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Over the past decade teacher education has attracted considerable attention. In England and Wales, new conceptions of where, how, by whom, and for what teachers should be trained have brought about a dramatic transformation of initial teacher education. Government intervention in this first phase of professional preparation, enhancing both the role of school-based teacher educators, and its own control over the process, was recently extended to the next phase of professional development with the (re)introduction of a statutory induction period, and regulations providing for both the support and assessment of teachers in their first year. The 1998 Green Paper proposals for a new ‘performance threshold’, along with the introduction of the Advanced Skills Teacher grade and a fast track scheme for serving as well as trainee teachers, make it clear that the continuing professional development of established practitioners is also undergoing significant change, stimulated by new initiatives intended both to support and direct the process.

For all those concerned with teacher education, these changes represent valuable opportunities. The new commitment to professional development that they imply, the demand for high standards that they entail, and the engagement of schools on a much wider scale than ever before, prompt us to question traditional assumptions and practices. Recognizing the central function of schools as places of teaching and learning – for the adults working within them as well as their pupils – they offer the prospect of real improvement across all phases of teachers’ professional education.

For this prospect to be realized, however, it is essential that the new practices and the assumptions which underpin them are subjected to serious critical scrutiny. The books in this series are all intended to help those involved in teacher education take just this kind of critical perspective. Based on research evidence they explore the ways in which teachers and
those working with them can most effectively and realistically bring about high quality professional development, setting out and defending what they consider to be valuable, with careful regard for what is actually possible. Les Tickle is extremely well placed to do this in relation to induction. His own understanding of professional development is rooted in long experience as a teacher educator, concerned particularly with induction but also involved in innovative programmes to support the learning of teachers beyond the first year in practice. His insights are informed not only by his own research work, but by extensive and authoritative reviews of the literature. They are further illuminated by international collaboration and a rich dialogue with colleagues abroad.

It is obviously a particularly opportune moment to be asking what the way ahead for teacher induction should be. Schools, with a new confidence and expertise in teacher education, gained from their involvement as full partners in initial training, are now being required to pay serious attention to the continuing professional development of newly qualified teachers. In the context of these new statutory requirements, Tickle’s warm support for policies that pay serious attention to the induction process is suffused with concern for a more humanist perspective – a perspective that risks being lost in a narrow focus on management issues.

Central to the induction process, Tickle argues, is a dynamic and creative individual. Whilst that individual has much to learn, he or she also has a great deal to offer. An exclusive focus on externally defined competencies yet to be acquired, is not only likely to be counter-productive in its neglect of the learner’s role in the active creation of professional knowledge. It also risks wasting the resources each individual brings to the complex, demanding and evolving practice of teaching. Recognition of the professional commitment, creative potential and intellectual capabilities of new entrants will not only help to establish the foundation for their own continued professional learning, but also harness valuable resources in the ongoing transformation of education.

This book is not a simple instruction manual. Although it has many valuable practical suggestions for those involved in implementing the new induction arrangements, it is also a call for serious reflection on the nature of professional education. It is a book for anyone interested in debate about the kind of teaching profession we want and how we attract and retain true professionals within it. The questions it raises and the insights it offers are of profound importance to all those concerned that the welcome provided for new teachers will equip them not merely to function effectively within existing educational systems, but to question, challenge and renew them.

Dr Hazel R. Hagger
When I was asked by Hazel Hagger and Donald McIntyre to contribute this book to the Open University Press Series Developing Teacher Education I did not hesitate to accept. At the time (the mid-1990s) I saw it as an opportunity to extend my work in support of the localized induction of newly qualified teachers, at the same time as taking my research interest in their lives and learning into new areas. By new areas I had - and continue to have - in mind an extension to the study of the complex, detailed, day-to-day, interactive experiences of young professionals, coming to terms with their chosen careers, and learning in the process. That perspective, primarily, reflects my humanistic interests in education as a potentially empowering activity, as well as my criticisms of schooling as an oft-times debilitating system which has within it the capacity to perpetuate educational deprivation, for both pupils and teachers. The tension between these two notions has autobiographical origins, as well as observational ones.

As happens sometimes in the sweep of history, my intentions were ambushed by events of global as well as more parochial dimensions. While my concerns to understand the scope and pursuit of individual agency in the self-construction of the new teacher as a ‘learning professional’ remain, national policy for teacher induction in England has twisted and turned rather dramatically in the period since I agreed to this project. In line with the general buffeting of the profession and its members, from pre-service to pre-retirement, those events in policy were part of both the confusion of a previous Conservative government, and the ‘Education. Education. Education’ sloganism of its New Labour substitute from 1997.

During the late 1990s we have witnessed in education maybe more than ever before that, just as parish boundaries are permeable and parishioners reactive to wider events, so are national boundaries and governments when
it comes to education policy. Among those wider events has been a surge of activity in many countries to improve teaching standards; to find the secrets of teacher effectiveness; to promote the quality of schooling. This is not, I hasten to say, a collaborative international venture among policy makers. Quite the opposite – it is driven by economic competition, aimed at getting or maintaining national prosperity and the economic upper hand which is supposed to derive from the education of our citizens.

Curiously (and for me fortunately) while academic and professional communities have been driven crazily in the direction of school standards by national policy bodies within our own countries, we seem to have been encouraged to engage willingly and openly in forms of 'educational espionage' with representatives from other nations. Researchers and educational practitioners are pressed, for funding reasons as well as intellectual ones, to adopt international perspectives in the pursuit of the betterment of educational understanding and education practice. This is not new, but with regard to teacher development and school quality it has taken a recent surge, teacher induction included. So, since accepting the invitation to create this book, I have found myself in the US, Australia, Israel, South Korea, Namibia, Ireland, Hong Kong, Slovenia . . . giving and gaining ideas on teacher induction and teaching quality with people from these and many other places.

The events and opportunities have combined to widen the perspective I have adopted here in ways which place the complex experiences of the lives and learning of newly qualified professionals in a much bigger picture. The details of some of those individual experiences were published in 1994 in my book *The Induction of New Teachers* (Cassell). There are other studies which enabled that book, and this, to represent those experiences in ways which I believe will have resonance and meaning for individual new teachers about to enter the profession. By presenting the broader picture in this new work I hope I will help them and their supporting colleagues, worldwide, to imagine the scope and scale of what they can bring to education and humanity, and the size of their newfound professional responsibilities. In some places, including the policy making corridors of England, there appears to be a serious lack of imagination, as teachers are regarded like some teachers regard their pupils – blamed, shamed, and treated with indignity. The challenge to change this point of view, to recreate the way ahead for professional induction, belongs to the educational communities of the world, led by new teachers themselves. Yet there is a distinctive problem with the collective point of view and the fact that the blame and shame mentality is perpetrated upon the induction process in an individualistic way. It is the individual new teacher who is assessed, held accountable, has a contract renewed (or not), feels inadequate and/or guilty, is driven by personal ambition, and so on. In the face of a culture of individualism I have knowingly tried to incorporate the personal responsibilities of the new teacher into a picture of the collective responsibilities which surround her or him.
The bridge of desire

There is a widely held view that a continuum, or bridge, is necessary in the professional development of teachers, linking initial training, entry into full-time teaching, and subsequent longer-term learning. The central span of that bridge is usually referred to as the period of induction – the first year of employment as a teacher. However, although I will to some extent follow this analogy, I will also argue that the bridge might not be a helpful metaphor. It presumes too much about the need for, or the possibility of achieving, a safe and smooth crossing from studentship, through novicehood, into experience, expertise and excellence as a teacher. I will urge that we should not think of induction simply as if novices are to be socialized into some well formulated and accepted practices which exist on the other side. That idea is partly applicable in areas of education with demonstrable success, but it is especially misleading given that there appear to be many unresolved problems within the education service. These include the difficulty of defining ‘good teaching’ or effectiveness (Hamacheck 1999), which is connected with the more fundamental difficulty of agreeing what schools are for, what curriculum should be followed, and what forms of education are most appropriate for a new age (Barber 1997; Elliott 1998). In short, it is not clear what this bridge is supposed to lead to, or that we should regard those on the other side of it as having secured clear conceptions of education’s future and the most desirable professional practices. It is also likely that issues as yet unforeseen will emerge within the career span of new entrants to teaching, setting challenges for which the professional landscape of today’s, and tomorrow’s, practices will need to be exchanged for novel and imaginative educational visions. So I will make the case that this image of professional
growth and development is not entirely appropriate, given the problematic and changing nature, and dynamic contexts, of professional practice which induction might help teachers to enter.

Instead, I will present the view that the factually accurate but conceptually limiting terms 'beginning teachers' or NQTs (newly qualified teachers) are symptomatic of a tendency to think solely in terms of the deficiencies of novices compared to so-called master practitioners. This tendency leads to missed opportunities to capitalize on the creative potential and professional commitments of graduate entrants to the education service. I want to suggest, therefore, that we should see new teachers as an enviable resource of intellectual capability, able to significantly help to transform education and to meet its unforeseen challenges. If that image is adopted, then we can see induction as a process in which the capital already vested in new entrants by the time they become teachers can be extended by way of systematic and sensitive provision for their further professional development, in accord with the need for transformative and dynamic dispositions towards educating which they will need to share with more seasoned colleagues.

Induction can be seen as an educational opportunity which previous generations in the service have failed to grasp. In that sense, it is itself one of education's many unresolved problems. There is certainly plenty of evidence that throughout the twentieth century, despite persistent (but spasmodic) attention, satisfactory opportunities for new teachers to utilize their expertise, and provision for their professional development in the first year of teaching, have remained very elusive (Hall 1982; Doyle 1985; Griffin 1985). This is surprising given that the experience of induction has been a recurrent and common theme in the profession (McNair Report 1944; Ryan 1970; James Report 1972; Bolam 1973; Evans 1978; Earley 1992; GTC 1992). It has also been the focus of numerous reports by government agencies in Britain confirming that it is a subject of interest in the central administration. Yet these very reports show it to be underdeveloped at all levels in the system (DES 1968; 1976; 1982; 1988a; 1990; 1992b; 1992c; Ofsted 1993; DfEE 1997; TTA 1998a).

In the face of research evidence and seeming failure in policy implementation, the debate has intensified about what is expected from teachers in general and hence from teacher induction and new teachers. The intensification has been on a global scale. New forms of school-based teacher preparation have been attempted, and the expectations relating to further professional development have increased, as reforms require older teachers to engage with new issues and adopt new practices – to cope with what Smyth and Shacklock (1998: 21) describe as the ‘daily exposure to educational aerosol words’. Notions of continuing learning by teachers are now widely espoused. The global intensification of expectations has presented a new surprise. At the end of the second Christian millennium education authorities across the world, from Switzerland to Thailand, Australia to Canada, the United Kingdom to China, the United States of America to Japan, have discovered that they have not adequately identified and articulated what it is that they
expect teachers to know and be able to do, or to be and to become. In an exaggerated way, and in a lighthearted context within a conference in Israel, I suggested recently that the constant renewals of education policy were intended to ensure that teachers should never know who they are supposed to be tomorrow! It is difficult enough to discover what they are supposed to do today. The sudden surge in the search for professional standards, joined by governments, academics, professional associations, and administrators, demonstrates a considerable gap in the conceptualizations of teaching and teaching knowledge. In a frenzy of activity, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 1994) surveyed work on the definitions of quality teaching in 11 countries; administrators in Ontario scanned the Internet to discover what was happening in Norway and elsewhere (Marrin 1999); ministerial staff in New South Wales searched other parts of the Australian Federation (NSWDET 1998a); the USA established a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS 1989); and the Teacher Training Agency in England created its own national Career Entry Profile (TTA 1997). These events are mirrored across nations.

So the surprise is twofold. There is uncertainty about what should be done in the way of support programmes to maximize the further professional development of new teachers; and there is uncertainty about where and in what precisely to invest in their lives and work, or what returns the investors expect from those in whom they entrust education’s future. In that context it should not be surprising if teachers, especially those who are new to the profession or aspire to join it, find themselves unclear or even confused about how they are to become best equipped to serve their pupils. It is within that context that this book provides arguments for a reconceptualization of induction, makes the case for further investment in opportunities for the professional development of new teachers across the world, and presents principles and practical proposals for induction provision. The ideas and proposals result partly from studies of policy and partly from practical projects which have attempted to reconcile the needs of new teachers as learners with their potential as qualified, professional, full-time educators. I have given detailed consideration to scholarship on the nature of teachers’ professional knowledge and learning on the grounds that the messiness of professional expertise and its acquisition needs to be understood, rather than ignored in simplistic portrayals of teaching. That search for understanding is set within the broader landscape of social change which is affecting teachers and their work.

As a result of research and practice in supporting new teachers’ learning, I am convinced that professional induction raises such complex issues that simple solutions should not be anticipated. Nor, for that matter, should we expect to easily understand the phenomenon in the first place. In fact recent years have shown up the complexities of both initial teacher education and continuing professional development, as these have been subject to political and economic buffeting, and the topic of academic research and scholarly debate (see other books in this series). Precisely because induction comes
between the two it combines these complexities, and adds other factors associated with the rapid adjustments required for a life in schools. So, while providing principles and practical proposals in the book, I have also tried to maintain a view which acknowledges that induction is problematic, conceptually as well as practically. In that respect, the book represents aspects of induction ‘as it is’, maintaining a sense of realism by portraying the experiences of teachers, as well as representing that messiness of policy and research. Alongside the realism, which also sees the education services in western developed nations as seriously flawed and in need of change, the proposals are nevertheless tinged with an idealism which sees new teachers as major contributors to the educational experiences of pupils, and as a potential force for change – in their own induction and in the services they provide to pupils and their communities. It proposes ways to move forward, towards a professional conceptualization of induction, as part of educational practices based on learning institutions and communities of enquiry.

That induction is an unsolved problem can easily be detected from recent policies relating to teachers’ professional development. There are many acknowledgements that initial training for teaching (where it exists) is not on its own an adequate form of preparation for the education service. In England that was reasserted succinctly in 1997 in a way which also recognized that initial training plus induction were not enough:

- every teacher should have structured support during the first year of full-time teaching. This should build on their initial training, where strengths and development needs will have been identified, and set the pace and direction of future professional development.

(DfEE 1997: para. 14)

The ministerial case made here adds to a long list of implied promises which have been recorded at least since 1925 (see Tickle 1994: 1–2). Indeed, the assertion ‘We shall therefore introduce an induction year for newly qualified teachers to consolidate their skills’ (DfEE 1997: para. 14) belies the fact that an induction period has existed for several generations of teachers, in England and many other countries with developed systems of formal schooling. Restatements of unfulfilled promises provide some of the evidence that solutions have not yet been found to the long-identified need to provide effective continuation of learning in the first year of full time teaching and beyond. Such desires acknowledge that learning by experience, in isolation, after appointment to a teaching post, is both undesirable and unacceptable.

During 75 years of recorded evidence the desire to extend learning through induction support programmes has not subsided. But consistent failure on a systematic scale to find better arrangements than simply casting people into practice in the hope that practice will make them perfect has left provision mainly to chance, or to the insight of enthusiastic individuals in some schools and some local education authorities. Small bridges of desire have been built and rebuilt in the landscape of education by the imagination and
skill of those individuals. So the primary question which still needs putting
to people at all points of responsibility in relation to the employment and
education of new teachers is: what are the best ideas about teachers’ learning
that can be brought to the first period of in-service experience? The second
questions is how can teacher education at this career stage be designed,
constructed and utilized to best advantage?

Those are not new questions. They were asked in significant ways during
the emergence of teacher education in the nineteenth century and by many
others later (Rich 1933; McNair Report 1944; James Report 1972; Bolam
1973; Dent 1977; Tickle 1994). However, they remain unanswered in any
satisfactory way and are central to the broader questions that this book
considers. It does so based on a search for a better appreciation of the nature
of the problem than was available when I began to consider similar ques-
tions in the late 1980s. At that point research on what and how teachers
learn from their classroom experience at this particular career phase was an
emergent rather than established field of study. It remains so today. That
means that these are research questions – questions that can be shared by all
those concerned with induction – which in turn means adopting a research
disposition towards the matter, rather than expecting immediate recipes for
solving its problems. The way ahead is, in that sense, a communal and ex-
ploratory one, but it is one in which the development of understanding and
a range of immediate actions can be achieved.

What clearly remains in the surge of accountability measures is the ten-
sion between teachers needing to learn more and become better at what
they do, while being expected to perform to the highest standards possible.
This inherent contradiction can be confronted very simply. As Agne (1999)
puts it, we are all perfectly imperfect. If there is a reasonable tendency to
think that new teachers are less perfect than others, McLean (1999: 56)
provides a worthwhile message when she acknowledges the different know-
ledge bases which are held by beginning teachers and teacher educators:

classifying those differences as deficits in the beginning teacher
is now considered useless at best, and at worst, as perpetuating the
powerlessness of beginning teachers in the process of their own profes-
sional development . . . [all] parties [in education] are engaged in work
characterized by conflicts between personal commitments and public
demands; trying to enact change within the problematic entrenchment
of institutional culture, [all] are experiencing personal uncertainties and
professional dilemmas.

For both new and experienced teachers, where there is room for learning
and improvement in practical performance, there is obviously a deficit in
one sense, but deficits are open spaces for learning, a precondition of educa-
tion and a foundation for optimism to flourish, and for the celebration of
becoming better educated. That depends on the perceived level of deficiency
of course, and the capacity to carry out responsibilities towards others in
an ethical profession. Where newly qualified teachers are concerned, I have presumed that recommendations for provisional certification are an assurance that proficiency has been achieved to a level deemed appropriate for taking up those responsibilities, as a substantial foundation for further learning. Yet that presumption is set within the trap of accepting that the prevailing definitions of proficiency are sound.

I do not accept that, and will show that definitions of good teaching are socially contended, and socially constructed. I will therefore be arguing that it is not only a few individual new teachers who might be deemed to be deficient, and hence fail their induction period or leave the profession voluntarily. It is also, I will contend, that the currently dominant conceptions of teacher and of curriculum are unsatisfactory. So the focus of attention will range around the lives and qualities of new teachers and the events of communal and global change within which they seek to establish themselves as professionals. This is a complex set of relationships that has been portrayed in different forms linking individual identities, personal agency, and social structures. Smyth and Shacklock (1998: 5) portray the ‘accommodation’ as a contrast between compliance with and dependence upon managers, and active contributions to educational processes:

Whereas, in the first case, teachers are inducted into and inculcated with an externally defined agenda, in the latter, they actively question the circumstances making them the way they are, and in the process construct an alternative agenda that is more informed by the internal workings of teaching, learning, curriculum and pedagogy.

There are numerous case-study reports of survivalism as a feature of the experiences of inductees, advice on how to survive, and descriptions of attempts to establish programmes of support. These perspectives underrepresent the positive aspects of induction: having a job, the exhilaration in working with children and young adults, carrying major ethical and educational responsibilities for large numbers of people, regenerating enthusiasm in the profession, learning new skills at a rapid pace, and so on. Reports of the experiences of young teachers certainly serve to confirm that the year of entry into full-time teaching is a challenge that faces the newly qualified, their colleagues, school managers, teacher educators, inspectorates, professional associations, and ministries. It remains a collective professional issue, or as I would prefer it, an opportunity for the taking. The reasons why induction remains a persistent problem, and why the provision of a satisfactory professional development curriculum for it remains elusive, are several.

Difficult crossing

First, induction is in the most simple sense a process of becoming a teacher in a system of mass schooling, which is increasingly buffeted by structural
economic, technological, political, and social changes, resulting commonly in contradictory pressures and increased role expectations. Exposure to scrutiny of performance in traditional practices in which some people are deemed to have failed, or in new measures which have yet to be tried and tested, leaves new teachers vulnerable in their work.

Second, from these tensions arises a central paradox faced by new professionals – of being inducted into old practices, traditions, and circumstances, in which behaviours are prescribed and performances assessed, while expecting and being expected to participate as reformers in search of solutions to endemic educational problems.

Third, such problems are both deep and widespread, and attention to them has a tendency to cloud the successes and celebrations which professional educators might themselves claim. They include curriculum disaffection among students; truancy; overloaded and fragmented use of curriculum time; social disadvantages of significant sections of the community; irrelevant and redundant curriculum goals and content; the educational and social divisiveness of assessment and qualifications; financial disinvestment in education; shortage of vision among policy makers; injustices related to race, gender, and social class; difficulties in defining effective teaching and improving teaching quality; the need to maintain educational idealism and morale in the face of the allocation of blame on teachers; keeping pace with communications technology; overcoming bad management; coping with poor forms of teacher education; handling the spoil-heaps of educational research; the failure sometimes to recognize that education involves discord, argumentation, and curiosity; and so on.

Fourth, from the perspective of new teachers, induction is a local and personal problem of school-based acculturation and assessment of performance, combined with the infusion of new blood capable of bringing about change. That is, it means being assimilated into the existing conditions and milieux of schools, which might clash with their identities, ideals and ambitions as members of the new graduate force in education. At their best, energized with desires for educational advancement and social imagination, while faced with the intellectual poverty of schooling, this is inevitably a period of negotiation and adjustment.

Fifth, from a quite different angle, of induction as planned provision for supporting further investment in the learning of new teachers, there is the logistical difficulty of tracking tens of thousands of newly qualified graduates as they move from different pre-service programmes into diverse locations of employment. In England alone in the 1990s, many thousands of new entrants in a year moved from a hundred or more initial teacher education institutions to jobs in many different types of schools, scattered among diverse local education authorities. It is estimated that two million new teachers will enter the profession in the USA between 1998 and 2008. China (excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan) has over 700,000 schools, 200 million students, and over 10 million teachers (Lo 1999). As Lo (1999: 8) aptly puts it:
given its gigantic size and the huge number of stakeholders involved, the school system in the Chinese Mainland can only be understood in terms of diversity and disparity. Getting students into school and making sure they stay there is a Herculean task. Similarly, recruiting people with appropriate qualifications to teach and helping them to develop a career in teaching present a tremendous challenge.

In order to achieve some kind of continuity of curriculum experience or some common provision of support, this situation would require many links. If the goal of those responsible for induction is to provide coordinated and systematic support to ensure progression in learning for newly qualified teachers, logistics provide a major problem.

Sixth, these logistics are compounded by frequent fluctuations in the supply of and demand for the intellectual capital of our graduate population and qualified teachers. Recruitment and retention rates, in times of both over- and undersupply, affect levels of interest in and attitudes towards what needs to be done for new teachers’ learning. This is also affected when teachers are regarded as a social commodity in the labour market, and when the main concern of employers is the assessment of minimum levels of competence.

Seventh, for employers, school managers, and teacher colleagues who do take a serious interest, the local problem is one of knowing the detail of an individual new teacher’s knowledge, experience, capabilities, and fit for a particular job. Thereafter the task for the individual new teacher and his or her professional tutor is to know what major contributions can already be made to a department or school, and what knowledge, experience and capabilities need to be developed.

Eighth, those who provide support are not just professional tutors and managers in schools. The task also falls to people in local education authorities, higher education, and policy making and funding bodies. At the systems level, the existence of disparate players creates its own problems – a sort of systemic anarchy in which these discrete agencies each works on its own interpretations of its role, based on their own conceptions of the needs of new teachers, and within their own funding possibilities and restrictions.

Ninth, it is also complex because the contexts of individual teachers’ work, the range of responsibilities they hold, and their own educational backgrounds and personal dispositions, are very varied. Recent attempts to achieve common standards among teachers could be interpreted as calls for standardization, which is both inherently anti-educational and practically impossible to achieve. Perhaps we should celebrate that, inevitably, there will remain a need to take account of individuality, diversity and difference among new teachers.

Finally, the identification of teaching standards that is happening across the globe is evidence of the most endemic problem of induction. There has been a failure to comprehensively identify the nature of professional
knowledge, of what new teachers should know and be able to do, or what kinds of persons they should be or be willing to become. A failure to manage the changes in responsibilities that teachers have, in such a way that new entrants can reasonably make sense of what they must learn and do, has added to that problem. Both identifying and managing teaching standards are essential in working out what it is that teachers are to be inducted in to, and how it is to be achieved. The Teacher Training Agency’s work illustrates the problem of both the difficulty in agreeing on standards, and the implied regression to minimum standardization in aspects of knowledge and classroom instruction:

The standards set out in this document replace the more general ‘competences’ set out in DfE Circulars 9/92 and 14/93 and DfEE Teacher Training Circular Letter 1/96 (DfE 1992b; 1993; DfEE 1996). The standards apply to all trainees seeking Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and who are to be assessed for QTS from May 1998. Successful completion by a trainee of a course or programme of ITT (Initial Teacher Training), including employment-based provision, must require them to achieve all the QTS standards, and courses must involve the assessment of all trainees against all the standards specified for the award of Qualified Teacher Status. ... The standards have been written to be specific, explicit and assessable, and are designed to provide a clear basis for the reliable and consistent award of Qualified Teacher Status, regardless of the training route or type of training leading to QTS.

(TTA 1997: 1)

As I have already indicated, this is by no means the only example of the attempts to make explicit what the nature of professional knowledge is, and what new teachers might reasonably be expected to do. A survey by the New South Wales Department of Education and Training of similar work in many countries, much of which focuses on the beginning teacher as the key point for establishing what constitutes satisfactory standards in teaching, shows clearly that this is an international quandary (NSWDET 1998a).

These conceptual difficulties and logistical problems suggest that any programme of learning may well be, in part at least, in the hands of the individual teacher to define in the absence of support. Indeed, even the Career Entry Profile (TTA 1997; 1999a) which claims to identify essential competencies, presumes procedures for its use in which it is the inductee who will carry a record of their experience and capabilities forward, in the hope of continuity and systematic extension of learning. It certainly seems likely that she or he will be the one with the fullest sense of what has been achieved, the greatest capacity for determining learning needs, and possibly the best placed to decide how to meet them. However, identifying individual new teachers as the locus of professional development decisions is an insufficient answer, especially if the criteria are constrained by a narrow definition of
professional skills. Successful individual profiling would presume that each teacher has:
• knowledge of professional practice in its fullest sense;
• the capability to assess needs and anticipate future responsibilities;
• awareness of opportunities for supporting professional learning and improving practice;
• the skills, time and resources to negotiate access to those opportunities.

It is almost certainly more realistic to recognize that appreciation of existing expertise and capability, as well as professional development needs and opportunities, will be greater if it is a shared venture, a matter for discussion and negotiation between new teachers and supportive colleagues, managers, and in-service educators. It is also important to assume that this will be a chancy and dynamic process, in which expertise might not be acknowledged, goals may shift, outcomes may be unpredictable or inconsistent, and chances for learning might not occur at the most fortuitous times. These are not the characteristics for which systematic induction of a programmed kind, towards standardization, easily allows. What’s more, the environments of induction both reflect and imply an inevitability about the intensity, uncertainty, and individuality of the first year of experience in particular, as a reflection of the volatile nature of events in professional practice in general.

To maintain a sense of the inevitable uncertainties of those environments does not mean abandoning inductees to the turmoil of the storm. That is how it appears in the survivalist reports of new teachers’ lives (and more recently in all teachers’ lives), but it does not need to be like that. Rather, for new teachers themselves and their supportive colleagues, anticipating the conditions can be done in a way that can help to manage both the circumstances and the experiences of teaching and learning to teach. By circumstances I mean all dimensions of it: the personal and domestic; classroom, school and locality; the profession; and the broader context of education within its own space of social, economic and political conditions.

Since the experience of circumstances is individualized, one might very helpfully ask:
• what are the possible circumstances in which a new teacher can find him or herself?
• what are the possible states of mind and learning that she or he might experience?

Awareness of those questions provides a powerful stimulus to look for evidence; to understand what the actual circumstances are; to define what are ideal circumstances and states of mind; and to manage events and professional actions in such a way as to meet those ideals as far as it is possible. They are questions that can be asked by all contributors to induction experience, including new teachers themselves. In short, they imply and even demand that a research stance should be adopted, collectively, by all those involved.
Abandoning continuity

So is it reasonable to think of the shift from pre-service training to the induction period and beyond as a continuum, when it is likely that the demands of a new teaching job and the knowledge and capabilities it requires will at best bear only partial relationship to the experiences gained for qualified teacher status? We should not, I believe, simply assume that continuity is achievable in some smooth, transitional sense, regulated by the so-called standards of a career-entry profile. Rather we might be prepared for discontinuities; for new and radically different experiences; for turbulence both between and within the pre-service, induction, and in-service periods of professional education. We might even acknowledge and learn from the fact that in some aspects of social life in some communities, initiation processes—rites of passage—are intended to disrupt, disturb, and radically change the outlooks, commitments, and even identities of initiates.

If that’s too radical, perhaps we should at least recognize the view that ‘crossing the ocean of existence...from the near shore which is fraught with dangers to the further shore which is safe’ (Gethin 1998: 64) is both a desire and an illusion in a world where everything we experience is unstable and changing; and where experiences are gained through minds which are themselves ‘fundamentally unclear, unsettled and confused’ (Gethin 1998: 73). Rupert Gethin’s words stem from a Buddhist tradition of many millennia, considering human experience in general, but they are mirrored by the International Study Association on Teachers and Teaching (ISATT), in its comment on recent influences in education, pointing out that:

Pace of change, globalisation, market forces ideology, to mention but a few, have contributed to a ‘manufactured uncertainty’. In this climate of unprecedented volatility, educators are challenged...to participate more actively in shaping educational theory and practice.

(ISATT 1998: 1)

Similar perspectives on the dynamic of social life in general and education in particular (and on the grasping for order in the face it) have been represented recently as a feature of education in postmodern society. The search for stability in the face of turmoil, for security in knowing rather than satisfaction in speculating, for orthodoxy instead of creativity, is also a characteristic that Sanger and Tickle (1987) observed in the learning experiences of student teachers. What we saw as a matrix of certainty and uncertainty in student teachers’ experiences can also be seen as a major conundrum of induction. This is the challenge of achieving educational conditions and states of mind which at one and the same time can handle and even create change, avoiding tendencies to become rigid and routinized in conventional and unquestioned practices, yet without being destabilized or destabilizing in a debilitating way.

It is difficult to imagine how that might be achieved, given the wider context of education. In much of the educational literature the picture is one of
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what Smyth and Shacklock (1998: 11) describe as ‘dramatic, profound and far reaching changes . . . impacting on teachers and their work.’ Describing the processes of economic globalization, international competitiveness, and national disintegrations, they detect moves within education towards annexing the curriculum to industry; the subjugation of teachers; the ‘commodification’ of learning; the routinization of teaching; more and more sophisticated surveillance; greater prescriptiveness; increased managerialism; and much more. These are manifest in multiple innovations and waves of reform, with a plethora of what they call ‘official policy discourses’ – effectiveness, partnerships, collegiality, international best practice, accountability, appraisal, competence, parental charters, league tables, strategies, standards, benchmarking, and much else (Smyth and Shacklock 1998: 35). Teachers are increasingly the subject of blame for perceived failings in society. Yet at the core of the job, it remains complex to the point of being undoable (Tickle 1987a). Citing Connell (1989) they dissect a simple piece of classroom instruction to reveal a complex inter-dependency of tasks: . . . preparing the lesson . . . getting the class settled and willing to listen . . . supervising exercises and correcting them; keeping order; dealing with conflicts between children; having a joke with them from time to time and building up some personal contact; discussing work with them individually; planning lesson sequences; preparing handouts and physical materials; collecting, using and storing books and audio-visual aids; organising and marking tests and exams; keeping records; liaising with other teachers; and so on.

(Smyth and Sharrock 1998: 25)

Continuing with Connell’s dissection, they move outside the classroom into the realms of playground supervision, arranging excursions and events, staff meetings, extraclassroom activities, counselling, liaising with other agencies, updating curricula and resources, attending courses, writing reports, and the rest. There is nothing new in this list of duties, of course. I use it simply as a reminder that the job of teaching has its own internal dynamic, which can become a maelstrom of events and interpersonal encounters within any one day. The turbulence is both within the mind, the immediate circumstance, and the wider context of the new teacher’s experience.

Even without this turbulent perspective the notion that learning should be extended from the pre-service period in a sequential or continuous direction may be misconceived or overidealized. Rarely is there a direct logistical link between training and employment – from school practice placement to a job in the same school. Even in that circumstance, judging precisely what learning is necessary for an individual new teacher, or which aspects should have priority, are likely to differ among people they encounter. Or maybe the needs just cannot always be predicted. Commonly, new teachers learn from their contemporaries that what is needed for one particular job differs in some ways from other jobs in other schools or localities. They also report, as do their support tutors, the common wisdom that what is needed by one
person differs from the needs of another. And they report being taken by surprise – ambushed even – by situations in which they feel inadequately prepared for judicious action.

So an agreed, standardized curriculum to be followed by all new teachers seems to be a kind of holy grail of policy makers. It might be achievable to some extent if it is based on certain kinds of generic qualities and capabilities which are core to all educational practice. The core might well include subject knowledge, pedagogical skills, curriculum understanding, and professional values (NSWDET 1998a). It might also include the capacity of professionals to manage changes in their circumstances and curriculum responsibilities, or to initiate change in their practices. I wonder, will it also include the ability to lead the planning and conduct of their own and their colleagues’ professional development, and to bring about change in educational environments? That involves a more expansive conception of professional knowledge and capability than the definition of either minimum or optimum competencies in subject knowledge, classroom management, and instructional practices to be acquired, consolidated, performed, and assessed (TTA 1998c; 1999a).

A more embracing conceptualization of induction is a celebration that the process of educating teachers involves the acquisition and use of diverse but complementary kinds of knowledge, and ways of coming to know. The explicit and the tacit, the demonstrable skill and the ineffably spiritual quality, the intellectual and the emotional, the conventional and the imaginative, are just a few images of that complementarity, of which I will say more later. This is probably the most difficult aspect of induction to be tackled because sometimes the impression is given that the knowledge and skills needed for an effective education service are well defined and measurable behaviours.

The scale of the challenge to our imaginations is represented by Elliott (1998: 2–3) in his conception of the social/educational context and ways of responding to it. In summary, his logic is:

• Advanced societies are open to continuous but unpredictable change.
• Social change has ambiguous consequences, opening opportunities for human fulfillment but increasing risk and hazards for those seeking them.
• Education must enable all pupils to become active contributors in shaping the economic and social conditions of their existence.
• Educational change requires a focus on curriculum and pedagogy, with teachers as leaders in innovations.
• Educational change depends on the reflexive and discursive consciousness of teachers.
• Different conceptions of education and curriculum presuppose different conceptions of society and the principles governing access to its ‘goods’.

In contrast, a technology of teaching is how the Teacher Training Agency, through its promotion of an ideology propounded by Professor David Reynolds, among others, portrays effective teacher behaviours. The search for an applied science of teaching is based on the premise that ‘our ignorance
in the area of teacher effectiveness is virtually total' (Reynolds 1998: 26). While Reynolds claims that a ‘codified, scientifically established body of knowledge’ needs to be developed, he also argues that it is necessary to ensure that all new teachers are inducted into ‘the technology of their profession’, through a training cycle that is sequential:

The training cycle should therefore go:
• teaching of instructional theory;
• teaching methods (that are only understandable if one can link them together theoretically);
• practice of the methods;
• re-teaching and coaching in the methods as appropriate.

(Reynolds 1998: 28)

The contradiction involved here is neat and clear. The argument is that teachers need to be given something that does not exist. If there is no adequate science, no theory, there is no training base and no promise of effective practice being transmitted. The difficulty which that presents is compounded by the argument that the technology needs developing by research that will ‘give us the teacher behaviours that are appropriate for children of different ages, subjects, catchment areas and districts [etc.] . . . with] . . . a common core of effective practices throughout’ (Reynolds 1998: 28). Presumably the ‘etc.’ includes gender, ethnicity, home circumstances, classroom environment and community, financial conditions and resources, the reigning policies on school visits, parental participation, and examination syllabuses – to add just a few of the material factors of schooling.

Perhaps it includes only a selective few of those material factors because the bid for a science of instruction is a curious attempt to overthrow those who celebrate a values debate and discuss the “ends” of education’, in favour of a systematic search for the means of achieving some presumed but unstated aim (Reynolds 1998: 26). Writing as if scientists do not debate or depend upon values, the TTA is cited by Reynolds as having done ‘sterling service’ in insisting that teachers themselves should be able to use the empirical rational model [of scientific research] to create knowledge about effective practices that is better than that which they should have been given as their intellectual and practical foundation.

(Reynolds 1998: 28)

Perhaps fortunately, a long history of educational ideas, research, and collected professional expertise shows that there are differences of view, within the social practice that we call education, about the nature and purposes of knowledge, the conceptions of teaching, and its practical performance. Fortunately, that is, partly because similar quests for understanding do exist in other branches of social life and community practices – in both the sciences and the arts. Indeed the attempt by Reynolds to divide the two is an unnecessary diversion, as Miller (1997: 40) pointed out when he asked, rhetorically,
‘What did Albert Einstein, George Braque and Pablo Picasso have in common?’ His answer is that each searched for ‘new means to express the inner beauties of nature. . . . While Einstein expressed himself in mathematics, Braque and Picasso applied paint to canvas’ (Miller 1997: 40). Fortunately, also, because even within the social sciences to which Reynolds appeals there continues to be a productive and enlivening debate about its purposes, philosophical underpinnings, and related methodological issues which offer complementary approaches to the empirical rational model (Phillips 1987; Scott and Usher 1996; Brown and Dowling 1997). Perhaps more importantly it is fortunate because this combined history of education and research leaves open the route to enquiry, and allows space for curiosity and imagination. It invites rigorous self-scrutiny by educators and researchers (who are often one and the same) as well as scepticism towards prescriptions for the schooling of societies’ young people in selectively ascribed knowledge, using ideologically prescribed pedagogical methods, based on notions of effectiveness derived from a narrow view of proof.

Of course there is a sense that the science is inadequate, as much of science is. It is inaccurate, however, to suggest that a literature on pedagogical processes does not exist. It is extensive, complex and contains its own frictions which are too broad to review here. However, if the call (in which I join) for teachers to become researchers of their practice is upheld, then it is necessary to ask how that might be possible, and how they can engage with that foundation of professional knowledge. It presumably means that all teachers, teacher educators, educational researchers and policy makers, including new entrants to the profession, need to engage collaboratively in the development of appropriate research aims and methods, which can lead to the further establishment of the body of professional knowledge. This places a quite different but complementary dimension of teacher expertise at the core of practice, to accompany what must then be seen as provisional views of what constitutes effective education. Such a claim on the professional dispositions, time, energies, and developing expertise of new entrants broadens the conception of teaching quality and into what that induction is to be very considerably. It is a breadth of view that is promoted elsewhere by the Teacher Training Agency in its subscription to a research based profession (TTA 1997; Cordingley 1998).

There is another sense in which conceptions of teaching quality and induction can be broadened to challenge the idea that new entrants are necessarily inferior in their contribution to the service compared with longer-serving teachers (Ingvarson 1998). It is a view in which the so-called novice is, in times of change, at least in some respects transformed into a relative expert alongside established members of a profession. There is a well-founded recognition that many new entrants to teaching have higher standing over their predecessors with regard to some aspects of subject knowledge, pedagogical imagination, and professional capabilities. Their capacity to handle uncertainty and to bring about change – given appropriately supportive circumstances – can be equal to or better than more senior colleagues. In
these senses they are potential or actual leaders and innovators as well as inductees, and are often acknowledged to be so by colleagues and pupils alike. These perspectives on induction require the extended core of qualities and capabilities to accommodate but also reach well beyond the minimum realms of teacher tasks and behaviours like those defined in career entry profiles.

Recovering the challenge

The more optimistic and expansive view of induction is a reminder to guard against the persistence of policies that adopt a predominantly minimalist perspective on the quality of performance by new teachers. That is exemplified in the approach to the treatment and assessment of probationary teachers adopted throughout the second half of the twentieth century, and reinforced with the reintroduction in England of a probationary year (DfEE 1998a). In it, the gatekeeping role to prevent incompetence, which in itself is an essential part of the profession’s responsibilities for quality assurance, displaces a constructive approach to maximizing the professional expertise of new teachers. The minimalist point of view has a tendency to reduce images of teacher induction to descriptions of subject content, curriculum specifications, methods of teaching, and modes of pupil assessment. It is that which dominates the TTA career entry profile and induction standards (DfEE 1999; TTA 1999a).

The outlook associated with this and similar conceptions of teaching make educational discourse limited only to decisions about time allocations, new examination syllabuses, new curriculum requirements, proposals for the adoption of particular teaching methods, or ways of tabulating test results. Discussions are, understandably, mainly carried on at this kind of practical level in the pragmatic tradition of schooling. While that is not a surprise, it is a matter for mourning. The dominant themes of subject, methods, and assessment swamp some very important educational considerations such as:

- views on what we think education is for;
- what we regard as being educated;
- how we view and act upon social justice issues;
- our regard for the distribution of educational resources;
- perspectives on the construction of knowledge;
- evidence of educational policy;
- who should have the power to decide what we learn, and how;
- what we think about the processes of schooling;
- how we regard the nature of childhood;
- theories of learning;
- whether we see education as political or apolitical;
- the part that research evidence should play in our educational imaginations; and so on.
The minimal approach to education and to induction into it masks different conceptions of education and of teaching, which display differences of view about what kinds of teachers we want and the criteria against which quality of practice should be judged. We see bureaucratic powers used to override such healthy discussion, to impose upon teacher educators and teachers a presumptive view of the purposes, practices and consequences of teacher education and of teaching.

Despite the stealth of attempts to impose a narrow view of teaching, there are various beliefs about what knowledge (or skills, competence, qualities, capabilities, etc.) should be acquired by teachers, and how, and to what effect it should be put. Throughout a long history, arguments about appropriate teacher knowledge and induction methods have been rehearsed in many parts of the world. In England it is now constrained, although not entirely, by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), the Teacher Training Agency, and the agenda of school standards, league tables, and educational effectiveness. Despite these restrictions, however, the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET), the educational research community, and the General Teachers Council, for example, continue to search for acceptable professional formulations of initial teacher education, induction, and continuing professional development, as do other bodies in the far corners of the educational world, with sufficient sparks of alternative thinking to keep fanning the embers (Mahoney 1998; NSWDET 1998a). As the OECD (1994) put it:

The new challenges and demands on schools and teachers emerge from new and heightened expectations of schools, advances in research on teaching and learning and the need to manage classrooms that are increasingly diverse in terms of ethnic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds. These challenges and demands require new capacities and knowledge on the part of teachers. The current situation is both dynamic and varied.

(Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD 1994: 9; in NSWDET 1998a: 4)

The demands for regressive and conservative approaches to teacher training, which derive from governments and their agencies, present one face to those with a will to improve the quality of debate about induction (Tickle 1994). Another face is presented by the kind of challenge from the OECD. Together these represent the Janus-like dilemma between reaction and foresight that faces education in general. The strained character of teacher education was summed up by the New South Wales ministry in the following way:

The differences between approaches on either side of the Atlantic serve to illustrate, inter alia, the extent to which discourse has been overlaid by a melange of theoretical, political and economic agendas. At its simplest level, this has led to a sharp divide between those who favour
a model of teachers as technically competent practitioners (technicians who implement government policy) and those who seek reflective, professional teachers, capable of thoughtfully evaluating their own work, adaptable, committed to equity and social justice and a process of lifelong learning (Schön 1983; Ofsted 1993; McCulloch 1994; Gore 1995). These models of course are closely related to perceptions of the fundamental purposes of schooling. The technician teacher is in a good position to protect and reproduce the social status quo; the reflective teacher is likely to be a better agent of social transformation.

(NSWDET 1998b: 32)

At the forefront of induction practice, then, the lack of sophistication and differences in views about professional knowledge are likely to result in variations of experience for newly qualified teachers, and quite possibly in vague, confused or unplanned experiences. Induction may well be encountered as discontinuities of experience; or conflicts of view about education; or indifference to role expectations; or puzzling about how to proceed in supporting new teachers to enable them to learn. Evidence shows that learning during induction is affected by different values and characterized in part by chance placement in employment, the happenstance of working circumstances, the views of senior teachers about their own roles as tutors, assessors, or managers, and their conceptions of newly qualified teachers’ potential to innovate and lead as well as learn and follow (DES 1982, 1988a; Beynon 1987; Tickle 1994).

The central paradox of teacher induction is that so much attention has been paid, over generations, to making the experience positive, or at least less traumatic than it is often reported to be. Yet the ‘problem’ of induction remains – both for individuals entering the profession, and for managers of the education service. Perhaps, then, it is time to reconceptualize at least some aspects of induction as a period of opportunity for maintaining a sense of the problematic nature of education for those who will become its professors.

Living with the problematic

If we see induction as being and remaining inherently complex, and seek to understand it adequately, then we might be able to assert some educational principles for entry to the profession that will help newly qualified teachers. Their pupils might also then get maximum educational benefit from the induction process. A disposition of educational enquiry is therefore adopted in this book as a means of empowering those who profess education to do so not simply as teachers but as educators who can engage in debate, the development of practice, and the transformation of educating.

The distinction I draw between teaching and educating is deliberate and purposeful, and readers should be very conscious of it, because I have assumed in much of what follows that as teachers we are also capable of functioning
in ways that are diseducational. That is not to say that we do so wittingly. It is, though, to argue that by becoming members of the teaching force we are drawn into a schooling system which in many respects is dysfunctional, despite our commitments and best efforts to the contrary. This perspective is a crucial part of the arguments I wish to address. It affects the interpretation which we give to the issue of what it is that induction is into, in terms of the role and function of teachers and schools.

A further problem of induction is that education’s managers, in their desire to prescribe and assess performance, carry a quite different mantle from educators whose interest is to debate, counsel, facilitate initiative, and encourage self-appraisal. Part of that process of diseducation is the tendency to seek certainties, to know, which can outweigh our capacity to live with ambiguity, mystery, and inquiry. Induction is a period of disturbance and imbalance, in tension with a tendency to seek calm and equilibrium.

I don’t intend to ignore the importance of material resources that are dedicated (or not) to induction, and conditions of education within which new teachers are obliged to learn and practise. They, too, remain persistently problematic, in ways that often adversely affect the learning experiences and practices of the newly qualified, and the possibilities available to their support tutors and their pupils. Finance is a major variable in the possible circumstances in which teachers find themselves. So let it be clear that the gap between the aspiration to provide systematic induction, and its realization in the lives of teachers, results also from the failure to fund induction programmes adequately, and the failure to change by funding both the learning environments in which new teachers are employed, and the opportunities to maximize the use of their educational talents and energies (DES 1982, 1988a; Ofsted 1993). This includes the need to fund those who support, educate, and facilitate the work of new teachers, in order that they themselves can develop the best possible conceptualizations and practices in their professional tutor roles (Tickle 1994; TTA 1998a).

To conclude for the moment this review of the problematic nature of induction, there are some other notable characteristics that are tied up in professional culture and the circumstances of schooling, particularly in the social conditions and physical environments of teaching which, for instance, result in the way:

- classroom practice is a largely isolated and individualized activity;
- teachers sometimes seek to be, or by force of circumstance become, autonomous and private in their work, and carry their responsibilities individually;
- the monumental demands of the job outstrip the resources for doing all aspects of it as well as teachers would like to;
- the shortage of time prevents discussion with others about education and its effectiveness, about the curriculum, or about policy;
- new entrants are expected suddenly, and despite sentiments to the contrary, to do the same job as experienced colleagues.
The background to and consequences of these conditions of education and associated professional culture add to the realization that to think of induction as being systematic on a scale wider than the provision made by individual schools may simply be misleading. Any thoughts in that direction are tempered by one experience (among many) of a three-teacher rural primary school that had not had a new appointment of any teaching staff for 15 years, let alone a newly qualified teacher. Suddenly it had both, in the same person. Teacher induction there, particularly for the rapidly designated teacher-tutor, meant something very different from a city high school with 120 teaching staff, regular appointments of several newly qualified teachers at a time, and a well tried, developed, and funded induction programme that had been devised and modified by senior staff over many years.

Both of these schools were working within an arrangement funded by a local education authority’s in-service budget. Then, without warning, the provision of funded support for new teachers was severely amended, then rapidly abandoned, because of financial cuts and changes in grants for in-service teacher education.

Schools and local education authorities, in any case, differ markedly in their attitudes to induction and their provision for it. A simple review asking if designated posts of responsibility for overseeing induction exist in schools and local administrative bodies will reveal those differences. A review of the (non)existence of formal induction programmes draws similar results. Policy at county, state, or national levels has remained indecisive and turbulent for as long as there has been induction (Tickle 1994). Recent years show little sign of policies or provision stabilizing.

Amidst this view of induction, the most worrying aspect from a professional perspective is the deprofessionalization of the education services being brought about especially by the casualization of work; the disengagement of teachers from curriculum decision making; and the redefinition of teaching as a process dominated by testing pupil performance. The recognition of induction as the start of career-long learning does not take account of the employment conditions of teaching, or the employment paths of individuals who may have already had other careers, in which initiative was celebrated. Nor does the rhetoric recognize that some might be expected to move to yet other jobs in despair that schooling is dysfunctional, or simply in search of security and salary.

A research-based profession

Anarchic, volatile, fragmented or fractured, or maybe ignored by some, even in the face of attempts by others to gain central control, then, are better descriptions than systematic if one looks at teacher induction at its various points of provision, even over a short timescale. That situation can, I suppose, be regarded as allowing the conditions to foster creative solutions
to the problem at a local level – more creative at least than imposition by stealth of a narrow view of teacher training. Yet such a narrow view may well prevail upon us by the power of assessment and profiling of teachers, definitions of teaching standards, and the assertions of classroom effectiveness research.

The ineffectiveness of policy, failure in local provision, and variable support for new teachers in schools is reflected in a disparate body of literature on induction. Fragments of this literature are laid down in the sediments of the past like educational fossils. They record the precarious nature of some of the many attempts to get induction right, evidence that the starting points of induction projects differ; that they are often small scale; geographically scattered; and their timescales short. These features are reason enough to ensure that the educational community is unlikely to learn from and apply their lessons to improve practice. This is a case of what Schön (1971) described as our inability to learn from investment in social programmes, because of our incapacity to deal adequately with the number of ideas vying for attention and funding. Schön was referring to competing, broad social agendas, of which induction into the teaching profession is a very minor one within the field of teacher education, which itself has not commanded much attention relatively to other aspects of education.

The case for the adoption of a view of teacher education that puts research-based practice at its heart has become a recurrent theme which contrasts with simpler views of competence. It comes from arguments for the continuing education of teachers to be based in action research (Carr and Kemmis 1986; Elliott 1991; McKernan 1991). The aim of research-based practice is the development of active dispositions towards classroom and school research and its use in understanding the quality of teachers' own actions, and in maximizing educational progress for pupils. The idea of the teacher as researcher can be used as a basis for the development of new teachers, as well as those with more experience. Taking that approach, I believe, provides an imaginative solution to the educational problem of teacher induction.

Those principles can provide a particular and distinctive element in the generic professional qualities and capabilities needed for educational practice. They extend the purported core of instructional competencies to encompass all aspects of an educator's work. That is, they are inclusive of subject knowledge; awareness of the curriculum; pedagogical expertise; the capacity to manage and generate change; the ability to engage constructively in self-development as a teacher; and involvement in the research and development of schools and the education service more widely. They accommodate practical skills, as well as perceptual, imaginative, conceptual, emotional and spiritual powers. Those principles provide for professional learning needs in aspects of practice in which teachers are novices, and potentially lead to their development as experts, at whichever career stage they are. The importance of this perspective can hardly be overemphasized – in the building of a professional knowledge base; in complex practices; in situations that are changing rapidly; and where education is constructively contended in
terms of both its ends and its means – the novice/expert relationship has to be unconventional and the usual image of induction reimagined.

The intention in this book is to illustrate research-based practices in ways that newly qualified teachers themselves can use to guide their own experience and development. It is also my intention to convey the ideas and their practical implications to those who support new teachers, in one way or another, during their initiation into the profession. They will mainly be professional tutors in schools, or interested colleagues, or maybe headteachers, and teacher educators. I hope that school governors, local education authority personnel, and members of the policy bodies will also pay heed to the needs of new and changing circumstances and of new teachers within them. The ideas that are offered for supporting their development, and enabling their talents to contribute to the service of educating, need to be promoted within the profession simultaneously with their promotion among new entrants.

The case for induction provision that includes teacher research is based on evidence of new teachers’ experiences of learning, and on underlying theories of teacher professionalism and teacher education curricula. The evidence shows that the problem of providing an effective, continuing, learning-based induction for newly qualified professionals is a universal one. However, albeit a universal problem, it is clear that the approaches taken to the question of what we learn or should learn as educators, and of what we should be able to do, differ among people even within various parts of the education service (Edwards 1998; Pring 1998; Reynolds 1998; Woodhead 1998). In recent years views about different kinds of teacher knowledge and competence, and associated conceptions of professional development, have been rather polarized and argued over (Doyle 1985; Shulman 1986a, 1986b; Sockett 1987; Elliott 1991, 1992). At the opposite extreme to the teacher-researcher notion for example, there is the view that teachers just need substantial academic knowledge in a specialist subject to be able to teach effectively, and that teachers’ performance in transmitting subject knowledge should merely be assessed, rather than developed. That view is still explicitly rehearsed occasionally, and is implicit in teacher employment in some schools.

These extremes suggest that it is important to take an overview of research on teacher learning, so that it is clear where research-based practice stands within the knowledge we have about teacher development. I am convinced that an approach to induction based on principles of research-based teaching can provide the benefits of complementarity for these seemingly different views on teacher education. It offers a distinctive answer to the questions raised about teachers’ learning during induction, by potentially developing educational professionalism, and not just producing the instrumental outcomes of training associated with subject knowledge and classroom performance.

The overlap between an academic knowledge/skills-view of teaching and a research-based view is an important focus of the book. A purely academic,
subject-expertise view of teaching, and the skills-based conception of competence have long traditions in popular and professional culture, and in policy. A broader notion of the teacher as a professional, which includes the development of personal qualities and dispositions, the place of the self in teaching, and a much broader sense of competence than just the technical classroom skills of instruction, can at best be described as an emerging tradition that is constantly threatened by the more dominant perspective on academic, skills-based instruction.

The arguments for a research-based profession, and for the use of critical educational enquiry as a basis for professional development, are relatively recent, though they are based on principles previously rehearsed by educators from Aristotle to Dewey. They are far from having widespread acceptance, though the associated but rather innocuously attuned notion of reflective practice is on the lips of many professional educators and policy makers worldwide (Schön 1983; Clandinin and Connelly 1990; Tabachnick and Zeichner 1991; NSWDET 1998a). Curriculum action research and research based teaching are increasingly being adopted and developed as more rigorous and self-critical approaches to professional development in international settings (Hollingsworth 1997).

Practical knowledge and professional support

Research that shows how induction is experienced by new teachers illustrates how they see the nature and complexity of the challenges they face. For example, discontinuity between pre-service education and induction is a problem because of the severe disruptions that come with the shift from studenthood to being a full-time teacher. This is characterized by:

- the shift in status;
- tension between expected professional performance and learning on the job;
- change of location;
- the fullness and complexity of new responsibilities;
- new school situation and organizational features;
- handling different curriculum content;
- getting to know resources;
- strangeness of new colleagues;
- meeting many (even hundreds of) young people who have suddenly become significant in one’s life;
- isolation from other novices as soulmates;
- facing aspects of teaching which were never dealt with in training.

In these circumstances the notion of a research-based professional induction is an ideal – and its principles are unlikely to be hot on the lips of newly qualified teachers and their support tutors. Nor am I suggesting that it is the
whole answer to professional learning for new teachers. In the mêlée of induction the very idea of principles and research might be like whispers from over the mountain top. Also, learning might come by a variety of means, in a range of circumstances, with regard to diverse elements of professional knowledge. So the search for complementarity meets another challenge: to ensure that these particular ideas on induction through research-based teaching can make practical sense. In the face of the real-life experiences of inductees and their school-based support tutors, within a range of contenders for their receptive attention, the case has to be convincing.

I have listed just some of the disruptions which have to be dealt with in those real-life experiences, where my notion of a problem is intended to represent challenge, motivation, matters to be solved, new learning to be acquired, new responsibilities to be adopted, new educational arguments to be rehearsed, new initiatives to be taken. In that sense this book treats induction in a constructive light, even though the individual experiences of it might not always be positive. At the same time it does not shrink from destructive experiences and negative aspects of induction. They provide a recurring reminder of the need to get it right, and a motivation for identifying what right means and how to achieve it. However, I hope the book displays and celebrates a way ahead where the constructive growth of the new professional is the foremost consideration and characteristic. Its aim is to contribute to the dissemination of that way, to bring about understanding and creative thinking which can achieve that development.

In so far as the question of induction hinges on the nature of what teachers have to know and be able to do, and the qualities and professional dispositions that they might have or acquire, then a picture of those matters is an essential starting point. An analysis of educational knowledge, based on the experiences of induction, on international research and scholarship, and on the content of policies for teacher education provides a major part of the book. The analysis is used to illustrate both the component parts and the holistic nature of educational knowledge and its contended nature. Initially I have concentrated on the more obvious dimensions of practice and practical knowledge – those simple categories of subject knowledge, knowledge of the curriculum and educational context, and the practical skills of pedagogy. That choice might be seen as confirming a particular definition of teachers' knowledge. I hope not. It should be self-evident that to function as an educator one needs to understand principles of education; to know about children and their modes of learning; and to appreciate the origin and consequences of a competitive system of compulsory, common schooling (among other things). Rather, I have sought to convey knowledge in those core domains as prerequisite to, but certainly not the whole of, what is required for an educative view of teachers' work, or of their own professional learning. It is also my intention to show how even those core aspects of professional knowledge should be considered from a problematizing disposition. At its simplest, for example, with regard to subject knowledge we need ways of dealing with:
• the expanse of knowledge content, which makes selection for curriculum inevitable, probably controversial, often outdated, and likely to result in irrelevance or disinterest for pupils;
• diverse ways of conceptualizing knowledge, from empirically demonstrated immutable facts, through theoretical propositions, provisional claims, interesting hypotheses, to ineffable mysteries;
• advances in knowledge, which need to be kept abreast of, over a career length of possibly 40 years.

With regard to knowledge of the school curriculum itself, an educative stance maintains that there are different ways of studying and understanding it, which affect the ways we think of designing, implementing and practising it. Again, curriculum knowledge is not simply a case of accepting and operating in accordance with someone else’s view of what constitutes a curriculum. Rather, it is a continuous process of engagement with:

• educational ideas, and the possibilities and consequences of different forms of curriculum provision;
• debates about the way educational institutions are organized;
• the potentials and impacts of educational technologies;
• evidence and argument about the assessment of learning, its practices, and its consequences.

The same applies to pedagogical expertise, in which there are some techniques that can be mastered and performed, but also a range of possibilities that need to be tested and contested. For example, we know it is essential to speak clearly and coherently when explaining something or presenting an argument. It is obvious that time spent on the management and distribution of resources should be used efficiently and effectively in favour of maximizing active learning time. There is a clear case for providing feedback to students as soon and as comprehensively as possible after they produce evidence related to their learning, either within or after an activity, and so on. These are the elements of practice dealt with comprehensively by many analysts of the act of instruction (Wragg 1984). But also, for example, the possibilities that exist within a range of methods for teaching reading, mathematics, or particular curriculum content demand awareness, understanding, and judgement in their adoption and use. Our understanding of children’s learning styles and of specific learning difficulties is still developing. The identification of appropriate moments for introducing new concepts to, or extending those already held by, individual students is a matter that depends on information, evidence, and judgement.

So educational practice resides in these realms of professional judgement and the use of evidence too. Furthermore, educational knowledge includes personal qualities, professional characteristics, and self-knowledge. That raises the profile of aspects of the self, and the importance of including the characteristics of being a professional and the place of emotions in teaching. Evidence shows how they can easily, and detrimentally, be disregarded (Hamachek...
I will argue that a curriculum for their development is necessary, and suggest ways in which it is achievable as part of teacher induction.

Identifying the nature of professional knowledge is one step towards developing induction, but working out how different kinds of knowledge are acquired and developed is just as difficult. So I will consider some ideas about how knowledge for educational practice is gained, and how best it might be provided for during induction. Different ways of imagining what teachers should know and how they might come to know it have resulted in the fashioning of different kinds of teacher education programmes. Some of these variants were described by Munro (1989), Tickle (1994) and Wilkin (1996). Each type makes assumptions about what kinds of education society should have, and therefore implies the kind of teachers to be produced. I have presumed that proposals for induction need to take account of those different orientations to teacher education curricula, or need to be understood in the context of their possibilities and consequences.

Assessment of professional performance is an aspect of induction that remains at the forefront of the minds of new teachers, their colleagues, managers, and policy makers. Its importance is emphasized with the reintroduction of a probationary period (called the induction year) in England (TTA 1999). Licensing and provisional registration have equivalents elsewhere (NSWDET 1998a). The renewed emphasis on teacher appraisal, the use of temporary contracts of employment, and the increasingly prominent use of standards and graded performance measures, also reinforce its priority position. Moves towards profiling the capabilities of new entrants to teaching is a particular formulation of the use of assessment criteria, and mechanisms for judging teaching quality are laid down in some induction arrangements, including those newly reintroduced in England.

Profiling and appraisal are not entirely built on promises to educate, however. They are intrinsically coupled with the professional and political need to assess the quality of teaching, and to prevent the entry of, or quickly remove, incompetent teachers. That combination of pressures to educate for competence and to eradicate incompetence is summed up by the notion of probation. This was explicit in the TTA’s (1998a) consultation as a search for balance between mentoring and monitoring, support and surveillance. It has also been a characteristic tension in teacher appraisal since its introduction in the 1980s in Britain and elsewhere (Elliott 1991; Tickle 1994).

I have sought to include this theme throughout the book too, by way of an educative alternative which holds the prospect of regenerating educational competence and commitment. It can be presumed that particular uses of assessment criteria determine the kinds of learning experiences of new teachers. I will argue that collaborative, research-based induction can provide a climate of self-regulation and self-improvement, for both individual teachers and schools. It also potentially accommodates the external imposition of assessment and inspection, through the creation of a professional force that is more advanced than any inspectorate. The consequent model
of an induction curriculum based on this broader perspective of quality is described. The proposals for research based practice, developed in collaboration with new teachers and their professional tutors, are placed in a context of first appointments, and the conditions under which those appointments are taken up. They present ways in which the research based practice of induction can be effected in institutional, local and national support arrangements. Perhaps a General Teachers Council in England will be capable of adopting this kind of educative and self-regulatory perspective on induction (Calderhead 1992).

The main players in creating provision for the implementation of an induction curriculum include government or state agencies, employers, school managers, professional support tutors, colleagues, new teachers themselves, and their pupils. Each carry responsibilities that contribute to the educational experiences of individual new teachers, and through them to the long-term development of the education profession. I think it is apparent that ideally induction provision by these various players needs to work in harmony towards creating opportunities (and expectations) for new teachers, but that harmony and coherence are likely to remain elusive. This does place the inductee in the eye of the storm, so to speak, with the challenge of steering a creative course through it, by adopting the principles of research-based teaching at the heart of, but amidst other modes in, their learning.

The image I have of induction is not so much a bridge, therefore, but rather more an outward access route, from the strength of initial competence to an open horizon of professional and educational adventure. It is an adventure that looks beyond the performance of individual teachers judged by pupil outcomes alone. As Simons (1987: 199) put it:

many of the indices being sought focus solely on pupil outcomes. These are only one measure of the worth of a school. Much more needs to be evaluated including curriculum policies, learning opportunities, the interrelationships between levels (pupil, classroom, school) and forms of provision and achievements.

Approaches to the continuing professional education of teachers during the period immediately postinduction are an important consideration in working out how induction itself can best be understood, planned, and provided for. Only with a clear sense of what it is that educators are being inducted into in the longer term, and where they might journey next, can we have a sense of their professional development. Like initial training, the assumptions about in-service development are diverse, and sometimes at odds with each other. These are discussed, extending the theoretical and practical issues already introduced, in order to identify the values that lie in the immediate postinduction stages of in-service education.

The possibilities for providing structured teacher education programmes for teachers immediately beyond the first year, related directly to the development of practical educational expertise, is presented to show how that can be achieved. Drawing from developments and research in this early
career phase, and locating the studies in the new contexts of so-called expert teachers, advanced skills teacher, and curriculum leadership proposals, a new outlook on teacher education for a period of teaching, which has tended to be overlooked, is presented. Indeed I will suggest that induction itself is necessarily rather more than a one-year process in which continuous self-improvement can be maintained. Of course there are reflections of that bridge here, presumptions that continuing professional development should build firm structures on the foundations of initial teacher education and induction towards the responsibilities of curriculum leadership in a managed way. I will need to remember my own appeals for a problematizing approach to the complex and agreeably argumentative world of the newly qualified educator. Perhaps Elliott (1998: 65) will help:

The intelligent response to the complexities and paradoxes of living in advanced modern societies is one of imaginative experimentation based on a tolerance of ambiguity and risk. Increasing complexity and paradox in a society enlarges the social space in which its members can participate in the construction of their own and their society’s future.