

---

---

## **Primary Newly Qualified Teachers' Experience of the Induction Year in its First Year of Implementation in England**

**CHRIS KYRIACOU & ANNE O'CONNOR**

*University of York, United Kingdom*

**ABSTRACT** This research followed a cohort of 43 primary PGCE students in England into their first teaching posts who were undertaking the induction year in the first year of its operation. An analysis of the responses identified five key issues: the timing of the statutory arrangements; the reduced timetable; funding; the support system; and career entry profiles. The study indicates that the rapid introduction of the induction year meant that many of the arrangements did not operate as intended.

### **Introduction**

In the early summer of 1999 trainee teachers completing BEd and PGCE courses learned that they would have to complete a statutory period of induction if they wished to teach in state schools in England. The induction period was to be for three school terms, to be completed within 5 years of gaining Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), and all newly qualified teachers (NQTs) were to meet a set of professional standards in addition to those required for QTS. The induction arrangements were announced in DfEE circular 5/99 dated 12 May to be effective immediately for all NQTs awarded QTS from 7 May. This research followed a cohort of 43 primary PGCE students into their first teaching posts who were undertaking the induction year in the first year of its operation.

Whilst the induction of new teachers may appear to be one of a number of recent high-profile initiatives primarily aimed at improving the professional standards and status of teachers, it is not a new idea. The induction year has its roots in a previous educational model, the probationary year. Much of the present framework for the induction period bears an uncanny resemblance to the guidance issued for Local

Education Authorities (LEAs) by the DfE in 1992, when the probationary year was withdrawn (DfE, 1992). Induction is just one component in a climate of unremitting reform in education. However, for NQTs, it is the reform that has the most immediate impact, and the one that has the capacity to begin or end their aspirations to become teachers.

First of all, it is crucial to define what is meant by induction, specifically in relation to NQTs entering their first teaching post. This is necessary because despite the statutory orders, induction retains a dual meaning, which needs to be addressed. In some contexts, induction is referred to as the transmission of basic information about the workplace and working conditions. This is not the working definition from which the present induction arrangements are developed nor one that is intended during this study. The DfEE (1999) defines induction as:

*well-targeted support in the first year of teaching, which will in turn help them give their best to pupils and to make a real and sustained contribution to school improvement and to raising classroom standards. It will also provide a foundation for the NQT's long-term continuing professional development and career development. (p. 1)*

Thus, induction is placed firmly in the arena of 'raising standards'. Despite their new packaging and statutory nature, it remains to be seen whether the new induction arrangements will be fully implemented in the form and spirit originally envisaged by the DfEE. As one source pointed out: 'since the arrangements from September 1999 are new, everyone involved in them will face a steep learning curve to understand what is expected of them' (ATL, 1999, p. 3).

The main aim of this study was to explore NQTs' experience of the induction year, paying particular attention to how well the induction orders were being implemented and the quality of mentoring the NQTs' received. The sample was composed of 43 primary school NQTs working in 17 different LEAs. This group comprised a cohort of NQTs who had completed the same PGCE course in the North of England in July 1999 and who had taken up a full-time teaching post starting the following September. These NQTs completed two questionnaires about their experience of the induction year: one at the end of their first term and the other at the end of their third term in post. An analysis of the responses identified five key issues, which form the basis of this article:

- the timing of the statutory arrangements;
- the reduced timetable;
- funding;
- the support system;
- career entry profiles.

**The Timing of the Statutory Arrangements**

It was an early concern that unreadiness for the induction arrangements would impact considerably on the success of implementation in this inaugural year. That everyone concerned had very little time to assimilate these arrangements is pertinent. Forty-three per cent of the NQTs in this sample had obtained jobs prior to the publication of circular 5/99, which gave details of these arrangements. By July most of the group had obtained jobs, with 91% of posts being advertised as specifically suitable for NQTs, despite many schools knowing little about the induction requirements.

The Arrangements	a	b	c	d	e
Contractual details	23	51	17	11	-
DfEE/LEA induction pack received	3	26	26	20	26
Induction tutor/mentor	3	20	43	6	6
LEA named contact	3	11	34	31	20
Schedule of support and monitoring	3	6	34	43	14
Reduced teaching commitment	6	9	49	20	17
Support with planning/timetabling	6	28	26	17	23
Opportunity to observe other teachers	-	6	28	40	26
First observation of your teaching	6	3	23	51	17
First formal meeting with induction tutor	9	-	49	34	9
Schedule for training/course	-	9	34	43	14
Discussion about Career Entry Profile	3	3	37	40	17
Opportunity for time with SENCO	-	3	17	26	54

Table I: Timing of the induction arrangements put in place (in percentages). Key: a, at/following the interview; b, before the end of the summer term; c, at the beginning of the first term; d, within the first half-term; e, not set in place during first half-term.

Schools had important decisions to make, often after making an appointment of an NQT, about who would be taking responsibility roles, about the feasibility of reduced timetables, and organising supply cover for monitoring and assessment. The practicalities of implementing these arrangements demanded more time than was available for the September start.

At the end of the first term the NQTs were asked whether the appointing school was 'aware of its obligation to provide for the induction arrangements' at the time of interview. Only 8% of the NQTs said that they were 'fully aware' of key aspects, 40% said they were 'reasonably aware', 46% said they were 'vaguely aware' and 5% said they were 'mostly unaware'. In this respect, many NQTs would themselves not be well-placed to evaluate what the school was offering and how well it matched the requirements. Support documentation (TTA, 1999a,b,c,d), which included such matters as the suitability of posts for NQTs, the roles and responsibilities of involved parties, and identifying development needs in the school, was not distributed until the end of 1999, although realistically it was needed much earlier.

At the end of the first term NQTs were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the way their school had 'met its obligations so far'. Around a third of the NQTs were 'fully satisfied', with a quarter saying they were 'reasonably satisfied'. However, at this early stage, the remaining proportion of 17% indicates that some expectations were not being met. The NQTs were asked to provide a breakdown of the timescale for aspects of the induction arrangements being set in place (see Table I).

The limited timescale for making the induction arrangements meant that some structures were not in place in the first half-term. For example, only 34% reported receiving support with planning and timetabling prior to the start of the term, and 23% reported no such support during the first half-term. Seventeen% of NQTs were not observed teaching during their first half-term, although it was intended that they should be observed at least once during the first 4 weeks, with a follow-up discussion that is kept on record, and 9% had not had a meeting by half-term.

### **The Reduced Timetable**

A central feature of the induction arrangements was the introduction of non-contact time for NQTs. The orders state that NQTs should be teaching for only 90% of the average for the whole induction period. As a primary teacher would normally be expected to teach 190 days, a 10% reduction represents 19 days over the year or the equivalent of one half-day per week. The TTA's intention was that the NQT would be clearly advised about the arrangements at an early stage of the induction period, and that the reduced timetable would facilitate structured support

throughout the whole of the induction year (TTA, 1999d). The TTA guidance put the responsibility for creating protected release time onto headteachers, stating that:

*some schools may find it preferable to distribute the time available in one or two-day blocks across the year; others may follow a weekly half-day release pattern or distribute the time in single periods across each week. (TTA, 1999a, p. 28)*

The responses indicate that not all NQTs were granted this amount of time away from their teaching commitment. Furthermore, the time allocated was not necessarily being directed towards what would be considered structured professional development. 37% of NQTs did not have the arrangements for their reduced timetable set in place by the start of the first term (see Table II). This figure is echoed in other studies, which reported that a quarter of NQTs (Heaney, 2001) and a fifth of NQTs (Totterdell et al., 2002) did not have a 90% timetable in place during their first term in post. Without doubt, non-contact time represents a culture-shift, which some schools found difficult to accommodate, although OfSTED (2001) and Bubb et al. (2002) have noted that there have been major problems in obtaining supply cover and this may, in part, have contributed to the difficulty.

The reduced timetable was the issue mentioned most by the NQTs who appended comments to their questionnaire. In all, 40% of respondents raised the subject without prompting:

*I feel slightly bitter that I haven't had the chance to take up the reduced timetable, when I asked our deputy head she blithely said; 'you don't seem to need it, you're coping better than an NQT should!' Flattering to the ego but I'd still like some time away from my class!*

*Although the school was well-informed about the 10% time-off, in practice I only had three mornings [in the first term]*

*I think out of the full term I have had about four free periods.*

Reduced timetable put in place	%
At/following the interview	6
By the end of the term preceding post	9
At the beginning of term post started	49
Within (during) first half-term	20
Not set in place within first half-term	17

Table II. Timing of reduced teaching commitments put in place

Clearly, these NQTs were not receiving the stipulated 10% release-time and there was no indication that 'missed' time was expected to be offered at a later date. Being granted 'non-contact time' was not the only concern. Lack of planning and foresight was evident in the handling of reduced timetables. Several comments highlighted a situation where NQTs with scheduled release time were having to plan lessons for the supply teacher covering their class, or were covering the supply teacher's absence at short notice:

*For the majority of time my free time has been cancelled or I have spent so much time explaining what is going on I may as well have stayed and done it myself.*

*So far I have missed 1.5 days of release time but this is due to the supply being ill and so I had to teach. I am in school on my release day and so I taught what I had planned.*

*Although I officially get one session (75 minutes) per week this has often been removed at short notice. Occasionally extra time has been given at short notice after I have planned and prepared the lesson.*

These instances indicate major problems in implementing the reduced timetable during the first term. In addition, references to the non-contact time as 'time-off' or 'free time' implies a lack of awareness about its purpose:

*I am enjoying teaching and everything is going well but I would like to be left alone to get on with it and not [be] wrenched out of my classroom to try to find something to do.*

Few comments reflected professional development opportunities other than the observation of other teachers.

### **Funding**

At a systemic level funding was problematic and it was anticipated that this would be the case. Whilst schools employing NQTs were to be allocated an amount for supply teachers to cover non-contact time during induction, there have certainly been mixed messages about funding which have put unnecessary pressure on NQTs. Illuminating comments on the subject of funding were made by NQTs here:

*We have little SEN help due to the fact that the money which used to be spent on this is now being put towards mine and another NQT's non-contact time. I think this issue was not really addressed.*

*The Induction Year means that NQTs have less chance of attending courses as lots of supply money has been allocated already for NQT time.*

*The school was not aware that NQT time could be 'saved' up and used for courses etc. We were under the impression that it had to be taken every week. I feel this should be clarified in the documentation about the Induction Year.*

*I am receiving 2 lessons/week off timetable although the Head wants to cut this down to 1 a week next term to save money but I am going to fight against this.*

The matter of funding has clearly affected the quality of induction for these teachers and also impacted on other areas in their schools. For instance, in the first quotation, the trade-off between SEN provision and NQT non-contact time puts an unacceptable burden of responsibility on the NQTs for the school budget, and implies pressure to forego non-contact time.

Funding for courses ought to be separate from funding non-contact time for NQTs. Circular 5/99 suggests that NQTs will receive, where appropriate, training development or advice from professionals outside the school, e.g. from other schools, LEAs, Higher Education Institutions (DfEE, 1999). Using the cost of induction as an argument against NQTs attending such courses is counter to the spirit of induction.

### **The Support System**

A further integral component of the induction arrangements was that every NQT should have an induction tutor, named and trained (Williams & Prestage, 2000). The TTA viewed the induction tutor as the designated person who is able to offer professional support, to monitor progress and provide well-founded feedback. However, with many demands on the title and role of 'mentor' in schools, perhaps the TTA and DfEE were justified in allocating an unambiguous and easily identifiable label to the person who should be the NQT's line manager, a senior member of staff or suitably experienced teacher, who has considerable contact with the NQT (DfEE, 1999). It is apparent that the full extent of the role of the 'induction tutor' remains unclear to many involved in the process. In the absence of an established construct for induction tutors and given the plethora of references to the existing mentoring constructs it is understandable that 'mentor' remains in use. For ease of reference 'mentoring' continues to be used to describe the ongoing supportive role that is part of the induction tutor's remit, but other aspects of the role may not sit comfortably with mentoring. This duality is problematic and

there are concerns that monitoring and assessment can even masquerade as support (Tickle, 2000a).

NQTs were asked to rate input from their induction tutor. Around half of the respondents felt it was valuable and, although a further 37% felt it was reasonably useful, 12% felt it was poor. A question was also posed at the year-end questionnaire about their relationship with induction tutors (see Table III).

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)
Have you maintained a good relationship with your tutor over the year?	93	7
Do you feel your induction tutor was adequately trained and prepared for the role?	64	36
Has your induction tutor:		
enthusiastically acted in the mentoring role?	71	29
had supply cover for meetings/admin?	50	50
observed the required number of lessons?	71	29
given constructive/well-informed feedback	93	7

Table III. NQTs' relationship with induction tutors

Some comments indicated satisfaction with what was a minimal level of input from the induction tutors, placing more emphasis on a good interpersonal relationship than skilled support:

*Yes, there has been a friendly atmosphere between us – more as colleagues than tutor and tutee.*

*Yes – not really been any problems (no help though as she didn't have time). We did not have regular formal meetings, but support was always there. We got on very well and have remained good friends.*

Some of the comments in the responses about the mentors' training again indicate the wide range of experiences and expectations:

*[the mentor] started off conscientiously then once I'd apparently 'found my feet' and stopped asking basic questions about resources, lost impetus and was swamped with own work.*

Perhaps the most illuminating response concerns both the relationship, and the training/preparedness of the induction tutor. One respondent indicated that support was both 'reducing over the year' and 'reasonable'. This aptly demonstrates the independence of some NQTs, and at the same time the lack of awareness of the opportunities presented by properly managed induction for both the NQT and the tutor:

*Have maintained a good relationship. I don't see my tutor very much and he did very little for me and the other NQT. However he was always there if we needed him and is a pleasant enough teacher to talk to. I don't think he went to the training, thinking he knew it all already. This did lead to some slight problems about filling in forms.*

Concerns have been raised about the quality and provision of support in schools, and this by definition impacts on induction (Rea & Parkinson, 1999; Bubb, 2000). There is more required than teaching experience:

*effective mentors need to be rather more than good class teachers. The mentor role demands the use of interpersonal and management skills to establish the sound relationships needed to implement a well-planned, appropriately targeted and carefully monitored induction programme. (Nest, 1994, p. 4)*

Existing trained mentors had to decide whether to continue supporting students or take on the responsibility of incoming NQTs. These decisions impacted on Higher Education Institutions finding mentored placements for teacher trainees, a partnership that was already experiencing strain (Hyland & Wood, 1998). There were no publicised accounts of NQTs entering schools without an induction tutor, but there is no way of knowing how many are trained mentors, how many willingly took on the role, and how many had little choice in the matter. There is evidence that in some cases it was tagged onto someone's job. Consequently:

*The new policy also means that actual support for new teachers' learning will, as in the past, depend on the allocation of resources, managerial decisions and mentoring capabilities within individual schools.' (Tickle, 2000b, p. 706)*

In addition to the induction tutor, the support system was intended to include quality assurance through the headteacher, the governing bodies and the LEAs. However, a number of NQTs had little or no contact with the governing body, and were unaware of any involvement on their part in monitoring or supporting the process. The LEA as a professional body had a specific role to play in ensuring that the induction arrangements were under control and of sufficient quality.

Despite the newness of the arrangements, the Governing body and LEA have an obligation when making an appointment, for ensuring that the school is able to provide the monitoring and support needed to prepare the NQT to meet the requirements for the satisfactory completion of the induction period (DfEE, 1999). In the first half-term one-fifth of NQTs were not aware of the LEA contact as stipulated. In the end of year questionnaire, 40% reported no contact with a named advisor:

*Do not know LEA contact or what their job is.*

*I presume he is our school advisor?*

*I didn't know I had one. So ... no contact!*

Of those who had contact it was often an initial letter of introduction with no further input. In a few cases, there were suggestions of constructive contact, with LEA advisors attending observed lessons and visiting schools, but all too often NQTs did not have an opportunity for the process to be regulated or to benefit from advisors' input.

### **Career Entry Profiles**

Another underpinning feature of the induction arrangements was that from 1998 all student teachers completed a Career Entry Profile (CEP) to form a bridge between their initial teacher training and their employment (TTA, 1999e). Again, the concept of a CEP predates the induction consultations and statutory orders and stems from a competence-based performance management ideology. As early as 1991-1992, the idea was piloted by some LEAs (CNAAs, 1993). Following this, the profile had been piloted and adapted in various initiatives before being distributed by the TTA in its present format, which focuses on objectives for development in the induction year (Simco, 1998).

The aims of the profile are to inform prospective employers of areas of strength, priorities for development, and to set and record objectives throughout the induction period (Bleach, 1999; Holmes, 2000). If the CEP is to be a central part of the induction arrangements then it has to be accepted as such by all parties concerned. This was one of the problems raised by the CNAAs (1993), which noted that 'A national system needs to be more than common documents' (p. 5).

The NQTs here received their blank profiles at the end of the PGCE course. As a vehicle for launching teachers' school-based professional development in their induction year of employment and beyond (Bleach, 1999), it was rather late to the launch pad, as most students had already secured employment without it and had put their final teaching practice behind them. The college was not failing in its duty, for the opening sentence of the profile's guidance notes states:

*all providers of ITT have to provide NQTs with a TTA Career Entry Profile when they successfully complete their initial teacher training. Only those who gain QTS receive a Career Entry Profile. (TTA, 1999e, p. 3)*

Consequently, none of the employing schools have sight of the profile prior to the NQT taking up post in September. In many schools, it was unlikely that they would have any knowledge of its existence or purpose other than through the statutory orders for induction. In many cases, the

CEP was not used after an initial reference to it, and in some cases not referred to at all. Many in the sample made comments about not using it:

*I don't think it had any relevance to my teaching. Mine was buried in my cupboard all year and I haven't been asked to refer to it.*

*Rarely looked at – not used so not applicable.*

*We set targets initially in this document but then did not use it at all as all the documentation we needed was on separate sheets.*

Only two respondents said that they had been asked to show the document at interviews or in meetings. Only three responded that the school had completed the tables provided in the supporting overview booklet, which actually provided a sound foundation for the induction programme (TTA, 1999a).

There was a lack of awareness about the place of the CEP within the induction arrangements, a point also noted by OfSTED (2001). This casts doubts on its usefulness as part of a standardised programme aimed to build on the Standards for QTS, certainly in these early stages. The CEP was intended to be an individualised action planner for the induction year, but it was a new and strange entity within schools (Simco, 1998; ATL, 1999). The findings here are in line with those reported by Totterdell et al. (2002), who also found that the CEP was not working as intended and that many of the targets written into CEPs were inappropriate in specific employment contexts.

### **Conclusions**

As stated at the outset, the main aim of this study was to explore the induction of newly qualified teachers following the introduction of statutory arrangements. The intention was to ascertain how effectively the orders were implemented by primary schools, and how the NQTs felt their schools had responded to the orders and to their needs.

All of the sample completed their induction period, except one who resigned during the first term. None of the NQTs were deemed to have 'failed' the induction year and none were considered at risk of failing during the course of the year. This reflects national statistics that show that failing the induction year was a rare occurrence, affecting only about a quarter of 1%. This has subsequently alleviated some of the fears that this cohort had that meeting the induction standards would be challenging.

The key findings of this study can be summarised thus:

Many schools employed NQTs without being aware of the induction requirements and did not all have basic arrangements in place when

the induction period started. These basic arrangements included non-contact time, supporting documentation, trained induction tutors, named LEA contact, planning and timetabling support, monitoring and professional development arrangements. There was essentially too little time for schools to prepare for the induction requirements.

The provision of a reduced timetable was inconsistent and did not always meet the minimum requirements of the orders. Suitable professional development opportunities were not always negotiated for the non-contact time. Larger schools, which had experience with students, provided the most structured support. Some NQTs mainly used non-contact time for marking and planning, which concurs with Ofsted's (2001) findings. There was insufficient awareness in some schools and amongst some NQTs of the purpose or value of a reduced timetable for professional development.

Funding arrangements were not always divulged to NQTs and it is not clear how adequate the actual funding was to cover costs. Some LEAs provided more funding than others. Some NQTs felt pressured to minimise the cost to the school of their induction. There was little guidance about what the funding should be used for, and whether the budget was to include courses that NQTs were entitled to attend. There was no specific budget for induction tutor training and supply cover, although the government expected personnel to be trained and sufficiently prepared.

Induction tutors were provided for the majority of NQTs at or near the beginning of the induction period. However, the role was interpreted in different ways and the quality of provision varied markedly between schools. Two-thirds of the responses indicated that tutors were not adequately trained and prepared. Most NQTs valued the relationship with the tutor, even if the quality of support was questionable. Headteachers and deputy heads frequently took the role despite the need for independent overseeing of the process and the long-standing recommendation that mentors should not also be evaluators (Turner, 1993).

Career Entry Profiles were little-used, either at interviews or as part of the induction process. Neither the schools nor the NQTs attached much importance to the profile and did not recognise it as central to the transition from student to teacher. The requirement to keep copies of induction documentation does not seem to have been extended to CEPs and targets from ITT were of questionable relevance. No links had been made between CEPs, threshold assessment and performance

management, despite the emerging common requirement of establishing evidence portfolios for future performance or salary assessments.

Overall, it can be seen that the experience of the induction year was less than ideal for this group of NQTs, and the marked variation in the quality of provision reported here is in line with other studies (e.g. Bubb, 2000; Bubb et al, 2002; Totterdell et al, 2002). There were obviously issues surrounding the fact that this particular cohort was the first year-group to be subject to the orders, but the preliminary findings of ATL's second-year survey revealed similar concerns to those of the first year (ATL, 2001). However, unique to the first year was the timescale of implementation. The late publication of documentation contributed to a feeling that the arrangements were being rushed through and that involved parties were unprepared. The NQTs began their ITT with no knowledge that there would be further conditions attached to gaining full teacher status. Completing the PGCE brought QTS for this cohort, but the additional requirement of completing induction in order to teach in state schools came in at the end of their training.

The timescale for obtaining guidance and implementing the orders was found in the research to be an unacceptable. With any new initiative there will be teething problems, but a period of sufficient preparation should have been allowed for any serious problems to emerge, before such an important initiative was ratified. This did not happen with the induction arrangements; problems that had emerged in pilot-schemes and research studies were largely ignored, and necessary documentation followed the NQTs into schools so that there was no time to assimilate the orders (Williams & Prestage, 2000). Notwithstanding the organisational implications, it is not possible to say if during this first year individual schools adjusted the expectations of NQTs in line with the lack of guidance or exactly how the standards were to be uniformly implemented, but on paper all NQTs were intended to meet the same rigorous standards to complete induction successfully. Interpretation of the orders was all too frequently delegated to untrained and overburdened colleagues, many of whom were unfamiliar with the standards for QTS. Inconsistencies in interpretation were inevitable, as were levels of preparedness.

The research in this study highlighted the experiences in the first year following the orders, but it cannot, however, be assumed that subsequent cohorts will be entering schools that are prepared and fully aware of the requirements once the arrangements are established. Only schools that have employed an NQT since 1999 will be familiar with the orders and may have concluded the experience without adequate reflection of its value for the NQT and the school. Familiarity with the requirements will not guarantee quality induction, although it will be a step forward. There will be issues about whether induction tutors

continue for subsequent NQTs; or if the role is attached to career development and becomes a vehicle for promotion in the school hierarchy. Induction matters will inevitably be subject to other school organisation constraints. Many questions remain unanswered. How far will schools be prepared to go in securing training for induction tutors if it has to be funded through the school improvement budget? Some schools will find that they have allocated time and resources to developing an induction programme that is not required in subsequent years. They and others may be unwilling to train staff, both tutors and NQTs, who can relocate or leave teaching altogether shortly afterwards. In this respect, issues concerning the investment and practicalities of implementing the orders in diverse circumstances have been neglected.

Additionally, for NQTs there is more involved here than simply 'surviving' a year in the classroom. Induction needs to be part of a new culture of teacher professionalisation and this is what new entrants will expect. In some quarters there is excitement and optimism about the future of education, with new technology, lifelong learning and developing career opportunities (Day, 1999; Tickle, 2000a). Unfortunately, at the same time, there exists in parallel a cynicism and negativity about teaching, caused in the main by an historic overload of ill-conceived initiatives and perceived deskilling of the teaching role. Into this context has come statutory induction.

NQTs deserve to have the best possible start to their career, and it has been argued that doing so through high quality induction can also help address problems of teacher recruitment and retention (Menter et al., 2002). Although the induction arrangements purport to ensure this occurs, a more secure infrastructure needs to be in place for motivated and qualified inductees to develop reflective practices, teaching skills and professional qualities, through the support and guidance of equally motivated and qualified professional colleagues. Whilst this is no doubt happening in some settings, it is not guaranteed for all NQTs. Quality assurance of the induction process has to be accountable, with monitoring and transparency, so that equality of opportunity, of the highest quality, is available to all NQTs. In the first year, the checking mechanisms were falling short of what should have been expected, and were certainly not acting to promote high-quality induction experiences. New teachers need to have their skills and potential recognised whilst benefiting from the wisdom and experience of colleagues and the protection of higher bodies. The present climate presents a dilemma, for with teacher shortages widespread, newly qualified teachers have become a valuable commodity. However, teacher shortages also threaten the efficacy of induction programmes that rely on good management, training, and fellow-teachers' time and goodwill. Attracting graduates into teacher training may not prove to be enough to retain them in teaching if

the wider issues epitomised by the haphazard implementation of the induction arrangements are not addressed.

*Correspondence*

Chris Kyriacou, Department of Educational Studies, University of York,  
York YO10 5DD, United Kingdom (ck1@york.ac.uk).

**References**

- ATL (1999) *Induction – Bridge or Barrier?* London: ATL.
- ATL (2001) *A Survey of the Induction Arrangements: 2000 and 2001.* London: ATL.
- Bleach, K. (1999) *The Induction and Mentoring of Newly Qualified Teachers.* London: David Fulton.
- Bubb, S. (2000) *Statutory Induction – a Fair Deal for All?* Viewpoint no. 12. London: University of London, Institute of Education.
- Bubb, S., Heilbronn, R., Jones, C., Totterdell, M. & Bailey, M. (2002) *Improving Induction: research-based best practice for schools.* London: Routledge Falmer.
- CNAAB (1993) *Continuity Between Initial Training and Induction in Education: sharing roles in assessing professional practice.* London: CNAAB.
- Day, C. (1999) *Developing Teachers: the challenges of lifelong learning.* London: Falmer Press.
- DFE (1992) *Induction for Newly Qualified Teachers, Administrative Memorandum 5/92.* London: HMSO.
- DfEE (1999) *The Induction Period for Newly Qualified Teachers, Circular 5/99.* London: DfEE.
- Heaney, S. (2001) *Experience of Induction in One Local Educational Authority, Mentoring and Tutoring, 9, pp. 241-254.*
- Holmes, E. (2000) *Handbook for Newly Qualified Teachers: the definitive guide to your first year of teaching, 2nd edn.* London: Stationery Office.
- Hyland, R. & Wood, G. (1998) *Changing Teacher Education – Genuine Partnership or Arranged Marriage?* in C. Richards, N. Simco & S. Twiselton, S. (Eds) *Primary Teacher Education: high status? high standards?* London: Falmer Press.
- Menter, I., Hutchings, M. & Ross, A. (Eds) (2002) *The Crisis in Teacher Supply: research and strategies for retention.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.
- Nest, T. (1994) *Training of Mentors of NQTs and the Effects on the Induction of NQTs in Primary Schools in Walsall LEA.* Wolverhampton: University of Wolverhampton Educational Research Unit
- OfSTED (2001) *The Induction of Newly Qualified Teachers: implementation of DfEE circular 5/99.* London: OfSTED.

- Rea, J. & Parkinson, A. (1999) Trainee Teachers' Perceptions of their Profession, *Journal of In-service Education*, 25, pp. 151-160.
- Simco, N. (1998) The Induction of New Teachers: the road to high status and high standards? in C. Richards, N. Simco, & S. Twiselton (Eds) *Primary Teacher Education: high status? high standards?* London: Falmer Press.
- Tickle, L. (2000a) *Teacher Induction: the way ahead*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Tickle, L. (2000b) Teacher Probation Resurrected: England 1999-2000, *Journal of Education Policy*, 15, pp. 701-713.
- Totterdell, M., Heilbronn, R., Bubb, S. & Jones, C. (2002) Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Statutory Arrangements for the Induction of Newly Qualified Teachers, Research Report, no. 338. London: DfES.
- TTA (1999a) *Supporting Induction for Newly Qualified Teachers, Part 1: overview*. London: TTA.
- TTA (1999b) *Supporting Induction for Newly Qualified Teachers, Part 2: support and monitoring*. London: TTA
- TTA (1999c) *Supporting Induction for Newly Qualified Teachers, Part 3: assessment*. London: TTA.
- TTA (1999d) *Supporting Induction for Newly Qualified Teachers, Part 4: quality assurance*. London: TTA.
- TTA (1999e) *Career Entry Profile for Newly Qualified Teachers*. London: TTA.
- Turner, M. (1993) The Role of Mentors and Teacher Tutors in School-based Teacher Education and Induction, *British Journal of In-service Education*, 19, pp. 36-45.
- Williams, A. & Prestage, S. (2000) *Still in at the Deep End? Developing Strategies for the Induction of New Teachers*. London: ATL.