Norway. Results from OECD's international study of teaching and learning]. Oslo: NIFU STEP.
- Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2007). Motivational factors influencing teaching as a career choice: Development and validation of the FIT-Choice scale. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 75(3), 167–202.

- Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2012). An introduction to teaching motivations in different countries: Comparisons using the FIT-Choice scale. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 185–197.
- Watt, H. M. G., Richardson, P. W., & Smith, K. (in press). Why Teach? How Teachers' Motivations Matter Around the World. In H. M. G. Watt, P. W. Richardson, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Global perspectives on teacher motivation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Watt, H. M. G., Richardson, P. W., Klusmann, U., Kunter, M., Beyer, B., Trautwein, U., & Baumert, J. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: An international comparison using the FIT-Choice scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(6), 791–805.
- Watt, H. M. G., Richardson, P. W., Morris, Z. A. (in press). Divided by discipline? Contrasting motivations, perceptions, and background characteristics of beginning Australian English and Mathematics teachers. In H. M. G. Watt, P. W. Richardson, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Global perspectives on teacher motivation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- With, M.L. (2016). Recruitment to Teaching: The Changing Impact of Social Origins in Norway 1975-2010. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. DOI: 10.1080/00313831.2016.1212259
- Yuan, K. H., & Bentler, P. M. (2000). Three likelihood-based methods for mean and covariance structure analysis with nonnormal missing data. *Sociological Methodology*, 30(1), 165–200.

Figure 1. The FIT-Choice model. Source: “An introduction to teaching motivations in different countries: Comparisons using the FIT-Choice scale”, by H. M. G. Watt and P. W. Richardson, 2012, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), p. 187. Copyright 2008 by Helen Watt & Paul Richardson. Reprinted with permission.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Factor	Item#	Loading	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis	FDS
<i>Self-perception</i>							
Perceived teaching ability $\alpha = .80$ $\rho = .81$	B5	.77	5.62	1.05	-.55	-0.20	.92
	B19	.85	5.23	1.23	-.50	0.27	
	B43	.67	5.59	1.20	-1.01	1.48	
<i>Intrinsic value</i>							
$\alpha = .82$ $\rho = .83$	B1	.79	5.91	1.13	-1.10	1.36	.93
	B7*	.32	3.32	1.78	.39	-.73	
	B12	.88	5.81	1.18	-0.95	.62	
<i>Personal utility value</i>							
Job security $\alpha = .86$ $\rho = .86$	B14	.80	5.40	1.48	-1.04	.77	.94
	B27	.79	4.85	1.60	-.62	-.22	
	B38	.88	5.28	1.45	-.88	.54	
Job transferability $\alpha = .74$ $\rho = .77$	B8	.78	3.78	1.98	.03	-1.20	.91
	B22	.53	4.04	1.73	-.09	-.76	
	B45	.83	4.07	1.94	-.16	-1.13	
Time for family $\alpha = .81$ $\rho = .83$	B2	.59	2.88	1.81	.62	-.72	.94
	B16	.84	4.44	1.92	-.39	-.96	
	B29	.89	4.08	1.99	-.13	-1.17	
Bludging $\alpha = .64$ $\rho = .64$	B4	.68	3.83	1.71	-.04	-.90	.89
	B18	.70	2.89	1.51	.49	-.27	
<i>Social utility value</i>							
Shape future of children and adolescents $\alpha = .84$ $\rho = .84$	B9	.77	5.60	1.40	-1.10	.82	.95
	B23	.80	5.30	1.46	-.85	.38	
	B53	.83	5.52	1.38	-1.05	.94	
Enhance social equity $\alpha = .86$ $\rho = .86$	B36	.86	4.76	1.67	-.51	-.48	.94
	B49	.85	4.32	1.72	-.23	-.74	
	B54	.74	4.88	1.65	-.54	-.40	
Make social contribution	B6	.79	5.40	1.42	-.90	.41	.93
	B20	.79	5.79	1.28	-1.28	1.80	

$\alpha = .84$ $\rho = .84$	B31	.82	5.07	1.58	-.66	-.19	
Work with children and adolescents	B13*	.65	5.18	1.59	-.65	-.33	.95
	B26	.89	4.32	1.72	-.22	-.80	
$\alpha = .88$ $\rho = .89$	B37	.84	5.32	1.43	-.69	-.09	
	B10	.82	6.01	1.10	-1.39	-2.70	
<i>Fallback career</i>							
$\alpha = .63$ $\rho = .64$	B11	.64	3.74	1.85	.10	-1.08	.86
	B48	.59	2.30	1.77	1.18	.24	
	B35	.59	1.83	1.36	1.80	2.82	
<i>Antecedent socialisation</i>							
Prior teaching and learning experiences	B17	.86	5.14	1.57	-.73	-.05	.94
	B30	.90	4.92	1.67	-.58	-.43	
$\alpha = .82$ $\rho = .85$	B39	.60	5.37	1.40	-1.06	1.06	
Social influences	B3	.77	2.68	1.74	.72	-.55	.89
$\alpha = .77$ $\rho = .77$	B24	.76	2.91	1.78	.60	-.62	
	B40	.65	3.91	1.87	-.04	-1.09	
Social dissuasion	D2	.57	4.67	1.70	-.45	-.62	.90
$\alpha = .67$ $\rho = .70$	D4	.52	3.21	1.92	.40	-1.05	
	D6	.87	3.83	1.88	.10	-1.09	
<i>Task demand</i>							
Expert career	C6	.46	5.18	1.32	-.60	.05	.90
$\alpha = .72$ $\rho = .74$	C10	.60	5.92	1.16	-1.14	1.26	
	14	.75	5.71	1.25	-.96	.83	
	C15	.77	5.67	1.15	-.95	1.52	
High demand	C2	.48	5.52	1.17	-.73	.64	.86
$\alpha = .65$ $\rho = .66$	C7	.65	5.93	1.10	-.96	.44	
	C11	.75	5.84	1.11	-.92	.64	
<i>Task return</i>							
Social status	C4	.61	4.29	1.28	-.19	-.42	.93
$\alpha = .85$ $\rho = .85$	C8	.84	3.20	1.37	.29	-.35	
	C12	.76	3.75	1.50	.18	-.54	
	C5*	.27	5.23	1.14	-.44	.03	

	C9	.76	3.69	1.28	-.03	-.22	
	C13	.72	3.44	1.33	.19	-.19	
Salary	C1	.93	3.66	1.31	-.14	-.40	.96
$\alpha = .92$ $\rho = .92$	C3	.92	3.58	1.27	-.17	-.17	
<hr/> <i>Satisfaction with choice</i> <hr/>							
$\alpha = .85$ $\rho = .85$	D1	.67	5.44	1.37	-.67	.62	.96
	D3	.89	5.57	1.15	-.73	.16	
	D5	.90	5.66	1.16	-.61	-.06	

Note. SD=Standard deviation. FDS= Factor determinacy score. α = Cronbach's alpha. ρ = Scale reliability coefficient. * = Excluded items.

Table 2

Correlations of Latent Variables

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1 Ability																			
2 Intrinsic value	.78*																		
3 Job security	.13*	.09																	
4 Job transferability	.09	-.03	.57*																
5 Time for family	.09	-.004	.49*	.46*															
6 Bludging	.07	-.10	.37*	.56*	.66*														
7 Shape future of children/adolescents	.37*	.34*	.31*	.21*	.27*	-.07													
8 Enhance social equity	.25*	.20*	.28*	.24*	.24*	-.03	.75*												
9 Make social contribution	.35*	.34*	.32*	.22*	.28*	-.01	.77*	.67*											
10 Work with children and adolescents	.30*	.36*	.29*	.09	.27*	-.10	.72*	.57*	.51*										
11 Fallback career	-.32*	-.38*	.10	.22*	.08	.45*	-.30*	-.15*	-.20	-.32									
12 Prior teaching and learning experiences	.21*	.20*	.27*	.20*	.21*	.03	.37*	.28*	.39*	.31*	-.16								
13 Social influences	.28*	.16*	.29*	.37*	.29*	.35*	.16*	.16*	.18*	.21*	.21*	.23*							
14 Social dissuasion	.11*	.11*	.09	.21*	.11*	.16*	.11*	.07	.11*	.004	.26*	.15*	.16*						
15 Expert career	.21*	.23*	.30*	.02	.12*	-.22*	.32*	.28*	.39*	.32*	-.27*	.20*	.05	.11*					
16 High demand	.09	.11	.11*	.01	.08	-.27*	.31*	.28*	.30*	.25*	-.13*	.19*	-.09	.04	.52*				
17 Social status	.01	.03	.26*	.18*	.19*	.09	.17*	.22*	.22*	.25*	-.10	.15*	.19*	-.11*	.24*	-.03			
18 Salary	-.02	.03	.34*	.21*	.16*	.13*	.06	.14*	.08	.05	-.02	.06	.18*	-.11*	.10	-.09	.45*		
19 Satisfaction with choice	.47*	.55*	.18*	-.02	.11*	-.27*	.54*	.37*	.45*	.54*	-.65*	.29*	.10*	-.04	.41*	.23*	.27*	.17*	
<i>M</i>	5.48	5.86	5.18	3.97	3.80	3.36	5.60	4.65	5.42	4.94	2.62	5.14	3.17	3.90	5.62	5.76	3.69	3.60	5.55
<i>SD</i>	0.98	1.06	1.33	1.53	1.63	1.38	1.13	1.48	1.24	1.42	1.26	1.33	1.48	1.42	0.90	0.86	1.07	1.24	1.23

Note. * $p < .05$

Appendix A

Norwegian Translated Scales and Items for the Factors Influencing Teaching Choice Scale

Factor	Item#	Original English	Norwegian
MOTIVATON		<i>I chose to become a teacher because...</i> <i>1 (not at all important) – 7 (extremely important)</i>	<i>Jeg valgte å bli lærer fordi...</i> <i>1 (ikke viktig i det hele tatt) – 7 (svært viktig)</i>
<i>Self-perception</i>			
Perceived teaching ability	B5	I have the qualities of a good teacher	Jeg har egenskapene til en god lærer
	B19	I have good teaching skills	Jeg er god til å undervise
	B43	Teaching is a career suited to my abilities	Å være lærer er et yrke som passer mine evner
<i>Intrinsic value</i>			
	B1	I am interested in teaching	Jeg er interessert i å undervise
	B7	I have always wanted to be a teacher	Jeg har alltid ønsket å bli lærer
	B12	I like teaching	Jeg liker å undervise
<i>Personal utility value</i>			
Job security	B14	Teaching will offer a steady career path	Læreryrket tilbyr en stabil karrierevei
	B27	Teaching will provide a reliable income	Læreryrket vil gi en sikker inntekt
	B38	Teaching will be a secure job	Læreryrket vil være en sikker jobb
Job transferability	B8	Teaching will be a useful job for me to have when travelling	Læreryrket vil være en nyttig jobb for meg hvis jeg ønsker å flytte
	B22	A teaching qualification is recognised everywhere	Lærerutdanning anerkjennes overalt
	B45	A teaching job will allow me to choose where I wish to live	En jobb som lærer vil gi meg mulighet til å velge hvor jeg ønsker å bo
Time for family	B2	Part-time teaching could allow more family time	Å jobbe deltid som lærer kan gi mer tid til familien
	B16	Teaching hours will fit with the responsibilities of having a family	Å jobbe som lærer lar seg kombinere med familieforpliktelser
	B29	School holidays will fit in with family commitments	Skoleferiene passer godt med familieforpliktelser
Bludging (newly distinguished from Time for family items)	B4	As a teacher I will have lengthy holidays	Som lærer vil jeg ha lange ferier
	B18	As a teacher I will have a short working day	Som lærer vil jeg ha korte arbeidsdager
<i>Social utility value</i>			
Shape future of children and adolescents	B9	Teaching will allow me to shape child and adolescent values	Å være lærer gir meg mulighet til å forme barn og unges verdier
	B23	Teaching will allow me to influence the next generation	Å være lærer gir meg mulighet til å ha innflytelse på den oppvoksende generasjonen
	B53	Teaching will allow me to have an impact on children and adolescents	Å være lærer gir meg mulighet til å ha en betydning for barn og ungdom

Enhance social equity	B36	Teaching will allow me to raise the ambitions of under-privileged youth	Å være lærer gir meg mulighet til å heve ambisjonene til barn og unge med sosiale og økonomiske vansker
	B49	Teaching will allow me to benefit the socially disadvantaged	Å være lærer gir meg mulighet til å hjelpe og støtte de som har sosiale og økonomiske vansker
	B54	Teaching will allow me to work against social disadvantage	Å være lærer gjør det mulig for meg å jobbe mot sosial urettferdighet
Make social contribution	B6	Teaching allows me to provide a service to society	Å undervise gir meg mulighet til å yte en tjeneste til samfunnet
	B20	Teacher make a worthwhile social contribution	Lærere gir et viktig samfunnsbidrag
	B31	Teaching enables me to give back to society	Å være lærer gir meg mulighet til å gi noe tilbake til samfunnet
Work with children and adolescents	B13	I want a job that involves working with children/adolescents	Jeg vil ha en jobb der jeg kan arbeide med barn og ungdom
	B26	I want to work in a child/adolescent-centered environment	Jeg vil jobbe i et barn- og ungdomsfokusert miljø
	B37	I like working with children/adolescents	Jeg liker å jobbe med barn og ungdom
	B10	I want to help children and adolescents learn	Jeg vil hjelpe barn/ungdom å lære
<hr/>			
<i>Fallback career</i>			
	B11	I was unsure of what career I wanted	Jeg var usikker på mine karrierevalg
	B48	I chose teaching as a last-resort career	Læreryrket var mitt sistevalg med hensyn til karriere
	B35	I was not accepted into my first-choice career	Jeg fikk ikke den jobben jeg egentlig ønsket meg
<hr/>			
<i>Antecedent socialization</i>			
Prior teaching and learning experiences	B17	I have had inspirational teachers	Jeg har hatt inspirerende lærere
	B30	I have had good teachers as role-models	Jeg har hatt gode lærere som rollemodeller
	B39	I have had positive learning experiences	Jeg har hatt positive læringserfaringer
Social influences	B3	My friends think I should become a teacher	Vennene mine synes jeg burde bli lærer
	B24	My family think I should become a teacher	Familien min synes jeg burde bli lærer
	B40	People I have worked with think I should become a teacher	Mennesker jeg har jobbet med synes jeg burde bli lærer
Social dissuasion	D2	Were you encouraged to pursue careers other than teaching?	Har du blitt oppmuntret til å følge andre karriereveier enn læreryrket?
	D4	Did others tell you teaching was not a good career choice?	Har andre fortalt deg at læreryrket ikke er et godt karrierevalg?
	D6	Did others influence you to consider careers other than teaching?	Har andre påvirket deg til å vurdere andre karrierer enn læreryrket?

Factor	Item#	Original English	Norwegian
PERCEPTIONS		For each question below, please rate the extent to which YOU agree it is true about teaching. 1(not at all) – 7 (extremely)	Vennligst kryss av hvor enig eller uenig DU er i følgende spørsmål om undervisning. 1(absolutt ikke enig) – 7 (svært enig)
<i>Task demand</i>			
Expert career	C6	Do you think teaching is a highly skilled occupation?	Mener du at læreryrket er et høyt kvalifisert yrke?
	C10	Do you think teaching requires high levels of expert knowledge?	Tror du at læreryrket krever høy grad av ekspertkunnskap?
	14	Do you think teachers need high levels of technical knowledge?	Mener du at undervisning krever høy grad av (undervisnings-)metodisk kunnskap?
	C15	Do you think teachers need highly specialized knowledge?	Mener du at lærere trenger høy grad av spesialisert kunnskap?
High demand	C2	Do you think teachers have a heavy workload?	Mener du at lærere har stor arbeidsbelastning?
	C7	Do you think teaching is emotionally demanding?	Mener du at undervisning er følelsesmessig krevende?
	C11	Do you think teaching is hard work?	Mener du at undervisning er hardt arbeid?
<i>Task return</i>			
Social status	C4	Do you believe teachers are perceived as professionals?	Mener du at lærere oppfattes som profesjonelle fagfolk?
	C8	Do you believe teaching is perceived as a high status occupation?	Mener du at læreryrket oppfattes som et høystatusyrke?
	C12	Do you believe teaching is a well-respected career?	Mener du at læreryrket er en høyt respektert karriere?
	C5	Do you think teachers have high morale?	Mener du at lærere har høy arbeidsmoral?
	C9	Do you think teachers feels valued by society?	Tror du at lærere føler seg verdsatt av samfunnet?
	C13	Do you think teachers feel their occupation has high social status?	Tror du de fleste lærere føler at læreryrket har høy sosial status?
Salary	C1	Do you think teaching is well paid?	Mener du at læreryrket er godt betalt?
	C3	Do you think teachers earn a good salary?	Mener du at lærere tjener godt?
<i>Satisfaction with choice</i>			
	D1	How carefully have you thought about becoming a teacher?	Hvor nøye har du tenkt igjennom det å bli lærer?
	D3	How satisfied are you with your choice of becoming a teacher?	Hvor tilfreds er du med ditt valg om å bli lærer?
	D5	How happy are you with your decision of becoming a teacher?	Hvor glad er du for ditt valg om å bli lærer?

Note. Mistranslations for items B22 and C5: Suggested new translations: B22:“Lærerutdanning er anvendelig overalt”. C5: “Mener du at lærere som gruppe har entusiasme og pågangsmot?” Excluded items: B7 and B13.