Foreword

When, in early 1970, as a young, newly minted trainee teacher from the University of Melbourne, I commenced my first teaching appointment in a regional technical college in the state of Victoria, I was in a minority among my teacher peers. This is because I was a graduate – indeed, not only was I a graduate but, like a number of trainees who had been part of my immediate friendship circle during our preceding Diploma of Education (or PGCE-equivalent) year, I was an honours graduate. What this meant was that we had completed a four-year, rather than the standard three-year (or pass), degree. The reason why this information bears recounting is not because in any sense it confers bragging rights, but because of the insights it provides into the state and status of the teaching profession at that time. There are three points in particular.

First, school teaching at the start of the 1970s was far from being a graduate profession. In Victoria, for example, most primary teachers were certificated because there were no specialist degree programmes for them. If a teacher happened to be a graduate then she or he was almost certainly a secondary teacher, although even here it was not unusual to find an abbreviation like 'Univ. Subs.' appearing next to the names of staff members listed in the annual magazines of schools. These words usually signalled the partial completion of a university degree. Second, there was a gross shortage of teachers generally, not merely fully qualified ones. The causes boiled down to a combination of a booming economy and a buoyant labour market, coupled with a prolonged demand for teachers arising out of a rapid and extensive post-war expansion of state secondary education. Both of these factors were exacerbated by escalating population growth as a result of a domestic 'baby boom', as it was known, and a massive influx of post-war European immigrants, all of which imposed huge enrolment demands on the school system. State officials struggled to cope with such pressures. This set of factors bestowed added significance on 'Univ. Subs.', because these words were a measure of

the desperation of the employing authority (the state Education Department) to be able to staff schools. (In cases of extreme staff shortages, a joke among teachers at the time was that, provided a person could stand on two legs and remain vertical for up to six or seven hours a day, then the Department would be more than likely to offer her or him employment.) Third, most of us young graduates had been recruited into teaching as a result of the receipt of teaching bursaries. These were known as studentships. A generous scheme had been introduced by the state government in the early 1950s and, until it was eventually phased out two decades or so later, its provisions covered the cost of four (or in my case, five) years of university tuition fees. Depending on the level of one's parents' income, it also provided a modest weekly living allowance. In return for the state of Victoria's largesse, each of us trainees signed an agreement to teach for at least three years following graduation and training. This teaching bursary set-up was truly remarkable, and one of its unintended consequences was to create a social-mobility conveyer belt for thousands of the offspring of middle, lower middle and working class families who benefited from a tertiary education that otherwise would have been beyond the financial reach of their parents.

Fast-forward about four decades and what do we find? For the most part, in the UK, Australia and beyond (although by no means universally across the globe), school teaching, in the primary and secondary sectors, has become a graduate profession. What this means is that preparation for training and for subsequent employment is available solely to university graduates. A number of factors have made this possible, but achievement of graduate status has been facilitated especially by the recent incorporation of what were previously stand-alone teacher training colleges into university faculties of education. Being qualified for a 'graduate profession', however, does not necessarily provide university graduates with guaranteed employment as teachers. This is because one can attain graduate status, and yet not be admitted to a training year (there may be insufficient funded places or one may not meet the selection criteria) and, even if admitted, one might not necessarily secure employment on the completion of training (the supply of vacant posts in a teaching subject may exceed demand). If, then, the battle to achieve a graduate profession has largely been won – 'battle', because, as I recall, one of the key planks in the professional action campaign of a teacher union in Victoria in the early 1970s was for 'control of entry' – what are the issues that are of current concern to the teaching profession?

Overwhelmingly, among OECD member and partner countries, the focus of interest is on aspects of teacher quality: the recruitment, first, not merely

of graduates, but of high-quality graduates; second, the ongoing profes-
sional development of such top-flight teachers; and, finally, the retention of
as many as possible of them in the interests of system sustainability. Indeed,
the OECD published a landmark report in 2005, *Teaching Matters*, which
outlined in detail (and legitimated) this agenda. Thus, in England, in *The
Importance of Teaching* (the Schools White Paper), there is the following
passage (p. 9, para. 7):

All the evidence from different education systems around the world shows that the
most important factor in determining how well children do is the quality of teach-
ers and teaching. The best education systems in the world draw their teachers from
among the top graduates and train them rigorously and effectively, focusing on
classroom practice. They then make sure that teachers receive effective professional
development throughout their career[s], with opportunities to observe and work
with other teachers, and appropriate training for leadership positions.

However, if in fact there is broad agreement that these aspects (attraction and
recruitment, selection and certification, development and retention) consti-
tute the key ends of policy, does that mean that the 'policy wars' in education
have reduced themselves to straightforward arguments about means, rather
than ends? Are they about the respective merits of HEI-based and school-
based training provision (or combinations of both through university–school
partnership agreements), about the merits of various incarnations of graduate
teaching programmes, about whether the profession is better served by the
provision of undergraduate education degrees (an innovation of the 1970s
and 1980s) or by the traditional model of training (at least for secondary
teaching) of 3+1 HEI provision?

The answer, not surprisingly, has to be no, which is to say that despite
the advancements made in teaching between then (1970s) and now, some
of the key questions that required answers earlier on still demand them in
2012. Such questions are left begging by the resort to such words as 'pro-
fession' and 'professional'. In respect of teaching, then: Who counts as the
profession? Who speaks on its behalf? And, what does it mean to be a pro-
fessional? The answer to the first question is not self-evident: lots of people
teach, not simply teachers. To take an illustrative example, when the founders
of the Australian College of Education gathered in the late 1950s to create
a college, they wrestled with who to include and who to exclude, and they
ended up inviting to the foundation seminar not merely teachers and heads
of schools (from state and independent sector schools), but also university
professors (including those in disciplines other than education) and officials

from the various state jurisdictions. The answer to the question about professional voice and who should speak for teachers and teaching is also not clear-cut. At the time of writing, the idea of a college of teachers in England is gathering some momentum (in the press and in a House of Commons Select Committee report) and yet much of the tone and content of documents that have emanated from Whitehall (both from the current and previous HMGs) suggest that politicians, ministers and secretaries of state are presuming to speak on behalf of the teaching profession. Would they dare to adopt a similar stance in respect of the legal or medical professions? And, if the answer is no, then what does the fact that they do so in respect of teaching tell us about the teaching profession?

As for the question of what it means to be a professional, when many years ago the American sociologist Amitai Etzioni wrote about the 'semi-professions', he argued that some occupations (including teaching) exemplified semi-professionalism at best. That is, such was their standing that they could not hope to attain the status and prestige of the likes of medicine and law. The point which Etzioni was making was that, in the end, full professional status is anchored in a claim to the possession of distinctive and complex knowledge. While the claim to professional status may be dismissed as peripheral to the central concerns of colleagues in teaching and teacher education – because our overriding interest is in improvements in pedagogy, teaching and learning, curriculum and assessment – Etzioni's point about knowledge is absolutely central to this interest. What, for example, are the grounds on which our claims to know best as educators and as teacher educators rest? What, if teachers are to be highly accomplished teachers who are able to improve student learning, do they need to know and to be able to do? In short, is there such a thing as a distinctive knowledge base (or bases) for teaching and, if there is, what does it comprise? To what extent is teaching knowledge and teacher education knowledge, as Linda Darling-Hammond (among others) has asked recently, grounded in something that might be thought of as the wisdom or craft of practice or in something much less elusively defined and more systematically ordered?

Some questions to ponder, then, include:

- What counts as teacher knowledge, and teacher education knowledge?
- What is the justification for these knowledge claims?
- Who decides what counts as warranted pedagogical content knowledge and subject content knowledge?

- If the answer is 'the profession', who or what is the profession in teaching? And who is it that speaks for or on behalf of the profession? Are we talking about one professional voice or a number of voices?
- What, next, is professionalism? Whose territory is this and who is authorized to make pronouncements about it?
- What about de-professionalization (or even the proletarianization of teaching), which is an accusation levelled by critics over the last couple of decades at the effects of policies of governments of all persuasions? Is there any substance to this claim?
- And finally, who decides on or determines what 'quality' means in education and learning? If it is teachers and teacher educators, based on a warranted claim to know, then how is it that governments see themselves as being in the business of determining quality? If governments have a role to play in these areas of professional knowledge and practice, and quality teaching and learning, what is that role?

I have dwelt in this preface on these aspects of teacher professionalism, because they are implicit or partially explicit in so much that is currently said, written and done in the subject area of this book. What is clear is that, just as in 1970, there is much unfinished business to be attended to in teacher education and pedagogy.

Peter Gronn
Professor of Education
Head of Faculty
University of Cambridge

Introduction

Michael Evans

In April 2012, the House of Commons Select Committee in the UK published its final report following a wide-ranging inquiry into the government's reforms of teacher education in this country. A salient and, for many, welcome conclusion reached by the Committee was its endorsement of the importance of university–school collaboration in this enterprise: 'We are left in little doubt that partnership between schools and universities is likely to provide the highest-quality initial teacher education' (House of Commons, 2012). Despite the volumes that have been written on teacher education policy and practice in the UK and abroad, researchers, policy-makers and practitioners continue to wrestle with issues and understandings of what constitutes effective practice and the role of partnerships in this process. As part of this debate and the search for a collective vision of teacher education, the Faculty of Education at the University of Cambridge held an international symposium on 24–5 March 2011 entitled: 'Cambridge symposium on pedagogy and teacher education: formulating an agenda for the future'. The chapters in this book have their origin in papers given at that symposium.

Research, theory, policy and practice are key themes and perspectives that structure the discussions and arguments represented in the chapters in this book. Different chapters focus on different combinations of these perspectives with different areas of emphasis, but the reader will find, I hope, a logic and value in the sequencing of contributions, as indicated in my summary in this introduction. Beyond the three groupings that I indicate below, the book as a whole aims to provide a broad theoretical and policy-related canvas against which a more fine-grained depiction of aspects of teacher education practice are analysed.

In the opening chapter of this book, Jean Murray presents an overview of the current context of teacher education in England that provides a fitting critical backcloth to the themes and issues that constitute the focus of the subsequent chapters. Murray provides a clear and, at times, sombre account of the development of university involvement in initial teacher education. The analysis of the 'fallout in teacher education' is partly based on a historical

account of government intervention in this area in England and partly on the
identification of four key factors which Murray sees as defining the param-
eters of this context: the concentration of the majority of HEI-based train-
ing in new universities in England (many of which currently experience
financial pressures in an under-resourced research environment); neo-liberal
educational policies that promote an instrumental approach to teacher edu-
cation driven by increased bureaucratization and regulation; the current
governmental drive to increase school-centred provision at the expense of
university-based pre-service training; and the adverse, diversifying effects
of university research audits leading to reduction of research funding. An
important theme here, which is of universal relevance beyond the English
context, is the relationship between research and teacher education. Murray
points out that the dilemma of the university teacher education community in
England is that, in the absence of research-informed information on teacher
education, universities' confidence in influencing reform is diminished.

In his discussion of the 'interesting times' of current teacher education
reform in England, Norbert Pachler focuses his attention on the Education
Act 2011 and in particular on a review of critical responses to the White
Paper and the McKinsey report which was used as an evidence base for the
policy formulation. The chapter summarizes key constructs that have been
applied in these critiques such as 'the commodification of education' and
Ball's notion of the 'policy technologies' of managerialism and performa-
tivity that are seen to motivate current policy-making in teacher education.
Pachler questions the extent to which the explicit aim of the policy reform to
tackle the relationship between social background and educational perform-
ance is based on intuitive assumptions on the part of policy-makers rather
than on a 'solid evidence base'.

The next two chapters in this group of papers approach the policy–practice
relationship from the perspective of different strands of the pre-service
teacher education programme at Cambridge. In her discussion of how uni-
versity–school partnerships can build 'social capital' in teacher education,
Elaine Wilson argues that the networking interactions of such partnerships
can lead to the creation of a sense of community and shared values between
different participants in the process. The author uses social network ana-
lysis to outline how the collaboration of university and school-based trainers
working with secondary science trainees on the Cambridge course has con-
tributed to an integrated and convergent practice. In 'Developing primary
trainee teachers' professional identity' Warwick *et al.* approach the partner-
ship model of teacher education from the perspective of the development of

professional identity. The authors borrow the notion of 'significant narrator' (in the form of professionals in schools, university and other settings) to locate and define agency in the construction of professional identity.

The second group of chapters focuses more sharply on the relationship between research, professional development and practice, albeit from very different perspectives. In 'Coordinating professional development across contexts and role groups', Kara Jackson and Paul Cobb report on an ongoing research project partnered with four large urban districts in the USA that aims to design effective professional development paradigms for teachers of middle grades mathematics. The authors used findings from a preliminary research project to develop an 'empirically grounded theory of action' consisting of five interrelated components: coherent system of support; pull-out teacher professional development meetings; job-embedded support for teacher learning; school leadership in mathematics; and the development of schools' capacity for instructional improvement. The paper emphasizes the importance of coordination of professional development across contexts and across role groups, as well as that of the centrality of developmental work around 'high-leverage' practices, defined as commonly occurring classroom practices that when orchestrated effectively by the teacher lead to enhancement of student learning. In 'Perfection in teaching' Demetriou *et al.* approach the issue of teacher development from a psychological and behavioural angle and draw on the theoretical literature on perfectionism which, broadly, identifies positive and negative manifestations of perfectionism, seen, respectively, as 'strivings' or 'concerns'. The authors apply the construct to their analysis of the expressions of teaching-related self-efficacy of a cohort of trainee teachers of science at Cambridge. The data set consists of survey and blog postings produced by the trainees during completion of the pre-service course. While ultimately questioning the appropriateness of the term 'perfectionism' per se, the authors conclude that 'negative perfectionism' leads to performance dissatisfaction accompanied by low mood, while 'positive perfectionism' can trigger striving for effective organization and self-improvement.

The final two chapters reflect a parallel concern with theoretical framings of the work of mentors in supporting trainees during pre-service training, explicitly presented within the framework of a theory–research–practice connection. Both authors apply specific, though different, theoretical perspectives as analytical tools for examining discursive interaction between trainees and their mentors. In 'Teacher education as embedded in diversity', Lily Orland-Barak adopts social activity theory and critical discourse analysis to examine and interpret the missing 'cultural lens' in teacher education in Israel.

The author illustrates the critical approach through a multi-layered analysis of the discourse of Druze student teachers and their mentors and teacher educators in the field of Arts education at the University of Haifa. In 'The other person in the room' Christine Counsell uses Gadamer's 'philosophical hermeneutics' to analyse the phenomenon of mentoring practice in the context of dialogue between Cambridge University trainee history teachers and their school-based subject mentors. The chapter provides an extended examination of the use of professional and academic literature in mentor–trainee interaction in relation to the trainees' experience of classroom teaching during professional placement. Counsell's rich, analytical account of the examples of mentor–trainee dialogues provides us with a deep insight into the use of literature as a medium for developing trainee pedagogical thinking for which the ultimate goal is the 'cultivation of disciplinary thinking in pupils'.

I would like to thank all the contributors and reviewers of the chapters for their invaluable work in the production of this volume as well as the editorial staff at Cambridge University Press for their support in the final stages of production. Finally, I would like to thank Mike Younger who, as former Head of Faculty, initiated the idea of the Cambridge symposium, and it is to him that this book is dedicated.

REFERENCE

House of Commons Select Committee (2012). *Great teachers: attracting, training and retaining the best.* London: The Stationery Office Limited.