Neutral and Timeless Truths: A Historical Analysis of Observation and Evaluation in Teacher Training

Donna Varga
Concordia University, Montreal

The use of observation as a technique of cultural power through which dominant ideas of teacher behavior are manifested and by which possibilities of teaching behavior are constructed is examined in this paper. The maintaining of documentary records on student teachers' development as teachers characterizes the records as forms of knowledge for reconstituting the student into a teacher. Through an analysis of 19th century Training Registers of the Ontario Provincial Model School in terms of characteristics observed, numerical evaluations, and written comments, the relation between educational processes and the regulation of behavior is described.

Cet article a pour objet d'examiner en quoi certaines pratiques d'évaluation des enseignants-maîtres peuvent constituer une technique d'abus de pouvoir culturel. Une analyse des registres de l'Ontario Provincial Model School montre comment la sélection des données d'observation, les évaluations numériques et les commentaires écrits révèlent le contrôle idéologique exercé sur le comportement des enseignants.

Teacher training is a dominant cultural agency that formulates the substance and limits of common sense about what good teaching is. Through the experience of teacher training, ideas of what constitute proper teacher behavior and schooling practices are manifested. Dominant cultural values underlying ideas of good teaching are incorporated into teacher training; in addition, student teachers experience the forms of schooling processes that they will be expected to reproduce when they are in charge of their own classrooms. Teacher training therefore defines, through its very organization, the system of practices, meanings, and values that structure teaching behavior.

An integral feature of teacher education programs is the placement of student teachers in a classroom for practise teaching. The purpose of this ritual is for students to become acquainted with the *real life* of the classroom and for supervisors to observe and evaluate their competence as teachers. The assumption is that one must "do" teaching in order to learn it, and that through

observation students' current and potential abilities as teachers can be revealed. Evaluating students through observation as they practise teach is taken for granted as a neutral and timeless truth in determining who is qualified to teach.

In this paper, a historical and sociological study of how observation and evaluation of student practise teaching define the structures of proper teaching behavior is provided. The history of the observation of teachers in 19th century Ontario, and the procedures for observing student teachers of the Toronto Normal School, are presented as central to the structuring of ideas about teacher behavior. In particular, the Training Registers of the Ontario Provincial Model School (the model school of the Toronto Normal School) for years from 1871 to 1887 are discussed in terms of the evaluation of students' characteristics for the purpose of illustrating how dominant ideas of the good teacher were produced in and through the forms of observation.

What I am investigating is the historical production of a technology of power that continues to be used to define and constrain modes of individual teaching subjectivities. The effect of Toronto Normal School practices on individual teachers cannot be assessed through quantitative means. That is, their impact on the defining of teaching behaviors was not a product of the number of teachers trained. During the 19th century, the Toronto Normal School only trained a small fraction of Ontario teachers. From 1847 to 1870, it admitted only 6,069 students, while in 1870 alone there were 5,165 active teachers in the Province of Ontario (Curtis, 1988, p. 246). Data for the years 1881-1889 reveal similar admission levels of just over 200 students a year (Dept. of Education, 1881 to 1889). Rather than through the standardization of behaviors by replacing the teaching body with its own graduates, the Normal School's influence was affected through the production of pedagogical forms that were incorporated into schooling practices beyond the doors of the School and borders of the city and province (Houston & Prentice, 1988). The methods of observing and evaluating student teachers at the Toronto Normal School were also utilized in Ontario's county model schools (Hardy, 1979) and instituted during the late 1800s in other areas of Canada (Singleton, 1949).

My central argument is that the observation and evaluation of student teachers is a process that defines structures of proper behavior and constructs social forms of teaching behaviors. Observation is presented here as an apparatus of cultural power. As such, it is informed by relations of power and social structures such as class, gender, and ethnicity and is a historically developed and transmitted method of classifying and regulating teachers. Analyses of the structural features of teacher training processes, of which the observation and evaluation of student teaching is one, reveal the relationships between teaching acts and the constraints of the culturally dominant traditions of educational institutions.

The effect of observation is not simply a matter of forcing or convincing individual student teachers to reproduce dominant practices. Contestation between students and teachers over forms of knowledge ensures that competing discourses are produced. However, observation as a tool in teacher training is a microcosm of the technologies of power in schooling that, while in exchange with subordinate voices, "establish the conditions under which some individuals and groups define the terms by which others live, resist, affirm, and participate in the construction of their own identities and subjectivities" (Giroux, 1988, p. 134).

Observation as Cultural Mediation

The incorporation of observation as evaluation within teacher training has formulated an apparently objective means of developing teachers. This objectivity established the right of education authorities to present its definition of the good teacher as the natural one. Evaluating student teachers through comparison to authorized norms legitimizes certain characteristics and denies the validity of others.

Common sense analyses of observation procedures and their meanings are plentiful. For example, in contemporary teacher education literature, observation is assumed to be a natural way to evaluate students' teaching abilities and their personalities. Stanton (1973) questioned the ethics of utilizing such procedures to instill particular values, but dismissed the concerns as philosophical, and therefore irrelevant, to the task of defining the good teacher. He identified Rogerian psychology as providing "intuitively reasonable" (p.27) attributes necessary for teaching that could be observed and evaluated. In the 1984 edition of Wittrock's *Handbook for Research on Teaching*, Evertson and Green conceptualize observation as a means of representing reality and as a contextualized process. However, this conceptualization is not used to examine critically the authors' description of systems of recording teaching behavior through observation. Berard (1988) reported evaluations of student teachers as essential because evaluation, per se, is "an integral part of human life" (p. 211). These arguments of intuitive reason and natural processes deny the complex relationship between observation as culturally organized and its use in evaluation processes.

Hardy's (1979) study of Ontario County Model Schools for the years 1881-1883 provided an explanation of how teacher evaluations were carried out. However, his focus on quantitative data (numbers of students and their numerical assessments) failed to situate the documents and the practices as social and cultural products. This was exemplified by his assertion that summary evaluations of student teachers were either "the result of the marks awarded under the various categories and summarized in the final mark" or "a purely subjective assumption" (p. 88). What must be considered is the unity of ideology

with numerical practices that transform descriptions of behaviors into normative judgments.

The problem with the studies identified above is their inclination, which Apple (1979) ascribed to phenomenological description, "to forget that there *are* objective institutions and structures 'out there' that have power, that can control our lives and our very perceptions" (p. 140). Gitlin and Smyth (1990) argue that the social relationships embodied within teacher evaluation processes "serve to foster particular types of relations among members of the educational community" (p.89) and "detach students and teachers from their language, customs, rituals, experiences and histories" (p. 91). Observation can never be a neutral practice, and when it is combined with evaluation it becomes a discursive technique that shapes and confines behavior through the values intrinsic to the techniques themselves.

Formal observation provides a means by which teaching behavior can be regulated. Qualitatively different from everyday perception, that is, the physical and psychological act of seeing, the act of observation is constructive of cultural knowledge. I am positing that observation is a crucial practice in disciplining subjects and regulating subjectivity; it is a controlling mechanism that is done to the other. Foucault (1979) described panopticism as a physical method of surveillance for the purpose of controlling behavior. The practice of panopticism — of inserting individuals into fixed, enclosed, and segmented spaces "in which all events are recorded" (p. 197) — was architecturally captured by Bentham's panopticon, a central observation tower, ringed by a circular building divided into cells. Foucault's (1973) study of medical perception explored the organization of the medical gaze as reconstituting the "relation between the disease and the gaze to which it offers itself" (p. 90). Goffman's (1961) study of total institutions examined surveillance as a technique for ordering the self of inmates and for bringing that self into line with institutional requirements of behavior. While subjects do maintain some degree of autonomy, such as allowing themselves to be seen (Giddens, 1984), the regulatory power of observation is not reciprocally negotiated when relations of power are asymmetrical. The subordinate position of student teachers in relation to their supervisors makes them vulnerable to regulatory observation.

Implicated in observation as a method of regulation is the keeping of documentary records of behaviors. The bounding of human behavior within documentary forms is a textual model of the panopticon. Institutional records are a substitution of the panopticon's physical detention with an instrument capturing activity by the written text. Characteristics are segregated from the whole person and entered into observation cells; numerical and descriptive ratings are entered over time and across activities, and used to obtain a summary of the person's self. The maintaining of records on student teachers' development as teachers for the technical purpose of changing that behavior is

the essential condition that characterizes the records as forms of knowledge for reconstituting the student into a teacher.

The language of observation reveals the quality of the individual; through it, the individual can be measured, compared, and acted upon. However, the symbolic representation of the individual through recording and analysis is not a record of the individual but is a manifestation only of the particular form of the method of observation, record keeping, and analysis. As Foucault's (1973) study of the transformation in medical perception revealed, "the sign no longer speaks the natural language of disease; it assumes shape and value only within the questions posed by medical investigation" (p.162).

In the linking of observation to evaluation, behaviors are limited to what is culturally possible, rather than to what is humanly achievable. Observation and evaluation are tools of teacher training. As tools, they contain within them the dominant ideas of teaching and schooling practices. It is with these tools that the good teacher is constructed. The process of evaluating teachers through observation mediates the behavior expressed by the teacher and the behavior determined as being good.

The following description of the observation of schools, pupils, and teachers in mid-19th century Ontario, as well as the formalization of observation and evaluation processes in the training of teachers at the Toronto Normal School, provides evidence of the interpenetration of culture and observation practices.

Observation of Schools, Pupils, and Teachers

In 1836 the Duncombe Report directed the government of Upper Canada to give school inspectors and commissioners the right, and the task, of evaluating the condition of schooling in the province. The method of inspection was an evaluation of "the progress of the scholars in learning and the good order of the schools," as well as a motivation for improvement by giving "their advice and direction to the Trustees and Teachers of such schools" (Hodgins, 1841, p. 314).

The absence of a standard and systematic method of training teachers was linked to a corresponding absence of formalized criteria by which to judge teaching competence, with the exception of testing teachers' knowledge of school subjects and the acquisition of that knowledge by students. Public examinations and official visits provided opportunities for the public and the central education authority to see whether or not teachers had been successful in transferring knowledge to students, and therefore, of being a good teacher. Observations by inspectors, visitors, and the public were identified as a necessary means of charging teachers with the spirit of improving their students (Dept. of Education, 1847).

During the 1840s a transformation in the purpose of schooling from knowledge attainment to moral formation of selves redefined the relationship

between teachers and students (Curtis, 1988; Jones & Williamson, 1979). The identification of the important role of teachers in moral formation centralized their activities in terms of self expression; thus, the focus of educational observers shifted away from students and towards teachers. Personal characteristics were identified as the means to "draw out the forces of his students in an economical and pleasing manner" and included teachers' "looks, gestures, expressions and qualities of voice" (Dept. of Education, 1855, cited in Curtis, 1988 p.104). By the late 1840s the work of Ontario Common School teachers was under official observation by the Education Office. Annual Reports and School Acts of that period specify the measuring of student knowledge and reporting of the character of teachers for the purpose of assessing teachers' abilities. This is not to say that an association between teachers' characteristics and students' acquisition of knowledge was not "seen" earlier, that is, recognized by teachers, students and parents. It was during the 1840s that the relationship was formalized by the Education Office as a key to the improvement of pedagogical practice. The observation of behaviors did more than specify the best methods of teaching. The connection between personal behavior as moral character and the role of schooling in moral formation showed evaluations to be representative of ethical behavior. The definition of the teacher as good because of skill in transmitting knowledge was transformed into the good teacher as morally sufficient.

A reorganization of schooling space was necessary for carrying out the function of moral formation. From groups surrounding the teacher, and from multiple small groups throughout the schoolroom, students were moved to seats in rows of desks facing the front (Hodgins, 1857; Phillips, 1957; Prentice, 1984). Teachers were positioned at the front of the schoolroom, a space that allowed them to transmit formal knowledge and at the same time supervise students' behavior. In an 1844 circular to Ontario teachers describing the duties of Township Superintendents, Jonathan Wilson, Superintendent of Education for the London District, Canada West, specified the contribution of the school house to character formation. In addition to specifying the size and placement of students' seats to provide physical comfort and to define passageways in the room, Wilson set out the placement of teachers and students in relation to the observation of the former by the latter.

> Then the internal arrangement should be such that the whole school should be under the teacher's eye. To accomplish this ... Let the low seats with the younger scholars be in front, the high ones behind. The writing desks may with great convenience be placed along the two lighted sides of the house ... enabling the scholars to sit with their backs to the light fronting the teacher. If the door be placed in the south east side and open from the right hand, the teacher's desk or table may be placed toward the south west side; there he will see the whole school and observe, without effort, all who come in and go out ... The very circumstance of attention to this and a little management and care to effect it, will not be without its moral influence as part of the discipline of the school. (Wilson, 1844)

While the circular emphasized the positioning of the teacher as an observer, it is also important to note that this arrangement of the classroom placed teachers in the most functional and vulnerable location for being seen by the students and thus for acting as a model of moral character.

Teacher Training and the Provincial Model School

In the attempt by education authorities to reduce what they regarded as an inappropriate medley of teaching methods, the Toronto Normal School was established in 1847 "to produce, directly and indirectly, an amazing and most beneficial change in the whole character of our common schools" (Dept. of Education, 1848, p. 18). Through formal teacher training, the model of good teaching behavior could be constructed and reproduced. The emphasis in normal schooling was not on educational content, although the lack of prior schooling for many students led to this as a lamented function. Rather, the focus of teacher training was on the instrumental regulation of behavior "to implant in them the habits, skills, and the character structure appropriate to the morally forceful teacher" (Curtis, 1988, p. 246).

The history of teacher training is a history of the systemization of the use of the body. Stow's (1854) model text of 19th century training emphatically identified the physical construction of teaching. "The voice and the eye constitute, unquestionably, fully one-half of the power of a trainer of young. Thus a trainer's manner may be said to be 'half his fortune'" (p. 320-321). This process of the embodiment of pedagogical technique is what Foucault (1979) called a physico-political technique. Practice teaching was the active physical process of remaking the behaviors of the student into those of the good teacher and was figuratively ascribed as such by Stow: "These exercises also rub off many incrustations, which must otherwise have remained, and which no teaching or instruction, nor mere observation of the method pursued, could possibly have removed" (Stow, 1854, p. 352).

According to Stow, student teachers were to give lessons to children in the presence of all the student teachers as well as the officials of the normal school, all of whom were to make observation notes during the lessons. After this, the student teachers and officials were to leave the classroom and those who gave the lessons were to comment on their performances. Any of the observers could then volunteer to comment on the teaching, while those who gave the lessons were to "submit *silently* to the criticism of all" (p. 350). The thoroughness of the criticisms was emphasized:

> No defect in the manner, tone of voice, or grammar, is overlooked. Every mispronunciation, error, or defect in stating the successive points of the subject of the lesson, want of picturing out, or failure in securing the attention of the children during these exercises, is plainly expressed. (p. 350-51)

The observation of practise teaching was an integral feature of the Toronto Normal School from its beginning (Dept. of Education, 1847). During their practise teaching sessions at the Provincial Model School, students were to demonstrate the pedagogical techniques they had been learning through observation at the Model School and lectures at the Normal School. Practise was carried out under the scrutiny of a Model School teacher who critically evaluated students' abilities. Students were expected to internalize the criticisms and restructure their behavior. Although details of the method of supervising the student teachers prior to 1869 are not available, it is likely that aspects of Stow's instructions were used in the Ontario training of teachers as his writings were held in high esteem by Ontario education officials.

In 1869 the Ontario Department of Education formalized and made systematic the observation procedures by publishing guidelines for using Training Registers to observe and evaluate Normal School students' teaching abilities. The Training Registers were standard forms bound as blank pages in a book. A page for each student was provided in the Register which was completed over the Normal School session by the Model School teacher. Each page was set up in a grid format with characteristics to be observed listed across the top and space provided for the recording of the students' performance in each category. The procedures reiterated the hierarchical relationship between students and teachers, and between the Model School and the Normal School. The Model School teacher had the power to evaluate student's teaching abilities based on standards defined as specific cultural norms. Observations and evaluations recorded by the Model School teacher were to be passed from teachers to the Model School Headmaster, and then on to the Normal School principal, and were open to review by the Department of Education. The limiting of practise teaching experience to the Model School and the defined hierarchy of observations and evaluations instituted a process whereby the making of teachers was systematically organized and controlled. This hierarchy formalized the subordinate role of students in defining their own images of the self as teacher.

The policies and procedures for using the Training Registers provided a tool for constructing and limiting the behaviors of student teachers. The listing of the characteristics of teaching behavior that were to be observed, the specification of the quantification of characteristics through numerical ratings, and the inclusion of written comments provided a discursive form of teacher training. An examination of the Training Registers from the 1870s and the 1880s revealed a transformation in the form of recording the observations in the Training Registers, from a dominance of numerical ratings to the use of descriptive statements only. I was unable to locate any discussion explaining the change in method or of rules governing the new method. However, this change signified a major shift in the training of teachers through observation as evaluation.

The extensive list of characteristics to be evaluated, ranging from 12 to 20 categories over the period of the Registers examined for this study, reveals the

characteristics of the self encapsulated within the Registers. These included the teacher's preparation, fluency, manner, energy, accuracy, watchfulness, mode of posing questions, mode of receiving answers, correction of errors, power of giving explanation, thoroughness, effectiveness, and general value of lesson. The student's value as a teacher was also partly determined from the Model School teacher's evaluation of the class and included the class's order, attention, and interest. The specification of characteristics in the Training Registers identified aspects of the student's self that were understood as being observable, measurable, and representing objective forms of knowledge. Both their inclusion and exclusiveness indicated the presumption that the characteristics displayed by the student could be shaped — through observation, practise, evaluation, and exclusion — into those of the good teacher.

The detailed gaze experienced by the student teachers as they carried out their practise lessons was quantified through the use of numerical ratings. By presenting explicit and specific criteria and measurement procedures in the evaluation of student teachers this process provided what Bernstein (1975) has termed a "visible pedagogy" in the training of teachers. The rating, from one for *great excellence* to six for *complete failure,* was to be entered under each category for each lesson taught by the Model School teacher. At the end of the Normal School session a numerical value was entered indicating the student's current ability and what the student might be expected to achieve in the future, "determined partly by the Model School report ... and partly by the general character for ability and energy he has earned for himself during the term" (Dept. of Education, 1869, p. 16).

On the average, students received 135 ratings in a 13 week session. Indeed, for students undertaking training in the period covered by the 1871-1874 Training Registers the number was more extensive, with some students receiving 220 ratings. A comparison of the registers for male and female student teachers revealed that women students received ratings in all categories more often than men students. The women also received additional positive (+) and negative (-) values with numerical ratings. For example, a woman might receive a two plus or a three minus (or such variations from one through six) while a man received the numerical value only. This difference of intensity in rating women and men suggests that women were evaluated in more detail.

The use of numerical ratings to measure students' abilities and the additional positive and negative values added to evaluations of women students presented the characteristics being observed as objective forms of knowledge and the Register as a scientific training tool. Students were expected to numerically add to or subtract from their person-specific characteristics.

Within the grid of the Training Register, space was designated for entering written comments regarding the student's teaching performance during each lesson. The written comments appeared to provide the student teacher with the

opportunity for a greater range of personal expression as a teacher, but the manifestation of personal expression through observation meant that the written comments exerted more control over the individual. In the use of written comments, the competencies being evaluated were not limited to explicit criteria, and the procedures for evaluation were not based upon precise measurements; the pedagogy of the method was invisible (Bernstein, 1975).

As in the case of numerical ratings, comments written about women from 1871-1874 were more extensive in content and were more often provided for each lesson taught than were comments entered for men. For all students, occasional descriptions of positive characteristics were recorded but the majority of comments negated the behaviors demonstrated by presenting them as incorrect or inadequate student teaching abilities. Hughes's emphatic statement on his experience as a teacher and then headmaster in the Provincial Model School, from 1867 to 1871, echoes Stow's directions and provides a glimpse of this method of evaluation in the formation of students as teachers.

> I was trained to believe that my supreme duty was to *criticise destructively* the teaching of the Normal School students while they were teaching their practice lessons in the Model School. I was told to point out to them the errors they made as the best means of making them good teachers. I have no sympathy with such a course now, and I am glad that I saw the great evils of this method of training before I was appointed Inspector of Schools. (Pierce, 1924, pp. 66-67)

A major change in the recording of written comments was seen in the female teachers' registers of 1883-1885: a gradual shift to the comments written over the space provided for entering numerical ratings rather than only under the designated space in the Training Register. While this practice appeared only occasionally during the early part of 1883-1885, by the end of that period, and in the 1887 Register, it was a systematic procedure. In addition, numerical values were no longer entered under any characteristic except "General Value of Lesson." The transformation from entering numerical ratings to providing only written comments, and the movement of the comments from their "proper space" to covering the grid of the Register was not simply a reorganization of the categories available to Model School teachers or students. Rather, it was a different method of evaluating altogether. Description and evaluation of behavior were no longer separated; cultural aspects were referenced as educative form.

The regulatory power of written comments is argued by Bernstein (1975) to make socialisation more "deeply penetrating, more total as the surveillance becomes more invisible" (p. 122). Thus, this process of evaluation poses a serious dilemma. The features of the good teacher are not apparent, but the method is more powerfully productive of historically specific practices. With the use of written comments as the primary form of evaluation in teacher training,

the normative constitution of teachers' subjectivities was more completely under the direction of education authorities.

The following comments taken from the Training Registers illustrate the use of the method to present information as to whether a student was a good enough teacher to instruct students in proper teaching behaviors and to produce subjectivities of the good teacher. While not providing a content analysis, the examples are representative of the process of constructing teaching behaviors through the denunciation of students' current characteristics. I have selected examples from comments written regarding student teachers' use of language, ability to ask questions and receive answers, and ability to maintain order. The dates indicate the specific Training Registers in which the student was evaluated.

The characteristics of student teachers' language that were evaluated ranged from grammatical expression to manner of speaking to use of language. Comments were made of Mr. Baker (1887) who made the "sound of 'n' incorrect"; John Forbes (1871-74) who "speaks low and gruffly"; Emma Scott (1883-85) who "talks too fast ... voice monotonous"; Miss Abraham (1887) whose "tone too high ... language and use of terms indefinite"; Mr. Hobb (1887) whose problems were "voice squeaky and speech slow"; Miss Beattie who "talked to no purpose"; and Miss Weller (1871-74) who "allowed poetry to be read in a sing song manner." In addition, students were criticized for saying "any more," "this here," "have got," "one time," or using "please" too often.

Student teachers were required to demonstrate an ability to ask questions and receive answers while giving a lesson. Inadequate presenters of these skills included Jennie Ross (1871-74) who "wasted time in thinking of each succeeding question ... allowed class to speak too loudly when answering together ... did not distribute questions"; Miss Bristol (1871-74), who "let the whole class answer which made the lesson quite confused" and "did not ask questions of any one boy"; Mary Abbott (1871-74), who "looked at scholar answering too closely"; Mr. Cassidy (1880-83), who "questions too much"; Miss Clarke (1880-83), who "waited too long for answers"; and Mr. Day (1887), who "questions monotonously and abruptly." Other problems included receiving incomplete answers, not asking enough questions, asking too many questions, reversing the order of questions, asking simple questions, and not testing answers.

Comments about the ability to maintain order and keep the attention of the class made reference to student teachers not seeing that slates were out of position, working with their backs to the class, not correcting students who were doing other work, allowing students to work while explanations were being given, permitting students to have hands up constantly, and not attending to idle

pupils. John Radcliff (1871-74) "looked at boys out of position and working mischief, but did not see them. One was spitting in the ink well behind him yet teacher did not notice him." Jennie Gordon (1887) requested "No talking" several times but took no steps to enforce it." In the case of Mr. Hobb, the "class seemed to be managing teacher instead of the reverse."

The Training Registers provide a concrete historical account of the ideology and experience that ordered 19th century teacher training. The numerical and written recordings inscribed on the Registers document the shaping of the language of teaching — the voice, body, and tone of expression — into particular practices of teaching.

Conclusion

The systemized form of teacher training acted to define what teaching could be. It also provided a tool by which teacher behavior could be recreated within the grid of the dominant culture. The forms of expression demanded of 19th century student teachers were cultural products that legitimized specific teaching practices. The choice of characteristics that were to be observed and evaluated represented the concerns of education authorities, who were worried most about the formation of students' moral character through teachers' orderly management of schoolrooms. The numerical ratings and written comments were signs through which the idea of the good teacher could be made manifest to the student teachers. Cultural characteristics beyond those authorized by education officials were denied legitimacy through the use of evaluations that refuted their validity. The process of becoming a teacher therefore required a redefining of the self according to centralized (as opposed to community) norms.

The varied needs and expectations in a province where the population was anything but homogeneous were not made an explicit part of the standardized form of observing and evaluating teaching behavior. The definition of the good teacher is culturally bound, not to different communities, but to the dominant culture. If this were not the case, then the comments in the Registers would have revealed that students demonstrated "correct" behaviors from the start, and the use of observation and evaluation for the purpose of remaking the teacher would not have been required. The comments reveal that the types of teaching behaviors defined as good by education authorities were not a natural form for many students. An exception to the denial of individual cultural abilities occasionally occurred when it was known that students would be returning to their communities, where such characteristics, although still perceived as negative by the Normal and Model School teachers, would be accepted. For this reason, students who were considered to have failed in accommodating specific characteristics of good teachers received certification because they were going back to the communities where they were well liked.

The instances where students were judged as maintaining inappropriate

behaviors but were accorded a teaching certificate provide examples of the degree to which variations of forms could be tolerated by the dominant culture. They also demonstrate the ability of communities farther from centers of power to maintain their own cultures (Williams, 1973). The flexibility of acceptable behaviors according to destined teaching location reinforces the notion that teachers were being "formed" for a specific setting. While the culture of place defined the foundations of a particular way of life for teachers, it was always in subordination to the standard of the Normal School. As subordinate forms, practices were neither considered alternative nor oppositional, but could be permitted to the degree that they remained at some distance from the effective dominant culture (Williams, 1980, p. 41).

The viewpoints of the students are not found in the Training Registers. We do not hear their responses to the criticisms and evaluations made of their teaching and we do not know if they saw themselves in the same way as the observers did. This is how the language of authority works; by referencing only the voice of authority, contesting voices are not taken into account. They disappear, not just from history, but also from the biography of the individual. In this way, "teachers either lose their voice in shaping the nature of educational experiences, leaving teaching unchanged, or find ways of temporarily escaping the dominating effects of hierarchy" (Gitlin & Smyth, 1990, p. 89).

Definitions of what good teaching is have undergone various modifictions since the 1880s, but the processes of normative definition and measurement have not altered. The observation and evaluation of student teachers is a method of regulating the possibilities of human action. This results in a hegemonic interpretation of the good teacher. It is possible to consider the evaluation criteria as obvious and necessary features of teachers. In other words, if teachers do not speak "correctly," or keep order, or demonstrate a certain skill in asking and receiving questions, then learning will not take place. However, if transformation of schooling practices is to be effected, and I take this to be a purpose of teacher education, the constitution of teachers' subjectivities through observation as evaluation, particularly in the use of written comments, must be taken seriously as a method of cultural production and reproduction. By investigating the cultural field within which observation and evaluation of student teachers occurs, the timelessness and neutrality of the method are challenged. This allows for the possibility of opening the discourses available to student teachers to other ways of thinking about teaching and schooling.

I would like to thank Robert Lanning, whose comments on drafts of this essay were invaluable. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Fifth Biennial Conference of the Canadian History of Education Association, London, Ontario, October 30, 1988.

References

Apple, M.W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum.* Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Berard, R.N. (1988). The evaluation of student teaching. In P. Holborn, M. Wideen, & I. Andrews. (Eds.), *Becoming a teacher.* Toronto: Kagan & Woo.

Bernstein, B. (1975). Class and pedagogies: Visible and invisible. In *Class, codes and control.* (Vol. 3). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Curtis, B. (1988). *Building the educational state: Canada West, 1836-1871.* London, ON: The Althouse Press.

Department of Education. (1847, 1848, 1869, 1881 to 1889). *Annual report of the normal, model, grammar and common schools. Ontario.* (Titles and publishers vary, depending on the year.)

Evertson, C.M. & Green, J.L. (1984). Observation as inquiry and method. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook for research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (1973). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Vintage Books.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1988). *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gitlin, A. & Smyth, J. (1990). Toward educative forms of teacher evaluation. *Educational Theory, 40,* 83-94.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums.* New York: Anchor Books.

Hardy, S. (1979). Making the grade: The assessment of trainee teachers at the Wentworth County Model School, 1881-1893. In E. Jackson & I. Winchester (Eds.), *Records of the past: Exploring new sources in social history.* Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hodgins, G.J. (1841). *Documentary history of education in Upper Canada, 1894-1910* (Vol. 2). Toronto: Warwick Bros. & Rutter.

Hodgins, G.J. (1857). *The school house: Its architecture, external and internal arrangements, with additional papers.* Toronto: Department of Public Instruction for Upper Canada.

Houston, S.E. & Prentice, A. (1988). *Schooling and scholars in nineteenth century Ontario.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jones, K. & Williamson, K. (1979). The birth of the classroom. *Ideology & Consciousness, 6,* 59-110.

Phillips, C.E. (1957). *The development of education in Canada.* Toronto: W.J. Gage & Co.

Pierce, L. (1924). *Fifty years of public service. A life of James L. Hughes.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Prentice, A. (1984). From household to school house: The emergence of the teacher as servant of the state. *Material History Bulletin, 20,* 19-29.

Singleton, I.D. (1949). *Teacher training and certification in the North-West Territories from 1885 to 1905, and in Saskatchewan from 1905 to 1937.* Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Saskatchewan.

Stanton, H.E. (1973). Teacher education and the 'good teacher.' *The Educational Forum, 38*, 25-30.

Stow, D. (1854). *The training system, moral training school and normal seminary*. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.

Williams, R. (1973). *The country and the city*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, R. (1980). *Problems in materialism and culture*. London: Verso.

Wilson, J. (1844). *Circular to teachers*. National Archives of Canada, RG5 C1, Vol. 130, file 7860.

Wittrock, M.C. (Ed.). (1984). *Handbook for research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.