



## The generative temporality of teaching under revision

Scott Eacott & Kimbalee Hodges

**To cite this article:** Scott Eacott & Kimbalee Hodges (2014) The generative temporality of teaching under revision, *Critical Studies in Education*, 55:3, 289-302, DOI: [10.1080/17508487.2014.922488](https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2014.922488)

**To link to this article:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2014.922488>



Published online: 05 Jun 2014.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 292



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

## The generative temporality of teaching under revision

Scott Eacott<sup>a\*</sup> and Kimbalee Hodges<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Faculty of Education and Arts, Australian Catholic University, North Sydney, Australia;* <sup>b</sup>*School of Education, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia*

*(Received 9 August 2013; accepted 6 May 2014)*

What we have come to understand as education has a temporal dimension: the school year, progression based on time, timetables, and so on. Similarly, our understanding of teaching is framed by temporality, primarily through salary structures and an implicit coupling of performance with time in the field. We argue that this underlying generative temporality is under revision. This revision is taking place through policy moves such as the professional standards agenda, which unlike salary structures (at least current ones) privilege demonstrable performance over tenure. Such a revision places time not as an external measure in which events and practices take place, but as the very core of such practices and events. Taking stimulus from the role of work-integrated learning within initial teacher education, we engage with this revision of temporality in education. With increasing attention being paid to temporality in scholarship across a number of disciplines, there has arguably never been a more appropriate opportunity to engage with the temporality of teaching.

**Keywords:** temporality; teachers' work and identities; teacher education; educational policy; higher education

### Introduction

Work-integrated learning is a key feature of professional degrees at many, if not all, universities worldwide. The terms 'work-integrated' or 'work-based' learning, 'clinical placement' and their numerous facsimiles are synonymous with attempts to effortlessly blend the constructed binary of theory and practice in tertiary education. Specifically, work-integrated learning is implemented by universities aiming for graduates to experience 'theory in practice'<sup>1</sup> by the time they complete their studies (Orrell, 2004). We see 'work-integrated learning' as including a breadth of activities, including but not exclusively, practicum placements, volunteering and outreach programs, fieldwork visits, shadowing/observations and other opportunities for higher education students to participate in profession-based activities. With an increasing demand for graduates who are 'work-place ready', particularly within an increasingly globalised community (Cooper, Orrell, & Bowden, 2010), it is hardly surprising that work-integrated learning has been applied to a substantial number of university professional degree programs, including nursing and other health professions, social work and education degrees (Atputhasamy, 2005).

In this theoretical article, we argue that the privileging of 'experience' and legitimatisation of 'time in the field' has been a defining feature of work-integrated learning in initial teacher education degrees. That is, the notion of time – or more specifically, a

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: [Scott.Eacott@acu.edu.au](mailto:Scott.Eacott@acu.edu.au)

theory of temporality – is not external to the work of educating but performs it. In doing so, this article fits within a temporal turn in contemporary scholarship. The increasing attention to temporality can be witnessed in sociology (Adkins, 2011; Snyder, 2013), human services (Colley, Henriksson, Niemeyer, & Seddon, 2012), education (Duncheon & Tierney, 2013) and educational leadership (Eacott, 2013). Mobilising temporality, as opposed to just time, historicises action without a need to prescribe a past–present–future model of reality. This challenges mainstream developmental thinking by breaking down the underlying generative linear progress that explicitly links experience with performance. Therefore, to understand the dynamics of work-integrated learning, that bridge between initial teacher education and the profession, we need not only in-depth ethnographic narratives or sophisticated models, but an appropriate theory of time. Such a move is timely as the current expansion of the professional standards movement is explicitly challenging hegemonic discourses by privileging performance over tenure. Put more simply, the professional standards agenda has placed the underlying generative temporality of teaching under revision. While building what is essentially a theoretical argument, empirically we draw from the practicum placement guidebooks and related policies from an Australian university. The data generated from these empirical artefacts adds to our engagement with the large-scale theoretical problem of the legitimisation of the social world through an investigation of an empirical manifestation of the socialisation and enculturation of pre-service teachers. Through the privileging of the theoretical problem, it is possible to illuminate many of the ways existing discourses came into being legitimised and highlight a number of the tensions that exist currently. In other words, our attention is on how work-integrated learning is shaped by and shaping of the contemporary conditions of the profession.

### Theoretical resources

This article explicitly fuses multiple analytical frames under the *relational* approach to scholarship in educational leadership, management and administration, which is advanced in this article and elsewhere by our lead author (Eacott, [forthcoming](#)). The intellectual heritage of this *relational* approach is eclectic, drawing heavily on French social theory such as the critical sociology of Pierre Bourdieu and the pragmatic sociology of Luc Boltanski, but also critical management studies, political science, organisational studies and, given our own disciplinary location, recognised educational administration thinkers such as Richard Bates, Colin Evers and Gabriele Lakomski, Thomas Greenfield, and contemporaries such as Helen Gunter, Pat Thomson, John Smyth and Fenwick English. Centrally, in bringing critical pluralism to scholarship, this *relational* approach engages with the key theoretical problem of the legitimation of the social world and its empirical manifestation in the administration of education. Through this theoretical and empirical focus, the *relational* research program investigates how the production of knowledge about the legitimacy, effectiveness, efficiency and morality of administration connects with the practices of administration. In doing so, questions are raised regarding the extent to which existing ways of thinking are generative or limiting of alternate ways of being. A *relational* focus enables scholarship to move beyond internal tensions and external pressures by opening up institutions and engaging with the dynamic relations that they hold with other social institutions and those which constantly redefine their very existence. As a means of bringing this *relational* approach into conversation with work-integrated learning, we list below five key features:

- The centrality of ‘administration’ in the social world creates an ontological complicity that makes it difficult to epistemologically break from our spontaneous understanding of the social world.
- Rigorous social ‘scientific’ scholarship would therefore call into question the very foundations on which the contemporarily popular discourses are constructed.
- The contemporary social condition cannot be separated from the ongoing, and inexhaustible, recasting of administrative labour.
- Studying administration ‘relationally’ enables the overcoming of the contemporary, and arguably enduring, tensions of individualism/collectivism and structure/agency.
- In doing so, there is a productive – rather than merely critical – space to theorise administration.

While this set of theoretical resources is aimed at educational administration (or arguably administration writ large), they are equally applicable to ‘teaching’ and, in particular, the transition from pre-service to in-service teacher. Although management is primarily concerned with manipulation – not necessarily in a negative sense – of people, places, behaviours, and so on, administration is more centrally concerned with the social order and the organisation of groups and social institutions. Work-integrated learning, while serving many purposes, is arguably a key event in the establishment and ongoing maintenance of the social order of the teaching profession. If, as we argue in this article, the temporality of teaching is under revision, then a *relational* approach that pays attention to temporality and spatiality provides a (not *the*) means of bringing to the level of discourse the underlying generative features of teaching – those which both actively and passively shape the contemporary conditions.

The type of analysis made possible by a *relational* approach offers a means of crafting theoretically charged narratives illuminating the situated nature of administration. Struggles for legitimacy are at the very core of institutions (Barley, 2008). Social institutions, particularly modern institutions such as education, are the configuration of individual actors in a particular socio-geographic space. As such, groups are an epistemic construction as much, if not more so, than an empirical reality. While individual actors exist in the empirical, it is the epistemic classification of groups on the basis of a particular attribute (which could include physical locality but more often location in a social hierarchy) that gives rise to institutions. In addition, administrative analysis is frequently based on an underlying generative assumption that this collection of individuals operate as a coherent whole. However, we, as with many others, argue that such configurations of individuals in a particular time and space are dynamic contested terrains. The binding attributes of institutions, as social groupings, are performative in the sense that they only exist in practice and cannot be solely reduced to particular structural arrangements of the empirical. The binds that hold a group of individual actors together in the form of a social institution are therefore problematic, active and, by virtue of these qualities, fragile.

The work of institutional actors is the ongoing construction of the social world through the embedding and embodying of it with meaning centred on what is legitimate. Therefore, change in institutions can only take place through shifts in the logics whereby legitimacy is assessed, or, in other words, shifts in the standards whereby alternatives are deemed to be appropriate. For the purpose of this article – arguing that the underlying temporality of teaching is under revision – a *relational* approach provides an analytical lens for interrogating the moment-to-moment social relations that define the power-laden relations of work-integrated learning. Specifically, this *relational* approach opens up analysis that brings to the level of discourse the underlying generative features of

practices. In doing so, this approach provides a means of constructing an alternate narrative or logic whereby the legitimacy of what it means to be a teacher is defined.

### **Theory as method**

We take methodology to be the enactment of our theoretical resources through method. Therefore, we have structured the article to reflect the key features of the *relational* approach. This is not to suggest that each section of the article directly aligns with the five features of the *relational* research program listed previously, as such artificial partitioning is neither consistent with our approach nor particularly helpful. Rather, we work our way through the theoretical problem of the legitimation of the social world and its empirical manifestation in the construction and maintenance of the contemporary condition of work-integrated learning in initial teacher education programs.

To achieve our purpose, there is a need to interrogate the discourses of the profession that establish and sustain the social position of actors and their ability to exert force – even if symbolic – on the legitimacy of practice. With our empirical focus on the relations between the pre-service teacher and the profession, most notably in-service teachers, the language of university guidebooks is our focal empirical artefact. We generate data from the practicum guidebooks from a single Australian university that offers numerous teaching degrees with embedded work-integrated learning. Across the 4-year initial teacher education programs, students are required to undertake three blocks of work-integrated learning: 20 days in the second and third year; and a 50 day (unpaid) internship during the final year of the degree. Additional opportunities for work-integrated learning are provided through outreach programs and volunteering in local schools, early childhood centres and homework centres. The number of days in the field undertaking formal work-integrated learning placements (90 days) is above the minimum requirement of 80 days as articulated by the accrediting New South Wales Institute of Teachers (NSWIT, 2005) for a 4-year undergraduate degree.<sup>2</sup> Inherent to the work-integrated learning placement is the concept of supervision. During these placements, the pre-service teacher is required to be supervised by an appropriately qualified and experienced co-operating teacher. This co-operating teacher is responsible for assessing the competency of the pre-service teacher against the NSWIT Graduate Teacher standards (which align with the National standards, but with states/territories constitutionally responsible for education, exist at a state level). We applied a strategic sampling approach to identify two primary (elementary) teaching degree guidebooks and two secondary teaching guidebooks, representative of second/third year practicums and the final year internship.

In analysing the guidebooks, and consistent with our theoretical resources, we systematically read through the guidebooks highlighting the use of temporal words (e.g. experience, time, service, development). These words/phrases were then subject to analysis of their referential space (e.g. field, school, and those demarcating university and non-university locations) and in relation to their affiliation with temporality, notably ‘clock’ or ‘event’ time (see Adkins, 2009). It is through the coming together of this constructed narrative of the empirical and our theoretical resources that we have generated this article. Our argument is built upon two markers: first, challenging the foundational basis of the teaching profession on experience in the field, or more specifically, the coupling of performance with experience; and second, conceptualising work-integrated learning through a theorisation of ‘event’ – opposed to ‘clock’ – time. In doing so, we make no claims to have generated a universal, in both time and space, theoretical articulation of the generative temporality of teaching – if such a prospect is even possible. Rather, we offer a

theorisation of the temporality of teaching that is consistent with the data we have called upon and coherent with the time and space in which it was crafted. This is not to say that our work does not hold up in other locations, but this is more a task for other papers and scholars than it is for this article. The work of others may support our argument, add to it, or even discredit it, but that is part of the intellectual trajectory of generating alternate ideas for hegemonic discourses.

### Theorising relations and temporality

The distinction between a ‘pre-service’ and ‘co-operating’ teacher in discourses of work-integrated learning are relatively unquestioned in the language of the everyday. This is primarily built on the underlying generative principles of the master-apprentice mindset of education and educating. We seek to explicitly trouble this common sense mobilisation of the terms and how it plays out in the relations between two defined actors. For us, educators, be they pre-service or in-service, are both embedded and embody the contemporary conditions of the profession.

Our first task is to move beyond the ontological complicity<sup>3</sup> of perceiving performance, or expertise, as based on tenure. In breaking with everyday discourses and explicitly engaging with the theoretical problematic of the legitimisation of the social world, rather than focus on the interconnected and interrelated *relationship* of the pre-service and co-operating teachers, we strip back the constructs to the core dynamic of ‘relations’. In doing so, we move from attempting to map concrete ties and chains of interaction between individuals/organisations (as is the case often with network theorists), to a sociologically charged approach focused on ‘the abstract systems of difference and distance in fields and social spaces on the basis of capital possession’ (Atkinson, 2012, p. 171). This move forces us to engage with questions regarding the notion of temporality, most specifically, the tension between ‘event time’ and ‘clock time’. As our lead author has argued elsewhere:

What we have come to know as the school and the administration of schooling is constituted through the operationalization and privileging of clock time. The temporal rules of schooling construct the school day, terms, semesters, the school year, class schedules and the notion of progression based on time. (Eacott, 2013, p. 96)

The hegemonic position on time and temporality in education is its measurement in terms of an abstraction, separate from events and reversible through units of the clock (see Adkins, 2009, 2011). As Bourdieu (2000 [1997]) notes, reinforced through ordinary language, time is constituted as a thing, something that an individual or institution has, gains, or wastes. In contrast, within a *relational* approach, it is event time that constitutes the pre-service and co-operating teacher relations. Adkins (2009) argues that in breaking with a view that sees time as an object that operates externally to agents, it is possible to consider temporal points of view from the acting agents. Thus, within this break, the relations in question are no longer perceived with defined boundaries (e.g. past, present, future). To do so, we argue that actors must be conceptually removed from their everyday language identified roles, (e.g. pre-service and co-operating teachers), and instead be viewed through the relations they hold with one another and institutions in a particular time and space. This means that social activity is not viewed or mapped using measurable units of the clock but rather as actions taking place in relation to other actions. These relations are reflective of the various dynamics underway in the social space. This is a key

distinction from mainstream discourses of teacher education and work-integrated learning, which remain wedded to essentialised categories based on a pre-determined roles and the separation of temporality from action. Privileging event time means accepting that temporality does not exist separate to action but is action.

Work-integrated learning, and in particular the practicum, as the conduit between initial teacher education and full membership of the profession, is a central means of establishing and sustaining the rules and rates of exchange within the social space. This is central to the reproduction of the status quo within and across social groups. The distinction between a pre-service and co-operating teacher is an explicit example of the unequal endowment in the social space. This is made explicit in the statement – present in each and every guidebook – that pre-service teachers should use the feedback given by the inherently more *experienced* co-operating teacher. This constructs a distinction between the two actors based on experience in the field. This is not strictly an empirical distinction based on performance or knowledge, but rather a relative one. Understandably, by the very nature of work-integrated learning, one actor (the co-operating teacher) will always possess the experience in the field, and the other will not. As a result, if we are to work on the assumption that the work-integrated learning of the initial teacher education program is the primary means of socialisation into the profession, then the explicit distinction between established and new actors on the basis of time is significant. The legitimacy given to the co-operating teacher – both their practice and counsel – is based not on their demonstrated expertise or standing within the profession (although this is assumed by the placing university), but rather their time in the field. Such practices have over time, and infused with a common-sense logic that is difficult to refute, led to a complicity in the way individuals and collectives (both within and beyond education) come to see and understand teaching. Our argument therefore is centred on the generative features of time in the field and its role in the constitution and legitimation of what it means to be a teacher.

The labelling of the *pre-service* teacher does specific work around the naming of actors and the defining, instituting and constituting of their role and position in the social space. The ‘Teacher Education Rationale’ section of each guidebook stresses the importance of ‘field experiences’. For example, on page 4 of each guidebook, there is a statement that argues for the validity of time spent in the field and its distinction above other forms of learning:

The things which pre-service teachers learn through school placement *can only be learnt in field* contexts. (emphasis added)

While the intent of this statement may be around the contextualised nature of learning, it invariably de-legitimises learning that takes place at university – an interesting point given that it is an official university document. Although a rather innocuous example on which to base such a claim, when taken in combination with broader discourses of the need for more time in the field during initial teacher education and the legitimation of time in the field linked to expertise, such statements are not neutral. The underlying – if not overt – generative principle is further embedded within the ‘Professional experience sequence’ where it explicitly states the focus of each practicum against the NSWIT professional standards (see Table 1). While this progression – both the sequence itself and the standards – are evidence of a developmental mode of thinking, there is also a subtle shift that involves the coupling of time in the field with performance. Unlike past conceptualisations of teaching where salary and career progression were based on tenure, the contemporary standards movement is designed to reward performance irrespective of

Table 1. Professional experience sequence against NSWIT professional standards.

Year of study	Days in the field		
	20	40	90
1			
2	Initial evidence of all NSWIT elements and aspects		
3		Continuing evidence of all NSWIT elements and aspects	
4			Final evidence of all NSWIT elements and aspects

length of service. That being said, the operationalisation of graduate teacher standards – infused with a developmental logic built upon clock time – over the practicum guidebooks explicitly couples performance with days in the field.<sup>4</sup> If this were not so, it would be possible for a pre-service teacher to demonstrate the necessary skills, knowledge and attitudes during the initial second year placement. In that case, the next two placements would be redundant. However, concurrently, accrediting policy requires a minimum of 80 days of work-integrated learning in a 4-year initial teacher education program. Therefore, even if it were possible to demonstrate the graduate teacher standards on day one, policy requires that pre-service teachers spend more time in the field. In the case of the sample university, this privileging of time in the field is further evidenced in the additional 10 days allocated to field placements above accreditation requirements. This costly exercise – as co-operating teachers are paid for their contribution to the education/mentoring of pre-service teachers – is readily accepted by universities as the value of work-integrated learning is well recognised and unquestioned.

Beyond the sector, the provision of greater than the minimum number of days in the field is recognised as an inherently good thing in professional programs. Policymakers and practitioners alike increasingly tout work-integrated learning as a key component – if not ‘the most important’ component of – initial teacher education (Anderson & Stillman, 2013). That is, while the pre-service teacher, and broader members of society, lack the ‘experience’ and/or ‘expertise’ in the field of the co-operating teacher (and any teacher for that matter), they recognise the legitimacy of time in the field and therefore lend their complicity to the affirmation of its legitimacy. Thus, the dominant group (in-service teachers) have determined the legitimate way of being a teacher, which they themselves embody, and without explicitly requiring it to be spoken, others accept it as a proxy for performance. As Samaras and Gismondi (1998) argue, existing (in-service) teachers believe that knowledge about teaching comes from being absorbed in a teaching community, and the culture of teaching is achieved through participation in the culture of practice. The immersion within the profession generated by work-integrated learning and legitimised through guidebooks provides the opportunity for pre-service teachers to appropriate the existing cultures of the teaching profession. What we see is the production and reproduction of a set of relations between temporality and performance. Therefore, pre-service teachers, as with in-service teachers, are not merely subjects of these practices, but actually perform them. That is, as a profession, teachers are both embedded and embody this legitimacy of experience.

### A Temporal profession

Our focus is on the very social construction from which the notion of the teaching profession is built. This is more than some abstract intellectual curiosity. As Bourdieu (1985) argues, one cannot conduct a science of classification (e.g. ‘pre-service’ or ‘in-service’ teacher) without engaging with the struggle of the original classification. At a point in time when initial teacher education programs/providers are under pressure to provide more time-intensive and high-quality work-integrated learning (Anderson & Stillman, 2013) and the contemporarily popular claim that teacher quality is the single most significant school-based factor in improving student outcomes (see: Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), theorisations that illuminate the underlying generative features of the teaching profession are invaluable in constructing a productive discussion about education. Importantly, we see the notion of the teaching profession having an essential temporal dimension.

The accumulation of legitimacy – or arguably status – in the profession takes time. This is why status is often, but not always, linked with tenure. More importantly, as we have argued thus far, the distance/s between actors in the social space (e.g. pre-service and co-operating teacher) are measured in (clock) time or temporal gaps. This is evident in career structures that are framed around an objective trajectory of ‘steps’. For example, the current salary structure for NSW public school teachers has 13 steps (although a 4-year degree – the current minimum qualification – starts at Step 5) with promotion positions (e.g. Assistant Principal/Head of Department, Deputy Principal, Principal) sitting above. Significantly, the *Crown Employees (Teachers in Schools and Related Employees) Salaries and Conditions Award 2009* cites:

6.1 An officer shall be entitled to progress along or be maintained on the common incremental salary scale or the salary level for a promotions position after each 12 months of service subject to the officer demonstrating by means of an annual review, continuing efficiency in teaching practice, satisfactory performance and professional growth.

Time in the field, that is, the participation and performance by members of the rituals, ceremonies, meetings and displays is the most necessary condition for the accumulation of the legitimacy or reputational status required for professional worthiness. It also comes with the implicit construction of a normal (biological and/or career) age of access. For example, current data shows that it takes on average 15–20 years of service before an educator is successful in acquiring their first leadership post (McKenzie, Rowley, Weldon, & Murphy, 2011). This brings to the fore a significant challenge for the profession, signposted by two key concerns: first, the workforce profile of education; and second, the integration of professional standards.

If workforce profiling data is accurate, there is an impending mass exodus of educators sometime in the next decade. There is some nuancing in relation to this potential mass exodus that is rarely engaged with, at least in campaigns by teacher unions. Using the New South Wales public school system as an example, data presented in the NSW Department of Education and Communities 2012 Workforce Plan<sup>5</sup> shows some 37,071 teachers on the employment waiting list, with 21,237 of those for primary schools. While there are certain curriculum areas where there are fewer teachers on the waiting list (e.g. secondary mathematics and science), there are clearly more trained teachers than there are positions. The issue around the mass exodus has less to do with the number of staff filling positions and more concern with a possible reduction in the experience gap – especially if coupled with performance – between pre-service and in-service teachers. Any such

reduction in this gap will arguably result in the temporal hierarchy of the profession coming under revision. The Workforce Plans states that the average public school (both primary and secondary) teacher is 46 years old and has served in the department for 15 years. Similar data was generated in the *Staff in Australian Schools* survey conducted by the Australian Council for Educational Research and colleagues (see: McKenzie et al., 2011) and in the similar work conducted in the United States (RATE IV, 1990 cited in Atputhasamy, 2005). Any shift in the demographic profile of teachers, and by virtue potential co-operating teachers, especially one that reduces the gap of tenure between the pre-service and co-operating teacher will recast the temporal dimensions of the profession. At the case study institution the professional placement policy states:

... placement agency supervisors [co-operating teachers] are professionals in the field preferably with at least two years of professional experience, or an appropriate level of equivalent clinical/professional/industrial experience.

While this policy is an institutional one, and therefore covers a range of disciplines (e.g. social work, nursing, education), it explicitly foregrounds time in the field over performance. This is consistent with the ontological complicity of seeing the world through hegemonic discourses. It also highlights the difficulties in over-coming, or proposing alternatives to, the spontaneous understandings of the social world. If we see a major shift in the demographics of the teaching profession, which does remain in question, a significant reduction in the length of service between the pre-service and co-operating teacher may serve to de-couple notions of experience and performance, and in doing so challenging the foundations of a temporal profession. The current professional standards agenda is already doing work in this space. For example, the internship guidebook states:

The *experience and expertise* of the co-operating teacher will be crucial in helping pre-service teachers provide evidence of attaining the elements and aspects. (emphasis added)

The structure of the professional standards framework still embodies a temporal dimension with certain time periods set before applying for the next level and/or the expectation that evidence demonstrating higher levels of performance is displayed over a period of (clock) time. However, the career stages of graduate (the most explicit temporal level), proficient, highly accomplished and lead teacher (see the National Professional Standards for Teachers, <http://www.teacherstandards.aitsl.edu.au/>) are linked to performance. There is a common sense and empirically defensible argument in support of the revision of teaching from a profession based on experience to on about performance. Claims to being 'professional' on the basis of qualification and high level skills have never been sufficient to gain traction in the broader societal context. Nor have more emotive appeals based on the importance of education and educating for wider society. That is, while education plays a significant role in both social and economic terms, the status of teaching has not reached the same level of social standing as other professions. While this is often argued on the basis of the gendered nature of teaching (as with nursing), our contention is that this is more the result of a disconnect between broader societal discourses that privilege accountability, performance and the language of data and teaching discourses which are tied to an underlying generative principle of experience as paramount importance – much like paternal/maternal family structures. This plays out not only in the work-integrated learning of initial teacher education, but also in how in-service teachers continue to learn and fine tune their craft. As Levin (2010) argues in relation to educational administrators, personal experience and colleagues,

rather than professional development and/or research, are the most powerful influences on beliefs and practices. Likewise, Hattie (2009) contends that teachers tend to rely on war stories and anecdotes rather than drawing on the latest research studies. Even in the context of *No Child Left Behind* and its requirement for only research based programs with evidence of positive effect on student outcomes, Berliner (2008) suggests that it appears that in making decisions about school programs, educators ‘do not often use scientific reasoning and proof to make sense of their world’ (p. 309). Why is this so? Our argument is that this is the result of the underlying generative principle of the profession being time spent in the field.

### **The Temporality of the pre-service teacher**

Deed, Cox, and Prain (2011) state that pre-service teachers are tasked with developing practical knowledge about teaching and learning and this learning exists in the context of diverse and contradictory opinions, approaches and frameworks emerging from prior experience, teacher educators mentors, other teachers and peers (see also Pridham, Deed, & Cox, 2013). We add notions of temporality and the coupling of performance with tenure, especially that measured by numbers, to the mix. As with managerialist discourses that occupy increasing orthodoxy in western capitalist societies in areas of greatest public interest (e.g. health, welfare, security, and education, among others), the universal language of numbers, which is increasingly synonymous with evidence or data, speaks across fields. The orthodoxy of constituting teaching as a profession, as we have argued thus far, is built upon an operationalisation of temporality that privileges easily measurable accounts of time in the field. The difficulty in refuting claims established through numerical means is that there is a common sense to such claims, and by virtue, widespread support within the ordinary language of the everyday and broader society. Even with scholarly research raising questions regarding the socially constructed nature of numbers or the consequences of numbers based arguments (such as neo-liberal discourses of quality), as a universal language, numbers are seductive. To place this in the context of constructing the teaching profession, recent (and ongoing) calls to improve teacher education, at least in Australia, have included raising the entry score for programs, raising the literacy and numeracy benchmarks of candidates, and most relatable to this argument, increasing days in the field.

Bourdieu (1977 [1972]), as with other social theorists, insists that an actor is never the subject of their practices, but rather, it is his/her involvement in the ‘game’, and all of the assumptions that constitute this social space, that shape and are shaped by behaviour. This is an important observation in the context of our argument, one where the traditional asymmetrical relations between master and apprentice in work-integrated learning legitimises the time in the field as the constitution of expertise. Axford (2005) argues that pre-service teachers understand this difference in social status and the consequential political and ethical dimensions of professional relations. In this space, Patrick (2013) contends that co-operating teachers see their role as giving pre-service teachers a more relevant and practical side to the profession (compared with what they perceived was taught at university). This is a significant move in the constitution of the teaching profession. While the pre-requisite of a university qualification is useful in the argument for professional status, university-based knowledge is perceived as of less value, or even irrelevant, to the day-to-day work of teachers. This results in co-operating teachers constructing the relationship on the basis of the pre-service teacher being there to learn – in a one-directional pedagogical relationship – from their experience in the field. Patrick (2013)

notes, while co-operating teachers show ‘respect for pre-service teachers, they draw on their years of experience in the classroom’ (p. 221) as the key point of distinction in the relationship and the socialisation of the pre-service teacher into the profession.

Our argument is that the existing temporal structures of the profession are framed by clock time and this is under revision. Within the pre-existing temporality of teaching, legitimacy was achieved by coming through a period of socialisation in the profession – work-integrated learning – and sustained performance. The apparent neutrality of the profession obscured the underlying discursive temporality. A profession, as a social group, can both include and exclude actors based on adherences to codes of conduct, standards and legitimised ways of doing and being. In this sense, teaching is a social product of the historical work of construction of teaching, and teachers, as a group. As Morrison (2013) states, the perceptions and understandings that newly qualified, and pre-service, teachers carry into the profession are the product of a long history of observation. In doing so, they bring an entire social unconscious, a social product of the historical work of constructing a group of people who bear the same label (teachers/educators).

Both the pre-service and co-operating teacher are bound to the same codes of conduct and professional standards. In the case of the internship, the pre-service teacher often equals the co-operating teacher in terms of qualification; that is, both actors have completed or will be about to complete, an undergraduate degree in education and their disciplines (and it was even possible not so long ago that co-operating teachers had diplomas while pre-service teachers were undertaking degrees). The key point of distinction is one of time in the field. The issue that emerges with the roll out of the professional standards agenda is that the practice of teaching is revised in its mobilisation of a theory of temporality. The move to professional standards – although not yet directly linked to salary – reflects a shift in the temporality of teaching. Temporality is no longer constructed as units of the clock and separate to the practice of teaching (such as time in the field) but rather as the practice of teaching. This temporality reflects a merging of temporality with events. That is, time in the field is replaced by an understanding of time demonstrated through events and evidence of events (e.g. student outcomes) as opposed to the accumulation of days/hours in the field. This goes beyond the possession of an appropriate teaching qualification and the accumulation of labour.

## Conclusion

There is a tendency across scholarly, professional and mainstream discourses to attribute the development of pre-service (and arguably early career) teachers to time spent in the field (Anderson & Stillman, 2013). We are not suggesting that an alternate theorisation of temporality, such as what we are arguing for in this article, has already de-stabilised the hegemonic status of clock time in managerialist discourses. This is especially so if key actors, educators/assessors and the wider community, remain complicit in their ongoing conceptualisation of what it means to teach. This is why it is important to engage with the everyday labels and concepts drawn upon and a rationale for adopting a *relational* approach to understand how implicit structures shape practice. Our contention is that the underlying generative temporality of teaching is under revision. Education and specifically teaching have always been temporalised. Far from acting at a distance, temporality has been central to our understanding of teaching practices. The embedding of professional standards in the work of the profession, and in the work-integrated learning of initial teacher education, calls for a revision of our thinking. To do so, we mobilised a *relational* approach to scholarship and called into question the underlying temporality of teaching and its revision. Such a revision places time not as an external

measure in which events and practices take place, but as the very core of such practices and events. That is, teaching practices and events make time rather than take place in time. This removes the idea of time as a commodity that can be lost/wasted. With increasing attention being paid to temporality in scholarship, there has arguably never been a more appropriate opportunity to engage with the temporality of teaching. The ongoing scholarly engagement with temporality and teaching offers fruitful directions for research and alternate ways of thinking about teacher preparation.

### Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the thoughtful feedback provided by the anonymous reviewers who challenged us to go beyond our initial theorisation and provide greater clarity in our argument.

### Notes

1. While we acknowledge the use of this binary within some discourses, we do not accept its simplistic use and mobilise the phrase here as an example of the use of the term in other contexts, without necessarily accepting in underlying generative assumptions.
2. The 2-year Master of Teaching, which serves as an initial teacher education program for candidates who already have a university degree requires 50 days. For the purpose of this article, our focus is solely on 4-year programs.
3. Following Bourdieu – who himself was building on the work of Pascal, Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty – we mobilise the notion of ‘ontological complicity’ to reflect the relations between the actor and the social world. Working specifically from Pascal, Bourdieu notes, when an individual ‘encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a “fish in water”: it does not feel the weight of the water, and it takes the world about itself for granted’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992 [1992], p. 127). Because of the embedded and embodied nature of the pre-service and in-service teacher, we claim that this ontological complicity requires engagement in the pursuit of rigorous and robust scholarship.
4. As a case in point, should a pre-service teacher be experiencing difficulties meeting the necessary standards expected of them, it is possible for the school to decide to extend their placement (or internship) to enable them time (e.g. 1–2 weeks during the internship) to attain the necessary standard.
5. See: <http://www.det.nsw.edu.au/media/downloads/about-us/statistics-and-research/key-statistics-and-reports/workforce-plan-4-school-teachers.pdf>

### Notes on contributors

Scott Eacott is Associate Professor and Leader of the Contemporary Thought and Analysis in Educational Leadership, Management and Administration (ELMA) Research Group in the Faculty of Education and Arts at the Australian Catholic University. His research interests and contribution to educational leadership fall into three main areas: theorising leadership practice; school leadership preparation and development; and re-conceptualising strategy in the education context. Scott is currently working on a funded project investigating leadership capacity building with a regional school system and writing a book that develops a sophisticated theory and methodology for the study of educational leadership, management and administration. Email: Scott.Eacott@acu.edu.au

KimbaLee Hodges is a teacher in the hunter valley and completed her honours degree at the University of Newcastle under the supervision of Associate Professor Scott Eacott, for which she was awarded first class and a Faculty medal.

### References

- Adkins, L. (2009). Sociological futures: From clock time to event time. *Sociological Research Online*, 14 (4). Retrieved September 24, 2012, from [www.socresonline.org.uk/14/4/8.html](http://www.socresonline.org.uk/14/4/8.html) doi:10.5153/sro.1976
- Adkins, L. (2011). Practice as temporalisation: Bourdieu and the economic crisis. In S. Susen & B. Turner (Eds.), *The legacy of pierre Bourdieu: Critical essays* (pp. 348–365). London: Anthem Press.

- Anderson, L.M., & Stillman, J.A. (2013). Student teaching's contribution to preservice teacher development: A review of research focused on the preparation of teachers for urban and high-needs contexts. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 3–69. doi:10.3102/0034654312468619
- Atkinson, W. (2012). Where now for Bourdieu-inspired sociology? *Sociology*, 46(1), 167–173. doi:10.1177/0038038511416157
- Atputhasamy, L. (2005). Cooperating teachers as school based teacher educators: Student teachers' expectations. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(2), 1–12. doi:10.14221/ajte.2005v30n2.1
- Axford, B. (2005). Entering professional practice in the new work order: A study of undergraduate students and their induction into professional work. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 87–104. doi:10.1007/BF03216821
- Barley, S.R. (2008). Coalface institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 491–518). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 81–98.
- Berliner, D.C. (2008). Research, policy and practice: The great disconnect. In S.D. Lapan, & M.L. Quartaroli (Eds.), *Research essentials* (pp. 295–326). New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977 [1972]). *Outline of a theory of practice*. (R. Nice, Trans.) [Originally published as *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique* (Geneva, Switzerland, Librairie Droz).]. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society*, 14(6), 723–744. doi:10.1007/BF00174048
- Bourdieu, P. (2000 [1997]). *Pascalian meditations*. (R. Nice, Trans.) [Originally published as *Méditations pascaliennes* (Paris, Editions du Seuil).]. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992 [1992]). *An invitation to reflexive sociology* ([Originally published as *Réponses. Pour une anthropologie réflexive* (Paris, Seuil).]. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Colley, H., Henriksson, L., Niemeyer, B., & Seddon, T. (2012). Competing time orders in human service work: Towards a politics of time. *Time & Society*, 21(3), 371–394. doi:10.1177/0961463X11434014
- Cooper, L., Orrell, J., & Bowden, M. (2010). *Work integrated learning: A guide to effective practice*. London: Routledge.
- Deed, C., Cox, P., & Prain, V. (2011). Enablers and constraints in achieving integration in a teacher preparation program. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(8), 72–92. doi:10.14221/ajte.2011v36n8.3
- Duncheon, J.C., & Tierney, W.G. (2013). Changing conceptions of time: Implications for educational research and practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(2), 236–272. doi:10.3102/0034654313478492
- Eacott, S. (2013). 'Leadership' and the social: Time, space and the epistemic. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(1), 91–101.
- Eacott, S. (forthcoming). *Relational administration: A theory and methodology for educational administration*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Grenfell, M., & James, D. (1998). *Bourdieu and education: Acts of practical theory*. London: Palmer Press.
- Grootenboer, P. (2006). The impact of the school-based practicum on pre-service teachers' affective development in mathematics. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development*, 2005/2006, 7, 18–32.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London: Routledge.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research – How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- Levin, B. (2010). Leadership for evidence informed education. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(4), 303–315. doi:10.1080/13632434.2010.497483
- McKenzie, P., Rowley, G., Weldon, P., & Murphy, M. (2011). *Staff in Australia's schools 2010: Main report on the survey*. Canberra: Australian Council for Educational Research.

- Morrison, C. M. (2013). Teacher identity in the early career phase: Trajectories that explain and influence development. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(4), 91–107. doi:10.14221/ajte.2013v38n4.5
- New South Wales Institute of Teachers. (2005). *Professional teaching standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.nswteachers.nsw.edu.au/Main-Professional-Teaching-Standards>
- Orrell, J. (2004, August 21, 2011). *Work-integrated learning programmes: Management and educational quality*. Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2004. AUQA Occasional Publication.
- Patrick, R. (2013). 'Don't rock the boat': Conflicting mentor and pre-service teacher narratives of professional experience. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 40(2), 207–226. doi:10.1007/s13384-013-0086-z
- Pridham, B.A., Deed, C., & Cox, P. (2013). Workplace-based practicum: Enabling expansive practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(4), 50–64. doi:10.14221/ajte.2013v38n4.7
- Samaras, A., & Gismondi, S. (1998). Scaffolds in the field: Vygotskian interpretation in a teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(7), 715–733. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00024-9
- Snyder, B.H. (2013). From vigilance to busyness: A neo-weberian approach to clock time. *Sociological Theory*, 31(3), 243–266. doi:10.1177/0735275113502482
- Walkington, J.A. (2005). Mentoring preservice teachers in the preschool setting: Perceptions of the role. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 30(1), 28–35.