

Teacher Development- Lit Review

Personal	Institution	Ages and Stages	Stalwarts, cynics and sceptics	
<p>My own position on teacher development is therefore closely associated with basic principles of what for me stands at the heart of teaching. This has roots in my own experiences of teachers and teaching, and reference points in particular theoretical traditions (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 1).</p>	<p>As Waller (1932) recognized, this institutional life of schooling makes the teacher as much as it makes the student (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 2).</p>	<p>I have come to understand over time that the teachers who taught me were not personally unskilled or uncaring, but people of a particular time and place, shaped and constrained as much by the structures and traditions of secondary schooling as were their students (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 1).</p>	<p>It therefore became increasingly important for me to work with teachers from a standpoint of understanding rather than one of condemnation, and to do so with all kinds of teachers; not just enthusiastic innovators or exemplary teachers in exemplary schools but stalwarts, cynics and sceptics as well (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 2).</p>	<p>By broadening the range of teachers with whom I work, to include even diffident (modest or shy because of a lack of self-confidence) and disagreeable ones, I have often been surprised. This has been good for my own learning and often confounded or created problems for claims about teacher development that prevailed in the literature (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 2).</p>
<p>Furthermore, many dominant frameworks in developmental literature do not address how power structures and personal experience intersect in identity formation processes (Velez and Spencer, 2018, 76).</p>	<p>The perspective of symbolic interactionism helps clarify why teachers (and others) do what they do. Built upon the work of George Hebert Mead (1934) and developed extensively by Herbert Blumer (1969) and others, symbolic interactionism addresses how people's selves are</p>	<p>Symbolic interactionism also points to the importance of shared cultures of teaching, common beliefs and perceptions among subgroups of teachers rooted in different subjects or sectors that develop in response to commonly faced problems, and provide ready made solutions</p>	<p>It helps us to see how less-than-perfect teacher actions are, in fact, rational, strategic responses to everyday, yet often overwhelming constraints on teachers' workplaces (Hargreaves, 1978; Woods, 1979 as cited by Hargreaves, 1994, p. 3).</p>	<p>Such perspectives, teachers realized, were related to , among other things, individual insecurities, hidden agendas, variation in educational ideologies, variation in role responsibilities and sensitivity to the public (Blasé, 1988, p. 130).</p>

Teacher Development- Lit Review

	formed and transformed through the meanings and language (symbols) of human interactions (Woods, 1992 as cited by Hargreaves, 1994, p. 2-3).	and sources of learning for new entrants to the occupation (Hargreaves, 1986; D. Hargreaves, 1980, Lacey, 1977 as cited by Hargreaves, 1994, p. 3).		Consequently, teachers made significant behavioral and attitudinal adjustments to others (Blasé, 1988, p. 130).
Broadly speaking, teachers worked to manufacture a political self based on two sets of considerations: protection (the need to protect oneself from others) and power (the need to proactively influence others) (Blasé, 1988, p. 130-131).	The school administration clearly was responsive to this dominant group of parents (Blasé, 1988, p. 130).	Lastly, symbolic interactionism alerts us to patterned human differences among teachers in terms of such things as age and career stage (Becker, 1952; Sikes, Measor and Woods, 1985; Riseborough, 1981; Huberman, 1993 as cited by Hargreaves, 1994, p. 3).	Teachers learned that their actions were frequently misunderstood and subject to dramatic distortion as personal and professional information about them was interpreted from diverse perspectives in the school and community (Blasé, 1988, p. 130).	Many teachers, for example, felt that they worked in a ‘fish bowl [and were] constantly being scrutinized’ and that people associated with schools (particularly parents) ‘react very strongly to little things’ (Blasé, 1988, p. 130).