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ABSTRACT

Thinking about race in education, especially in the multicultural or even “postracial” context of 2012, is not an easy thing. A paradox exists: On the one hand, race is powerfully present in teachers, in teaching, and in school contexts; on the other, teachers, generally, are unable to think about their work and practices in the context of race. This dissertation explores this paradox by asking the following question: How does pre-service teacher education produce teachers as racialized subjects?

This dissertation is informed by the Foucaultian methodology of genealogy and poststructural theories of subjectivity. Through genealogy, this work presents a cogent history of secondary teacher education in Regina, Saskatchewan, that is both critical and effective; critical, because it undermines the continuity forced onto teacher education through more traditional history, and effective, because it is focused on exploring the development of particular kinds of subjects.

This genealogical analysis examines how White teacher subjectivity is produced through three modes: (a) how the White teacher subject is produced in racialized discourses, especially through notions of racelessness that erase racializing processes even as they are enacted; (b) how the White teacher subject is produced through technologies of power, especially the embedding of technical rationality as the core of teaching; and, (c) how the White teacher subject produces him/herself through techniques of the self, such as clinical supervision and self-reflection.
While the analysis traces the production of dominant White subjects through teacher education, poststructural subjectivity allows at least the possibility that changing the discourses and practices might produce different subjectivities. Understanding what else is accomplished in the attempt to train teachers through these technical models is a necessary step in addressing the continuing dominance of White racial identities that schooling seems to perpetuate.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION/PROLOGUE

My program of teacher education at the University of Regina was productive. The 4 years that I spent studying, practice teaching, interning, and reflecting produced me as a teacher in particular ways. By many accounts, I am a good teacher; performance reviews, student evaluations, and even a teaching award attest to this. My technical competence, my personal commitments/attributes were shaped and formed through my time in the Faculty of Education. In some sense, my identity as a teacher was produced in relationship to my training and experiences in the faculty; I came to understand my role as teacher, what made for good teaching, and who my students and I could be, partly because of the content and experiences in the Faculty of Education.

There were other things that my training as a teacher produced. In my 4 years of teacher training, from 1994 to 1998, I do not remember once being asked to think about race. In no class was my own White racialization acknowledged or made problematic. Rather, my teacher education both furthered and made more hidden this White identification. I could understand my role as teacher as a technical one, quite apart from the enactment of that role within social contexts that were always and already marked by race and privilege. I could understand and strive towards good teaching without also realizing the concomitant values of White, middle-class culture within the very practices that I was striving to perfect. I could understand my students as learners, through the matrix of educational psychology, but not through other social lenses such as race or class that were also determinant of who those students could be/become.
I took these overt and tacit understandings of my role, my students, and myself with me into my work as a teacher. I switch to narrative briefly to add some nuance to these understandings.

I taught for 2 years in a community school that served as the primary high school for three First Nations. Rich experiences as a teacher were underscored by the ongoing manifestations of poverty, social dysfunction, and the legacy of colonialism. I remember a conversation with a White teacher who had been in the school and community for a number of years. She was retiring in the summer and pulled me aside for a conversation. She said, ‘Mike, you are a real teacher.’ By this, I think she was complimenting me for my approach to students and work in the classroom. She followed up the kind words with, ‘What are you doing teaching here?’

In the same school, I witnessed acts of poor pedagogy: Science 10 courses taught using correspondence material (classes where students would sit and read quietly and answer questions, all provided on handouts, every day, for a whole semester); a White senior science/math teacher who could refer to her students as her ‘brown children’ in front of the class; classroom teachers losing their tempers, screaming and expelling students from class, and being verbally abusive towards their students on a regular basis.

I asked one of my older White colleagues, who was usually pretty negative about the school and the students, if he might tell us a good story. He thought about it briefly and started to share about this one student who he taught in English and history. He couldn’t remember if he ever passed a class, but he was a nice enough student. One day, this teacher was in town and the student (who had been out of school a few years) passed him on the street and recognized him and gave him a warm greeting. My colleague ended the story with, ‘The next day I read in the paper that this guy had killed someone that night with a 2 x 4 …. Oh, you wanted a good story. I’ll have to try harder.’

Without question, working in schools such as this exacted a toll on teachers: This was not an easy place to work, and the academic evidence of the success of our educational ventures was not often obvious. I do not tell these stories to highlight examples of bad teaching or to contrast my good teaching with someone else’s bad teaching. Rather, I think these examples illustrate a powerful paradox: On the one
hand, race is powerfully present in these narratives; on the other, teachers, generally, are unable to think about their work and practices in the context of race.

It is a particular, colonial mis/understanding of race that enabled my retiring colleague to think that I was wasting my talents and time with “these” students. Mirroring what Valencia (2010) describes as deficit thinking, ‘real’ teaching was to be reserved for those students who could do something with it, those with aptitudes for learning, and those who were a part of cultures that supported and enabled learning. These hesitations about teaching and learning fit with centuries of race thinking (Leonardo, 2009) and are demonstrative of the way that White teachers have learned to “divide the world” (Willinsky, 1998); yet, even when these ideas are now marshaled as politically correct “truisms” (cultures of poverty, at-risk students, etc.), racism is revealed within pedagogical dialogue.

A mis/understanding of race underscored some of my colleagues’ abilities to yell in anger as a form of classroom management, and to so manage the classroom as to eliminate any higher order thinking. Both of these extremes would have been frowned upon in the context of the teacher education that these teachers received and in most non-Aboriginal schools. Yet, these behaviours are allowed to continue at a school such as this with students such as these. These practices point to the underlying beliefs about First Nations students as lazy; as incapable of intellectual work; as belligerent (i.e., requiring stern treatment).

Racist history within the Canadian national narrative has underwritten these interactions. Stories as those above can be thought of and spoken as truth within a context where perceptions of the violence and criminality of First Nations people
have been anticipated and normalized: It is expected that the story will end with death and/or incarceration. Some Aboriginal communities do see violence, and some of my students lived with the realities of drug/alcohol abuse, gang activity, and the effects of poverty. The telling of these stories, outside of an analysis of the history that forms the context for their reality, allows these stories to remain as stereotypes. These stories can be told so lightly by my colleagues only outside the context of colonialism and outside the recognition of both a colonial past and a colonial present. It is a sign of dominance to the tell these stories outside the context of the production of race, imagining that race, racism, and oppression are only of the past, and that, in that moment, no racializing, either of White teachers or of Aboriginal students, is taking place. It is the absence of a race analysis that enables these stories to continue to produce the reality of racist effects.

These were not insights that my teacher education enabled me to understand. My teacher education did not make it possible for me to see (or make sense of) the racial issues that my First Nations students experienced and the ongoing work of schools in processes of racialization. Coming from the field and having worked with “at-risk” and racialized minority students, I have been enabled through my doctoral work to think differently about these situations. It is now apparent to me that an historical accounting for the practices and ideas of teacher education that formed the horizons for my teacher identity might make sense of the paradox: how race can be both powerfully present, even determinative of teacher identity, and also largely unnoticed by teachers.
Through Foucaultian genealogy, this dissertation engages with the historical and discursive constitution of the production of teachers. Genealogy, or a “history of the present,” calls into question the very sturdy ground on which this present seems to be built, in order to make better sense of the concerns/struggles of the present. Given the continuing salience of race and racism in the Saskatchewan context, and given the ongoing discursive construction of teachers and education as potentially ameliorating the historical effects of this racism, investigating how this present has been constituted seems relevant.

Genealogy begins with a “question posed in the present” (Foucault, 1988, p. 262). The specific question of the present that this work asks is: How does pre-service teacher education produce teachers as racialized subjects? This dissertation explores how racialized teacher subjectivity is produced through discourses/knowledge/technologies of power embodied within the practices of teacher education and the techniques of self-formation made available to teacher candidates as part of how they become teachers.

1.1 Situating This Work: Necessary Assumptions

The next three sections describe the underlying assumptions of the dissertation on which the main question about the production of White subjects through teacher education rests. The underlying assumptions include the salience of race, the dominance of whiteness, and teacher education as White institutional space.
1.1.1 The Salience of Race

Race remains a salient feature effecting and producing social realities, and it is, “often undertheorized in education research” (O’Connor, Lewis, & Mueller, 2007, p. 541). To some it may seem like speaking from another time to refer to race in this formative way. This is especially so in the present climate. In public spaces, speaking about race and racism has become demonized, such that almost the worst thing you can now be called is a racist (Blaut, 1992). Official multiculturalism in Canada, and the acceptance of difference as somehow central to Canadian identity, suggests to many that we have moved beyond race in our thinking.

Race thinking has changed. Some race scholars describe the contexts for race and racism in three paradigms (Frankenberg, 1993; Marx, 2006; Omi & Winant, 1994). Notions of “biological difference” (Marx, 2006), usually associated with the scientific racism of the 19th and early 20th centuries, assert that race is innate and describe some essential differences about people. In this system, White people were thought to be biologically/genetically different from other people: White people were naturally superior. Goldberg (1993) demonstrated the ways in which this racism was constitutive of modern culture and underwrote the colonial endeavors of Western nations. Through science, hierarchies of races and racial characteristics came to dominate understandings of human differences (Smedley, 1999), with the particular racial category of the researcher often placed at the top of the hierarchy. Often, social realities were made to demonstrate this belief in hierarchy, mandating politically, economically, or physically the dominance of one (usually White) over the other. While genetic science now clearly demonstrates the uselessness of
biological conceptions of race in understanding both human beings and our attendant social realities (Goodman, 1997; Gould, 1996), these essentialized notions continue to mark both the scientific (see The Bell Curve, Herrnstein & Murray, 1994) and the broader public sphere.

Partly because of the erosion of a scientific basis for race, and the adoption of the language of multiculturalism, race thinking became articulated in terms of the “ethnically different” (Marx, 2006): Ethnicity takes the place of race. Dominant discourse “purposely moves away from open discussion of color/race and power inequality” (Marx, 2006, p. 13) and leaves instead “racism without racists” (Bonilla-Silva, 2003, n.p.). As Michaels (1992) puts it, “The modern concept of culture is not, in other words, a critique of racism; it is a form of racism” (p. 683). In this paradigm, behaviour and group norms take the place of genetics in explaining human potential. White dominance and privilege are justified and explained in terms of cultural superiority, while the economic disadvantage of other ethnic groups is explained through cultural practices (especially cultural deficits) and backgrounds. Razack (1998) calls this the “culturalization of racism” (p. 60). In spite of appearances, because cultural behaviours were often traced through descent and therefore rooted in the body (rather than cultural practices rooted in the social), the ethnically different paradigm ends up being not that different from earlier biological conceptions (Frankenberg, 1993).

In the present paradigm, race thinking is manifest in terms of the “economically and nationally different” (Marx, 2006, p. 15). On the one hand, the language of difference may be employed by groups minoritized by race, language, or
belief. On the other hand, dominant groups lash out against the otherness and perceived danger of minoritized groups (e.g., fears of Muslim immigration and terrorism) and also the perception of the cultural power and political agendas of marginal groups (i.e., fears of the adoption of Sharia law). White dominance and privilege are seen as under attack from both the entrenchment of the rights and the cultural power/cohesiveness of marginalized groups.

It is important to notice that each of these racial paradigms is not mutually exclusive; the presence of each paradigm is still noticeable. Race scholars have theorized the complex ways in which race and racial thinking morph and transform over time in important ways. Goldberg (1993) explores how racist discourse is embedded within the growth of modern culture and liberal political theory. He charts the transformation from an ancient world where there was no “racial conception of the social subject” (Goldberg, 1993, p. 21), through to the modern world where human identity could be variously racialized as “natural kind” (p. 62) or “pedigree and population” (p. 63) or “breeding populations and gene pools” (p. 65). Omi and Winant (1993) describe the process of “Racial Formation” whereby, “social, economic and political forces determine the content and importance of racial categories, and by which they are in turn shaped by racial meanings” (p. 16). This ongoing process depicts the mutually constitutive nature of both race thinking and (racialized) social realities. Feagin (2010) explains the constitution of American society through a “White Racial Frame,” depicting how “racial oppression and its rationalizing and structuring frames” (p. 7) have fundamentally shaped modern societies. Layers of social meaning, laws, interpretations, and social practices
contribute to the creation and ongoing production of this frame that includes beliefs (stereotypes), racialized thinking, audiovisual data (images and accents), an affective domain (feelings about race), and “inclinations to discriminatory action” (Feagin, 2010, p. 11).

Each theorist understands racialization—the process by which race is produced in, on, and through peoples’ bodies and lived experiences—as a discursive reality and not, as often assumed, as a quality or trait held by individuals. Race and racism are not simply qualities that an individual possesses, either physically, morally, or psychologically. Rather, race is a discursive reality produced within the creation, dissemination, and contestation of institutions, public policies, sciences, popular culture, social practices, and commonsense social understandings. In this way, the material reality we inhabit remains textured and coloured according to the power of the ongoing social construction of race. This discursive understanding contrasts with the race thinking and racism that continue to exist as both commonsense understandings and as structural realities. The concept of biological race remains embedded within the fabric of popular discourse (e.g., “he has Aboriginal blood”); ethnic race is carefully marshaled in terms of both multicultural policy and racist backlash against the perceived gains of cultural minorities. Neoracism uses language devoid of overtly racist terms, coding race into the subtext of words such as at-risk youth or the culture of poverty. These terms often refer to populations that once would have been seen as racial groups. In fact, it is the baggage of racist history that is carried along with these new, somewhat sanitized
terms: To use these terms in contexts which are always and already racialized is to continue to foster commonsense, racialized understandings.

It is important to briefly explore this sociological notion of the commonsense, which represents the social stock of knowledge (Tupper & Cappello, 2008) or Apple’s (2000) “official knowledge.” As Hall (1986) says, this knowledge is peoples’ “everyday consciousness or popular thought” (p. 20). This commonsense carries suggestions of many, sometimes contradictory, ideas and it is where the “‘stratified deposits’ of more coherent philosophical systems have sedimented over time without leaving any clear inventory” (Hall, 1986, p. 20). This social stock of knowledge, made of fragments sedimented together over time, makes up the collected reservoir of ideas that people can draw on as they interpret, name, and narrate the world. Hall also suggests that these sediments are taken for granted—“we use them without thinking” (p. 20). This partly explains how there has been little distance made between the way popular culture thought about race in the past and the ways these notions continue to animate and underlie practices in the present. As Furniss (1999) suggests, a dominant culture, framed by racism and colonialism, “is experienced as a set of common-sense, taken-for-granted truths about the nature of reality and the social world” (p. 14).

Locating race thinking within the commonsense, within that which is culturally sanctioned yet largely unexamined, enables us to acknowledge that we “share a common historical and cultural heritage in which racism has played and still plays a dominant role” (Lawrence, 1987, p. 322). So Anderson and Robertson (2011) can say that colonialism, with its racializing necessity, “in a sense is Canadian
society at its deepest level—as treaties and residential schools attest" (p. 6). Locally, this colonial history and heritage continue to produce present realities in ways that underline race—from the 2001 National Census data that show 50% of Aboriginal children in Saskatchewan are living in poverty (Hunter & Douglas, 2006), to the median income disparities between First Nations and non-First Nations people, and to the overrepresentation of First Nations people in provincial jails. Saskatchewan social realities continue to be powerfully marked by race.

The first assumption of this dissertation, then, contends that race remains a salient idea; race still matters. As this work unfolds, especially in consideration of the early texts where biological race is assumed and spoken of directly, it is necessary to be clear about how I am using the term. When I speak of race, it is to place that historical baggage—biology, psychology and, later, ethnic/cultural iterations of race—into the process whereby race is made tangible, through discursive practices that racialize. I use race to explore how processes of racialization work and to notice how some bodies are disadvantaged by being racialized and how others are advantaged.

1.1.2 The Dominance of Whiteness

An example of a group benefitting from processes that racialize involves the production of whiteness. The second assumption underlying this dissertation is that White racial subjectivities are produced as the dominant teacher identification. These racialized realities, just described, and their attendant commonsense understandings, contribute to the production of racialized subjectivities. For Omi and Winant (1993), race is a “central axis of social relations” (p. 16) and, just as the
meanings of race are constantly shifting, so, too, are the racial identities/racialized subjectivities that are being made and remade, “depending on social relations of power” (Schick, 2000, p. 301). These racial categories of colour (Black, White, etc.) or of ethnicity are “complex constructions” “characterized by exceptions, inconsistencies, and frayed edges” (Marx, 2004, p. 134). The second assumption necessary to this research is embedded within, and constitutive of, this complex and contested territory in which whiteness continues to function as an organizing trope of dominance. I understand that the construction of whiteness embeds me, racialized as White, forcefully within this racist reality, implicating me in the unequal consequences of ongoing processes of racialization.

More than merely noticing the effects of racism on the marginalized Other, studying the production of whiteness illustrates how ideas of race work to produce White identities and practices as dominant. Merely accounting for the privileges that accompany whiteness (McIntosh, 1992) does not go far enough. Privileges accompanying White racialization are the symptoms of a much larger system of White dominance/supremacy that makes White privilege possible (Leonardo, 2004). In this way, whiteness can be explained as a “concept that reveals and explains the racial interests of white people, linking them collectively to a position of social dominance” (Hartigan, 1999, p. 16). Locating whiteness within historical, social, political, and cultural struggles and “unfolding relations of domination” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 6) is necessary to make sense of the ongoing effects of racism and the persistence of both White domination/supremacy (Earick, 2009) and racial inequality.
As a concept, and as a social reality, whiteness is contested terrain (Ignatiev, 1995; Roediger, 1991), more often defined by what it is not, rather than by what it is (Marx, 2004). There are some key features of whiteness that could use explication here. Whiteness depends on the racialization of others. Whiteness is situated within knowledge (scientific, economic, political, and cultural) that produces racialized others in ways that enable the maintenance of dominance. Thus, racist discourse (Goldberg, 1993) is centrally concerned with categorizing, legislating, naming, and framing others in ways that support White domination (especially see Said, 1987). This construction of the marked Other is also the condition in which whiteness emerges: “The construction of the former is impossible without the concomitant construction of the latter” (Levine-Rasky, 2002, p. 325). This emergence of whiteness is often unnamed and unmarked, except that whiteness is produced asymmetrically, signaling within itself “domination rather than subordination, normativity rather than marginality, and privilege rather than disadvantage” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 236).

Whiteness is characterized by neutrality. Often deemed as lacking specific cultural traits (as compared to the other who is marked by culture), whiteness is also paradoxically seen by Whites as the status quo and the normal experience (Marx, 2006). This supposed neutrality enables people racialized as White to imagine themselves as somehow “raceless.” Because of this, “racism can... be conceived as something external to us rather than as a system that shapes our daily experiences and sense of self” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 6). The neutrality of whiteness obscures the ongoing racial constitution of the social. Whiteness also represents
particular moral terrain “associated with all that is good and blackness with all that is bad” (Lee, 2005, p. 4). The assumption of goodness—along with the norms of Protestant Christianity, civilization, and rationality—is embedded within the layers of meaning that constitute whiteness. Aside from the ways these norms enable White identities to be constructed as good, as helpful, this goodness makes it difficult for White people to see how they benefit from unearned White supremacy, let alone name their own racism. As Marx (2006) describes, the preservice teachers she worked with, self-identified as good, struggled because “good people could not be racist because racism necessarily suggested hate” (p. 85). The goodness of whiteness enables racism to be attached only to evil people and, therefore, to be connected only with overt acts and hate speech.

This second assumption builds on the first, enabling a more nuanced understanding of how processes of racialization work to produce/maintain advantage. Whiteness, then, refers not to a particular race or set of essential qualities, but rather to the way that people are racialized as if they were White—treated in particular ways, thought of in particular ways, imagined to be a particular way, and produced in particular ways. Throughout this dissertation, I use White and whiteness to refer to the processes by which the dominance of a particular group is produced and maintained; the formation of whiteness illustrates how racialized privileges are conferred and continued.

1.1.3 Teacher Education as White Institutional Space

The third assumption in this dissertation extends the analysis of racialized privilege to the way that race is codified through the production of teacher
education and schools, in general, as White Institutional Space (Feagin, 2006; Moore, 2008). Moore’s (2008) careful description of whiteness embedded within two elite law schools is helpful here. Through descriptions of the physical space (i.e., the pictures on the wall, the old professors memorialized), the administrative structure, the admission policies, and the content of the curriculum (e.g., as case studies where a majority of lawyers are White and the minority persons are almost always the ones in need of legal help), Moore demonstrates the ways in which whiteness marks/shapes these spaces and is produced/reified through these spaces. In a way, this dissertation makes a similar argument: The Secondary Program in the Faculty of Education, University of Regina, functions as White institutional space.

The space in the Faculty of Education, University of Regina, is marked by the almost exclusively White faces of graduates of the program whose graduation photos surround students as they walk the third floor hall from the Student Program office to the General Office and by the almost exclusively White staff who work on students’ behalf. The mostly White faculty pictures outside the Deans’ offices and the all-White professors emeriti attest to the history of whose bodies are represented and welcomed here. The housing of Aboriginal teacher education programs in other buildings further delineates the Education Building as White space.

In considering the teaching profession, one could extend the analysis to the “White Box” of curriculum (Tupper & Cappello, 2008), a description of the prevalence of White cultural capital represented in and through curricular
documents. As Willinsky (1998) outlines, the roots and practices of many of the
disciplines that make up our common curriculum in public schools are in British
Imperialism, and it is through schools that colonial knowledge and ways of knowing
are displayed. Subjects such as history, geography, biology and English all
contribute to and constitute a colonial “dividing of the world.” To the structure and
history of the disciplines, we can add the content of the various subject areas.
Mainstream curriculum represents official knowledge and thus constitutes those
things that can be agreed upon publicly. The ongoing insistence that we add more
diverse voices to curricular content is suggestive of the way that the curriculum
already embodies a normative, White, European perspective. Both this curricular
commonsense and the overwhelming White identification of teachers in
Saskatchewan are key elements in the constitution of the White racial framing of
education.

In this space, it is hard not to imagine the normal teacher (default, typical,
natural, etc.) as a White teacher. In fact, it would be almost impossible to think
anything else (Schick, 2000). Whiteness, as the desired end of teacher education,
excludes the marginalized identities (not White enough, not middle-class enough) of
pre-service teachers, preserving the “modernist figure of the dominant culture: the
autonomous, rational and self-determining agent” (Schick, 2000, p. 299). It is into
this racialized social reality I have described that teacher education programs (as
well as schools) fit, both as products of a racialized system and as producers of
racialized discourses and subjects.
Popular discourses around schooling and teachers tell a different story. Rather than invoking the effects of racialization or whiteness, dominant society presently prefers to speak of schools and teachers as potentially ameliorating the effects of social inequality. This remains true to the tradition of seeing school as the great equalizer—attending, working hard, learning to be useful/productive; schools are still seen as pathways to success for a large number of students. Increasingly, Saskatchewan teachers and schools are placed in the position of mediating social services to better serve those students who require healthcare, child-and-family services, and other professional help. The language of school boards and of policy documents and curriculum positions teaching and teachers in ways that emphasize the help teachers can offer to mitigate or undo social inequalities. This gap between the overt and tacit production of White racialization through teacher education and schooling, generally, on the one hand, and the effects of racialized oppression through schools, on the other, represents a troubling paradox.

The question of this dissertation is

*How does pre-service teacher education produce teachers as racialized subjects?*

The following three assumptions ground the work of this dissertation in a particular reading of social reality.

1. The social is a racialized order where, in spite of claims to being beyond race, race continues to shape both marginalized and dominant identities.
2. Dominance in this social environment is marked by White racial identification.
3. Teacher education is White institutional space, both marked by, and productive of, White dominance.
These assumptions enable an understanding of my question both broadly, insisting on the salience of race, and, specifically, understanding the dominance of whiteness and tracing its production in and through the White institutional space of teacher education.

1.2 Situating This Work: In Discourse and About Subjectivity

In this section, I highlight some of the ways in which I assume discourse to function. For the purposes of this paper, I use discourse in the Foucaultian sense to refer to “what can be said and thought, but also about who can speak, when and with what authority. Discourses embody meaning and social relationships, they constitute both subjectivity and power relations” (Ball, 1990, p. 2). Discourse concerns how certain statements, ideas, and identities are made intelligible and “true.” Simply put, discourses are “groups of related statements which cohere in some way to produce both meanings and effects in the real world” (Carabine, 2001, p. 268). In order to avoid seeing discourse as only being about language, it is important to qualify, as Lecourt (2004) puts it, that “language is part of discourse, not its totality” (p. 10). Discourse is “locked in an intricate web of practices, bearing in mind that every practice is by definition both discursive and material” (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1984, p. 106). Discourse and practice cannot be separated, but are mutually constitutive and thus dependent on each other: Discourses are performative; practices are discursive.

The constitution of the postmodern subject hinges on a Foucaultian conception of discourse. The subject is discursive because “persons come to ‘be’ ‘who’ they are by being intelligible within discourses, the bodies of meaning that
frame social contexts” (Youdell, 2006b, p. 2). The complexities of a poststructural theory of the subject can be laid out as three interlocking, recursive moments wherein the subject is seen as: (a) the subject of discourse (i.e., knowledge, ideas about who and what the subject can be), (b) subjected in and through technologies of power (i.e., practices that work to produce the subject in particular ways), and (c) produced through practices of self (i.e., ways in which the subject is invited to act upon him/herself). In this way, something of the productivity of discourse is revealed, not in regards to any particular subject, but by drawing attention to “the discursive context in which their identities are produced” (Schick, 2000, p. 304). By tracing the ways teacher education imagines, works on, and produces teachers, this research demonstrates the racialized subjectivities inherent in becoming a teacher. Rather than focusing on how individual teachers are racialized, it is necessary to see the discourses and discursive practices engaged in teacher education. Because discourse is performative, tracing discourse is tracing subjectivity; seeing the meanings/practices that produce subjects, means seeing the kinds of subjectivities that are available/intelligible to take up.

Conceiving of discourse in this manner carries a major implication for my research in regards to the conceptualizing of race. Attending to the discursive construction of meaning (and subjects) shifts the emphasis from any inherent biologic characteristics of race to the socially constructed discursive regimes of racialization. For me, the concept of discourse allows insights into how processes of racialization function and how the “effects” of race are produced discursively. This dissertation seeks to make sense of discourses that impact and shape teacher
education, that work to produce teachers in particular ways and, in terms of my interests, that work to racialize teachers. Having considered the nature of discourse, I am now able to consider genealogy.

### 1.3 Situating This Work: Genealogy as Methodology

In discussion with a graduate student who was writing about him, Michel Foucault, with a characteristic humility regarding his own work, urged her to not spend "energy talking about him and, instead do what he was doing, namely, (writing) genealogies" (cited in Sawicki, 1991, p. 15). Foucault’s insistence on the importance of genealogy is salient; comments such as his response to this graduate student add strength to the general feeling that genealogy is more important than the rest of Foucault’s work: Genealogy is preeminent.

Prado (2000) defines genealogy as Foucault’s analysis of “how the development of discursive practices and interactive conventions produce truth and knowledge and so shape and define subjects and subjectivity” (p. 11). Dean (1994) reflects the same range, describing genealogy as an analysis of the historically concrete modes of discourse and practice that surround/enable practices of self-formation. Genealogy examines “the means which seek to establish and promote particular human capacities... within bodies of knowledge and types of rationality, forms of power and government, and ethical practices” (Dean, 1994, p. 63).

Genealogy as a practice is generous in the range of analysis it might allow. While Foucault eschews commitment to closed methodologies and, instead, goes “beyond any existing theories and/or methodologies” (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 201), he continues to consistently refer to his work as genealogies.
It may be said, then, that a range of practices/research might come under the umbrella of genealogy. In the Foucaultian sense, work can be described as genealogical if it attends to:

- questions of truth (the constitution of discourses, what can be said/thought of as knowledge)
- questions of power (the enactment of these discourses within technologies and practices)
- questions of the subject (the production of particular kinds of subjectivities).

These enquiries—considered within an historical framework that seeks to understand how certain truths, or certain practices, or certain selves emerge or disappear over time—can be considered genealogies.

A brief look at Foucault’s writing will serve to illustrate some of the ways that genealogical inquiry might work. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1995) and *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1. An introduction* (1981) represent Foucault’s most polished genealogies. *Discipline and Punish* starts with an unflinchingly brutal portrayal of the trial, torture, and eventual execution of a regicide in France in 1757. This event is used as a bracket and sets up a comparison with another bracket: the birth of the modern prison. Together, these brackets allow Foucault to consider the transformation from one kind of societal relationship to punishment to a different kind of relationship. *Discipline and Punish* represents a genealogical recasting of the reasons for this transformation, moving from the traditional progress to more humane treatment to a more complex reading.
Discipline and Punish (Foucault, 1995) traces how the imposition of certain disciplines produces certain kinds of subjects. The new management techniques, or techniques of power, are employed to bring about new subjects. Whereas torture acted on the surface of the body, these new technologies aimed for the depths of the body, creating and managing the human soul. Foucault examines techniques of power that include five devices: (a) hierarchical observation, (b) normalizing judgment, (c) the examination, (d) panopticism, and (e) surveillance. Through these devices, rule/discipline was internalized to produce more self-governing subjects. Each technology also represents an instance of power/knowledge. From the production of “true” knowledge through the examination, to the notes made during observation, through to the physical architectural designs for the institutions themselves, the dynamic interplay between relations of power and knowledge is on display.

The History of Sexuality: Volume 1 (Foucault, 1981) also takes a commonsense understanding of a period and seeks to make it less facile, less immediately intelligible. The book traces the production of sexuality. It starts with the notion of the “repressive hypothesis,” that traditional understanding of the Victorian era—prudish, repressive, and silent on the subject of sex. By careful elaboration, Foucault demonstrates the essential role that sex and sexuality play in the knowledge produced through the human sciences. Similar to the technologies of power at work in the prison, Foucault lists five devices, conceptual/practical features of this period that produce/shape knowledge about sex. They are: the “clinical codification of the inducement to speak”; the “postulate of a general and
diffuse causality”; the “principle of a latency intrinsic to sexuality”; a “method of interpretation”; and the “medicalization of the effects of confession” (Foucault, 1990, pp. 65-67). It is these technologies that produce “sexuality as a complex but essentially unitary defining aspect of human nature best dealt with a scientia sexualis capable of fully mapping that complexity” (Prado, 2000, p. 103). Foucault demonstrates that sex becomes an incitement to discourse, a space around which discourse can be produced. Thus, the book is not so much about sex per se, rather it details how the production of discourse (and subjects) around sex occurred. Foucault (1981) lays out how a norm-based sexuality was developed through the human sciences and established as the truth (i.e., examples of power/knowledge). This history of sexuality demonstrates how power “manufactures a particular subjectivity that is internalized and made the truth about oneself by most members of our culture” (Prado, 2000, p. 85).

This range of approaches and interests is also shown in some of the research enabled out of Foucault’s theoretical terrain. Dean’s (1991) The Constitution of Poverty: Toward a Genealogy of Liberal Governance represents his attempt to demonstrate that “pauperism belongs to the conditions of emergence of our present” (p. 2). He examines social theory and policy in order “to make intelligible the conditions under which poverty appears in various forms of discourse, whether theory, policy, or empirical social investigation” (Dean, 1991, p. 9). Carabine’s (2001) Unmarried Motherhood 1830-1990: A Genealogical Analysis investigates social policy to trace the production of unmarried motherhood through discourse (i.e., what is said about it and to what effect). She charts the production of a
deserving class of the poor (e.g., widows) who should be looked after and endowed with rights, and the undeserving poor, unmarried mothers who should not be looked after (i.e., given duties) because of their dubious morality.

Corrigan’s (1987b) *Masculinity as Right: Some Thoughts on the Genealogy of ‘Rational Violence’* attempts to think about how discursive regimes, images, and moral regulations still “differently empower men compared with women” (p. 270), through the necessity of male dominance. Especially important is the way this differential power is taken to be normal, natural, and “simply right.” Corrigan briefly traces the ways that this dominance is formed through the family (and the sexuality relations on display), in schooling (and the subjectivity relations on offer), and through cultural forms (and the gendered relations available). McWilliam’s (1999) *Pedagogical Pleasures* looks at the historical contingency of the production of pleasure within the teaching profession through “moral training made possible through disciplinary discourses organized around certain epistemic rules in a particular historical time and place” (p. x). She examines a number of commonsense notions of what makes for good pedagogy (proper and improper relationships with students, proper and improper forms of discipline) and explores how these are locally produced through discourses and governed by what is considered to be ethical at the time. Here there is a clear range of interests and emphasis on discourse, practices of power, and subjectivity in varying degrees, yet these are all genealogical in their approach.
1.4 Genealogy as my Methodology

Given the analyses offered through the genealogical inquiries previously described, it is possible to outline how I use this approach in my own research. As genealogy requires a local focus, so this dissertation considers the racialized production of teachers in the University of Regina. Just as Foucault chose brackets for his work, I consider two specific moments in the history of this production:

- 1914, the first year of teacher education in the newly built Regina Normal School
- 1985, the first official year of the new secondary program at the University of Regina.

This dissertation explores how teacher education works to racialize teachers as White through their training. I show that this racialization occurs through the following mechanisms.

- the production/iteration of discourses about race and nation
- the embodiment of a technical/rational epistemology and an emphasis on technique
- the psychological foundations of teacher education that underwrite the unitary, rational, subject and reify this subject through technologies of self-management cum teacher supervision.

By paying careful attention to the various discourses and discursive practices that teacher education in each period encourages/enables, one can more clearly understand the kind of subjectivity that the programs are engendering.

My research consists largely of what could be called “archaeological” work, the “grey” work (Foucault, 1971) of taking up discourses through the weathered
pages of records; searching out obscure, local, often overlooked texts as sources; and tracing the practices of a place and a timeframe through its parchments. These include sources that initiate, explain, chart, establish, or apologize for teacher education. They also include the textbooks used in the training of teachers in a given period. For the 1914 context, texts were traced through the Legislative Library, the Provincial Archives, and the Historical Textbook Collection at the University of Saskatchewan. *The Ordinances of the North West Territories*, *the Report of the Board of Education for the North West Territories*, *the Report of the Council of Public Education*, and *the Report of the Department of Education for the North West Territories*, for various years, provide important background information to the establishment of teacher education. The *Report of the Department of Education for the Province of Saskatchewan* (for various years) and the *Normal School Course of Study, 1911* provide more immediate context/structure to understanding the education of teachers in 1914. Biographical articles on some of the major political/administrative figures of the time also contribute to understanding the period.

The textbooks used by the pre-service teachers and their instructors in Regina Normal School for the First Class certification program include:

The MacMillan Company.


The documents for the 1985 context were discovered largely through the Archives and Special Collections, at the Archer Library, University of Regina. Memos, minutes of meetings, and other correspondence from 1972-1986 from the Dean’s Office files, the Dean’s Advisory Committee, the Faculty Executive Council, the Secondary Education Program Development Committee, and the Curriculum Committee were explored. The first six volumes of the *Journal of Professional Studies* were examined, especially because the professors/architects of the new program were very involved in both imagining and editing this new journal. ‘Professional Studies’ was being adopted as an area of study at about the same time as the new secondary program. Lang’s (1978) *A Survey of Literature Relating to Secondary Teacher Education with Implications for the Faculty of Education, University of Regina* provided some of the sources that motivated/underpinned the direction of program change.

Part of the difficulty with examining this later period is the experimental nature of the development of the new secondary program: Notes were not necessarily taken and writing/research was not necessarily produced. Two books in particular were identified as being very important in the thinking behind the development of the secondary program. Goldhammer’s (1969) *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers* and Joyce and Weil’s (1972) *Models...*
of Teaching provide crucial direction/information about what teacher education in the faculty was trying to accomplish. Besides the lab manuals, internship manuals, and other internally developed documents that depict the work of the faculty, Lang, McBeath, and Hébert's (1995) Teaching: Strategies and Methods for Student-Centered Instruction captures something of the undocumented work and ideas that were circulating in the 1985 context.

1.5 Outlining an Analytic of Practice

How does teacher education produce teachers as racialized subjects? To answer this question, I draw on Foucault's (1990) analytics of practice expressed in The History of Sexuality: Volume 2. Both Dean (1994) and Mahon (1992) devote significant attention to this articulation of genealogical inquiry. By the later stages of Foucault’s career, he had become more clear and explicit about what his historical projects entailed. The four elements of this analytic include: (a) an ontology (what needs to be governed in both the self and others?); (b) a deontology (what is produced in the self and others when we govern this element?); (c) an ascetics (how is this element to be governed? which methods?); and (d) a teleology (what is the aim of these practices? who do we imagine ourselves to be?). These questions enable an inquiry into the practices of teacher education—including course content, methods, practica, and supervision—that open up genealogical space to understand the effects of these practices in producing teacher subjectivity.

Articulated with respect to my own local interests, an analytic looks something like this:
1. **Ontology.** What is being governed in teachers themselves and in society as a whole through the education of teachers? To what is teacher education a response?

2. **Deontology.** What is being produced in teachers by this governing? What is being produced in the students these teachers will teach?

3. **Ascetics.** What are the practices of teacher education that bring about or enable this governing?

4. **Teleology.** Who are we trying to become through these practices?

It is these questions that form the outline for the “interviews” of the texts that I conducted. These questions, applied specifically to an historical practice of teacher education, open up Foucaultian spaces of inquiry in ways that produce a genealogical analysis.

Starting with the earlier texts, I read everything that I had collected, searching for answers to the questions that I had posed. In each text, I noted the words, themes, and assumptions that were evident. Over time, and after reading more texts, it was possible to notice broader trends, words in common, themes that were repeated, and assumptions that stretched between and across the books. For each period, it was possible to outline and categorize the answers I found to the questions outlined in the analytics of practice. These answers, taken together, draw attention to the discourses that shape and limit the subjectivity offered to students.

**1.6 Limits/Possibilities of This Work**

To be clear from the outset: Genealogy is not history in the sense we generally understand it. At the end of this chapter, I concisely outline the history of
teacher education in Regina, in order to locate the analysis of texts within a broad historical narrative. However, this dissertation is neither a history of teacher education nor is it a history of the secondary education program at the University of Regina. Though there are deeply historical elements to this research, I am not trying to account for every contributor or nuance of these periods. There are significant historical moments, as well as actors who get little or no consideration. My genealogical work aims to make sense of how teaching subjects have been formed through teacher education. I take up the legitimacy and limitations of this approach to historical work more fully in Chapter 2.

There are other complications with this research, especially around how embedded I am in the work. As a graduate of the secondary education program at the University of Regina, the processes and discourses that I explore in the research are ones that have shaped me as a teacher. Some professors who were part of the transition to the new secondary program were my professors and are now colleagues. As a White teacher who has taught high school in overtly racialized environments, I have some experience with the racialization effects of teacher education that I describe. In many ways, I am asking questions that immediately reference myself: I am entangled within the discourses that I am trying to understand. Although my place within this research is complicated, there is no space outside of dominant discourses that is safe or neutral, including whatever spaces I create or talk about in this research. Because discourse, discursive practices, and performances surround and constitute me, it is impossible to be outside of discourse or to find some objective place outside of my own experience of teacher education.
1.7 Overview of This Work

Chapter 2 explores the work of genealogy as methodology. I listen to what traditional history has to say to genealogy, taking seriously the criticisms that the discipline of history offers. I explore both what genealogy has to say to history and the analytic opportunities that are available through the adoption of this methodology. The chapter also discusses the theories of subjectivity that underlie genealogical work.

Chapter 3 begins the genealogical inquiry by looking at discourses of nation and race within the texts of teacher education. The earlier texts are conspicuous in marshalling overtly racialized material and characterizing teacher education in explicitly racialized terms. Although these ideas are not overtly present in the later texts, the absence of race speaks to the particular ways in which race thinking was manifested in the 1985 context. The chapter considers the way that this appearance of racelessness, together with an emphasis on culture as a stand-in for race, represents a discursive shift in the expression of racism and enables dominant White subjectivities to continue to form within an ongoing White institutional space.

Chapter 4 continues the genealogical analysis by examining the dependence on technologies of power that embrace technical rationality underlying both periods in question. Particular conceptions of reason and technique animate the foundations of how teacher education is articulated and practiced in the early period. In the later period, teacher education more fully adopts technical rationality in attempts to become more effective. The chapter explores how the technical process of the
developmental model inserts whiteness into the core of the teacher, demonstrating that the good/effective/skilled teacher is also the White teacher.

Chapter 5 concludes the genealogical work by analyzing the techniques of the self that are embedded within the practices of teacher education. The 1914 context was psychological; however, this emphasis was somewhat muted because of the relative place and development of the science of psychology. The chapter considers the self-work of student teachers, especially the ways that practice teaching supported/enabled technologies of hyper-visibility and self-surveillance. Psychological tools and content deeply mark the 1985 context. The chapter looks specifically at the technologies of clinical supervision and reflection and how students can come to see themselves, write themselves, and act on themselves in increasingly effective ways. These technologies embed racelessness deeply into the selves of student teachers, allowing them to take up the work of producing themselves as White in powerful ways.

Chapter 6 concludes the dissertation by foregrounding my own experiences as a teacher education student. The chapter offers an (un)usual narrative, the murder of Pamela George by a University of Regina education student, and one of my classmates, as a place to consider the results of educating teachers within a narrow technical-rational framework. The narrative also suggests possibilities for considering both the racializing work of teacher education and the broader social context of education in this place. The chapter ends with a consideration of how my own work as a teacher educator might better disrupt the production of whiteness
and thereby interrupt the ongoing racialized domination that education currently supports. It is possible to imagine being different than we are now.

1.8 Prologue: A Brief History of Teacher Education in Regina

Saskatchewan did not become a province until 1905. Saskatchewan’s preprovincial history of education as part of the North West Territories (NWT) might begin with the NWT School Ordinance of 1884 which saw the creation of a dual-confessional education system similar to that of Quebec (Scharf, 2006) or Manitoba (McDonald, 1979). Power was concentrated in the hands of the churches until 1891, when the NWT Act was amended and an exclusive committee to oversee education and move towards centralizing the education system was established (McDonald, 1979). By 1892, the Territorial Government had complete control of education, and denominational boards had been replaced with the Council of Public Instruction (McDonald, 1979). Chairman of the Executive Committee of the NWT Council, Frederick Haultain, who became premier of the NWT in 1897, had a keen interest in shaping the direction of education and was responsible for these changes. It is important to notice the similarities (not just in name) between the Council of Public Instruction and Ontario’s model. Similar to Ryerson’s efforts in Ontario, this group represented a “sphere above politics,” in that none of the members were elected and the council was unaccountable to anyone, except the Premier. This enabled the rapid centralization and uniform administration of education in the territories. As well as the model for administration of education, Ontario also served as a source for curricular materials and, especially in the early decades, for trained teachers.
In 1892, Haultain hired David Goggin, the man he thought best suited to make real his vision for “state-controlled national schools” (McDonald, 1979, p. 15), to be first the director of Normal Schools and Teacher Institutes and, a few months later, the superintendent of schools. At Haultain’s direction, Goggin was to focus his attention on the development of courses of studies and on the training of teachers (McDonald, 1977). Goggin was already known to territorial teachers and administrators because of his work in educational leadership in Manitoba and his frequent speaking engagements at NWT teacher conventions (McDonald, 1979). Moreover, he was a known advocate for national schools (McDonald, 1979) and, according to Axelrod (1997), this fit in with an aggressive moment in educational practice that featured a “passionate commitment to Anglo-Saxon heritage” (p. 56).

According to Goggin, there were four central features of British-Canadian citizenship that must be preserved in and through schools, namely: Imperial patriotism; Protestantism; the English language; and cleanliness (Axelrod, 1997).

On Goggin’s retirement from the NWT in 1901, James Calder, Goggin’s successor, was able to call him the “guiding spirit of Education in Western Canada” (McDonald, 1979, p. 19). Goggin maintained a presence in educational and imperial associations such as the Empire Club, where he became president in 1908. From 1901-1904 he served as President of the Dominion Educational Association and from 1904-1907, as Secretary. At their convention in Toronto in 1904, Goggin emphasized, among other things, the importance of preparing teachers to “think imperially” (McDonald, 1979, p. 23), by which he meant the pursuit of a nationalist Canadian spirit. He continued to affect education through his work as a textbook
commissioner in Ontario (1909), as the general editor of textbooks for Ontario (1912), and, eventually, as the editor-in-chief of the Macmillan Company of Canada (McDonald, 1977). On his death, Goggin was widely lauded as an exemplary figure in education and the architect of educational systems in Manitoba and in the NWT (that eventually became Alberta and Saskatchewan). It is clear that the spirit of Anglo-conformity motivated and shaped the direction of NWT education through the leadership of both Goggin and, ultimately, Haultain who sanctioned and encouraged this direction.

The reality of population growth illustrates why this emphasis on imperial education was deemed so important. The numbers of people living in the NWT grew quickly from about 20,000 in the 1890s, through until 1920, when almost a million people lived in Saskatchewan, which gained provincial status on September 1, 1905. People came from Ontario, the northern United States (US), and from all over Europe. European immigrants tended to settle in ethnic blocs, largely in the southern half of the province. This pattern of ethnic settlement in homogeneous blocs was problematic because the ethnic factors of language, cultural practices, and politics made schooling difficult and “retard(ed) their assimilation” (a sociology report from the time, cited in Scharf, 2006, p. 8). Schools were to provide the means through which these disparate groups could be turned into subjects and full participants in the larger Anglo society.

The training of teachers to provide this education was an issue from the outset of the NWT, given the disparity between the numbers of settlers and the inability of territorial administration to train their own teachers in large numbers.
Therefore, many teachers were recruited from Ontario to fill the needs of the territory. There is some evidence that high school education in the NWT was aimed at teacher preparation (Axelrod, 1997; Langley, 1944; Walker, 1979), with the academic program closely following the requirements for teacher certification. More evidence of this connection is seen in the authorization of high schools to include Normal\(^1\) departments. In 1890, Moosomin Union High School briefly offered a professional course for teacher certification (Walker, 1979). Later, short Normal sessions were offered in Moosomin and Regina (Walker, 1979). Normal sessions were to last from the first Monday in November until the last Friday in March and include the following subjects: the history, science and art of education; methodology; school organization and management; school hygiene; school law; drill and calisthenics; and practical teaching (Langley, 1944).

According to Harrigan (1992), the establishment of a Normal school made evident a “concern for the development of a regulated, certified, and supervised cadre of teachers in a publicly directed system of schools” (p. 496). Whereas the earlier instances of teacher training were inconsistent, Goggin instituted regular Normal training in Regina’s Territorial Normal School starting in 1893. These classes operated first out of the Regina Union School, at Hamilton Street and 11\(^{th}\) Avenue, moved to a site on South Railway Avenue, and, later, to the Alexandra Public School. First Class (Grade XII standing to enter) and Second Class (Grade XI standing) certificates could be obtained by attending 4-month Normal sessions. Third Class (Grade X standing) certificates were still available through short Normal

\(^1\) Originally from the French —École Normale— schools designed to create teaching standards or norms.
training offered in communities where there was a need and/or desire. Aside from the entrance requirements, the major difference between these grades of certification was largely the depth of content knowledge (Langley, 1944). To meet the rising demand for teachers, Normal schools were later opened in Saskatoon (1912) and Moose Jaw (1927).

The teachers at Normal schools were school inspectors and/or master teachers and, similar to teacher education in Ontario, “the culture was that of the classroom” (Hallman, 2003, p. 172). Courses of study included lectures, observation of the Normal school staff modeling various educational practices, and practice teaching in surrounding schools. Langley (1944) notices in the development and articulation of successive programs of study for Normal certification the “gradual transfer of the emphasis from scholarship to technique” (p. 124). Each Normal school curricula deployed (1896, 1906, 1911) demonstrated not more content, but an increasingly detailed accounting for how each subject area was to be taught. More than general theory, the emphasis became increasingly focused on how that theory might translate into practice in the classroom.

Regina Normal School Principal T. E. Perrett (intermittently from 1906-1926) noted in the Annual Report for 1910 that “The necessity for a properly arranged and equipped Normal School is most pressing, the accommodation in our present quarters in the Alexandra Public School being completely inadequate” (Department of Education, 1910). The Department of Education met these requests by setting aside 10 acres of land for the development of a teacher education facility. The corner stone was laid on May 20, 1913. The Regina Normal School officially
opened the doors of its new building, at the corner of Broad Street and College Avenue, in January of 1914, with 165 students working in courses towards First and Second Class certification.

The next few decades were marked by a steady increase in the entrance requirements to Normal schools, as well as an increase in the expectations and time required to obtain professional certification. In 1919 the Department of Education extended the required length of time for obtaining First and Second Class certificates to 8 months. Until 1926, the need for teachers was largely met through the issuing of Third Class certificates—a temporary certification that could be obtained by attending short training sessions held in communities. After 1926, these temporary certificates were no longer issued. In 1936, Second Class certificates were also abolished. Certification requirements were relaxed briefly during teacher shortages around the time of the Second World War.

It was noted in the annual reports for 1926 that for the first time the province was unable to accommodate all the candidates who had applied for Normal schools. The opening of the Moose Jaw Normal School in 1927 was an attempt to alleviate these restrictions. Moreover, the College of Education at the University of Saskatchewan also opened in 1927, offering both a certificate course that enabled graduates to teach in high schools and a Master of Science in Education course. The responsibility for training high school teachers was transferred to the university, which further relieved the stress of inadequate placements in the Normal schools. Hallman (2003) characterizes these two sites—the practical training in Normal schools and the professional college at the University of Saskatchewan—as “two
traditions” within teacher education that would exist side by side for the next 35 years.

In 1939, Regina Normal was closed, although short courses were offered in Regina for a few years. This closing was justified largely because of the decrease in the overall demand for teachers; it was felt that three Normal schools in the province were too many. Moreover, teacher education was continuing in the College of Education at the University of Saskatchewan. In 1946, the college offered a 4-year undergraduate program in education that was “meant to put teaching on par with other professions” (Hallman, 2003, p. 173). Elementary teacher education students had to spend their first year at Teachers’ College, which was accepted as 1 year towards a Bachelor of Education degree. In 1953, Normal schools were renamed as teachers’ colleges in order to “enhance the professional status of teaching” (Hallman, 2003, p. 173).

The Teacher’s College in Moose Jaw was moved back to Regina in 1959 because of changes in the requirements for the certification of teachers. Previously, a certificate required 1 year of professional training. With the changes to the requirements of teacher certification in 1953, a second year of general, university-level study was mandated to qualify for professional certification. These requirements could be met through Regina College, and the Teacher’s College eventually moved back into the old space at the College Avenue campus. In 1959, these buildings were updated and were home to teacher education in Regina until 1969.
In 1964, after many years of discussion and collaboration, legislation was enacted that placed all teacher education under the direction of the University of Saskatchewan, while maintaining the regulation of teacher certification in the hands of the government. Staff at teachers’ colleges in both Regina and Saskatoon became part of the university and were granted commensurate standing as assistant or associate professors, depending on their level of education. Regina Teachers’ College became the College of Education at the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus. In 1965, the College was renamed the Faculty of Education to differentiate it from the residential colleges. Faculty became standard nomenclature in Regina for what were called colleges at the University of Saskatchewan (Pitsula, 2006).

Both sites offered elementary and general education courses but, originally, the secondary program was offered only in Saskatoon. Completing a professional year of study plus five acceptable university classes qualified a student for a Standard A teaching certificate. Those students who completed only the professional year qualified for an Interim Standard teaching certificate. The Regina campus quickly added a full degree course in 1965, and a 4-year degree in secondary education was launched in 1966 (Pitsula, 2006). What differentiated this secondary program from its counterpart in Saskatoon was the commitment to a full-semester internship, compared to a 2- or 3-week internship at the University of Saskatchewan.

With extensive consultation and input from the teacher education faculty in Regina, a new four-storey building for teacher education was built on the main campus in 1969. Flexibility was the keynote of the design of the education building
which, at the time, was the largest single building on campus. Built to house between 2000 and the expected 3000 students, it officially opened on October 24, 1969. The building was built primarily for teacher education, although engineering and administration faculties also shared the space. Features included a 500-seat lecture theatre, with two, 150-seat lecture theatres attached that could open into an 800-seat hall. As well, innovative classrooms were built for 35 students, some with movable walls that could either be opened to seat 70 students or cut in half to accommodate smaller groups. Almost all the second floor was set apart for an Education Library, and the third floor was dominated by five, fully equipped science labs to enable instruction in the various scientific disciplines. Classroom space was largely set apart in the centre of the building, while administration, office, and work space were built around the periphery.

Around the time of the move to the new building, there was a renewed interest in doing teacher education differently. Generally, there was leadership in Regina that sought to experiment. R. N. Anderson, head of secondary education, was responsible for innovations such as the full-semester internship and the use of reviewing tapes of student teaching in order to improve teaching skills. He placed an emphasis on trying theory out in the field and encouraged faculty to locate and develop practicing teachers in their areas who could test new pedagogical approaches. Although Anderson was a casualty of the leadership ‘trauma’ (Tymchak, 1988, p. 23) under the short-lived deanship of Norman France, this spirit of innovation seemed to mark the work of the faculty.

---

2 The appointment of France, an outsider and an authoritarian, caused a great deal of unrest and acrimony among faculty members.
In 1971, Arthur Kratzmann, the new dean, initiated a significant review of the faculty organization. From this review, Kratzmann switched the organization of the faculty from the traditional elementary and secondary departments to a structure that focused on subject areas. This innovation demanded that faculty collaborate across departmental divisions and that more faculty be involved in decision making about programs. More than collaborative, interfaculty approaches, the Faculty of Education developed and maintained strong relationships and collaborations with both in-service teachers and the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation leadership.

Schaller and Lang (1982) suggest two other significant factors that supported or encouraged change. First, the 1973 fall study conferences, set up by the Department of Education, set off an extensive collaborative public consultation that stretched throughout the province and attempted to include as many voices as possible to determine how teacher education might be changed. Among other findings, this process drew attention to both the need for more emphasis on the teaching of skills to teacher candidates, as well as an increased focus on practical field experience. Second, the formation of the University of Regina in 1974 as an autonomous university in its own right made it possible to imagine and carry out a program of education that was different from what was happening at the University of Saskatchewan. This new autonomy provided impetus for the kinds of program development that the Faculty of Education was undertaking.

In September of 1971, the Program Development Committee began its work of redesigning the approach to teacher education. The faculty worked to bring together a variety of ideas about effective teacher education from across the
spectrum of academic and theoretical perspectives. In practice, these ideas were turned into experimental offerings where smaller groups of students and faculty tried out an approach or practice. Professor Nickel’s “Experience Bank Project” is an example. Students in the project alternated between a few weeks of instruction on campus and a week of practice in schools, enabling a focused emphasis on particular skills or teaching ideas. This project became the trial run for the professional-year concept and pre-internship. The constant evaluation, the hands-on nature of the work, and the time commitments for teaching, field supervision, and meetings were a heavy burden on faculty members involved in program development. The dramatically increased workload of the new program left less time for research and writing/publications that are traditionally the measure of the contributions of a university faculty member.

The new elementary education program was fully implemented in July 1977. The developmental model, as referred to by some, focused on the systematic development of teacher candidates in the four interrelated areas of cognitive development, ego development, skill development, and reflection/decision-making development. To facilitate this growth, the program planned for individual students to develop by following a spiraling path that built sequentially. The plan looked like this: theory → controlled practice → feedback/reflection → further practice in the classroom → feedback/reflection → further theory → further practice (Schaller & Lang, 1982, p. 12). This development was supported throughout 4 years of carefully sequenced training. Early reports from the field suggested that the graduates from the new program were “different, were better prepared and able to function at a
higher level in their first year of teaching than former graduates” (Schaller & Lang, 1982, p. 11).

Building on the success of the new elementary program and the momentum of the changes, the faculty turned their attention to improving a secondary program that only a decade earlier was considered progressive. In 1977, an initial task force was established to raise significant questions that could provide the basis for a more extensive task force (Lang & Schaller, 1985). In 1978, the Task Force on Secondary Teacher Education was given a mandate to “produce recommendations, which, if implemented, will result in improvements in the program and services provided by the Faculty of Education, University of Regina” (Toews & Cooper, 1980, p. 4). The scope of the work was detailed and far-reaching, seeking to consult all those constituencies across the province with a stake in secondary education. The final report and analysis were given to the faculty in June 1980. The Program Development Committee, chaired by Hellmut Lang, began to work on the recommendations and presented an initial proposal to faculty in November 1981, which was approved. Through various faculty retreats and ongoing committee collaborations, the outline and details for the new program took shape. A formal presentation of the new program was made to faculty in February 1984, and the program was implemented over the next few years.

While the meetings and conversations were ongoing, the approaches and ideas in the program were being experimented in small batches. This experimentation was similar to (and no doubt influenced by) the developmental process of the new elementary program. Interested faculty experimented with
delivery models, integration of subject areas, approaches to fieldwork, and other aspects of the program. The most significant changes in the program were concentrated in the professional courses. What in the new elementary program were EdGen courses (i.e., generic education, as opposed to subject-area specific courses) became education professional studies (EPS) courses. The EPS courses were designed to integrate theory and practice, allowing students to develop/understand teaching skills and exposing them to educational theories in ways that could be seen in practice and reflected on. It was the careful sequencing of the content of these courses, combined with an integration of opportunities to both microteach (at the university) and practice teach (at cooperating schools), that was at the heart of this new approach.

The new secondary education program at the University of Regina was officially implemented in the fall of 1985. While similar to the elementary program, there were some important refinements that characterized the secondary approach. The ultimate goal of the program was to prepare teachers who were “self-analyzing, self-actualizing, interdependent teacher/decision-makers” (Lang & Schaller, 1985, p. 18). This would be accomplished through incorporating field experiences throughout the 4 years of the degree program. These field experiences were supported by the rigorously sequenced professional courses that introduced students to relevant theory and skills, that provided opportunities for microteaching and observation, that taught through self-reflection, and that linked these skills with targets the students might plan to meet through their instruction. This vision of
teacher/decision makers or rational decision makers (Hutcheon & Malikail, 1973) as the end result of teacher preparation was an important new conceptualization.

With what Langley (1944) described as the move from scholarship to an emphasis on technique in the early years of teacher education, and the two traditions that Hallman noted, there appears to be an ongoing tension between an emphasis on practice and an emphasis on more traditional scholarship that seems relevant. According to Hallman (2003), this division came to mark the difference between the program at the University of Saskatchewan and the program at the University of Regina. The vision for teacher education that emphasized the technical or practical orientation, over and above a scholarly orientation, became dominant at the University of Regina. One professor who had participated through this period characterized Regina’s technical/practical orientation as having occurred because key faculty “were very profession oriented, they were very schools oriented. They weren’t very university oriented at all …. they were field oriented” (cited in Hallman, 2003, p. 177). The adoption of a technical approach, even though it was supplemented with other psychological or humanist ideas, largely fits within this practical orientation.

The professor in the program who was quoted by Hallman (2003) described the overall approach this way:

We would teach people how to teach. We would do skills and strategies, we would do lesson planning, we’d do things like set development closure for presenting a lesson. We would talk about questions, we would show people how to lead a discussion. We would talk about classroom management, … how to handle disruptions when they occur; you know we would give people a repertoire of skills and strategies that would enable them to teach and meanwhile they’d be taking curriculum classes. And then at the end of the
program we’d tack on Ed. Foundations and tell them what it was all about. (p. 178)

With some minor changes, depending on subject areas and their emphases, this description captures something of the way the program functioned into the late 1990s and beyond. The program renewal in the faculty, implemented in 2009, represents the first and largest fundamental shift away from the technical base that had been the foundation of the program for almost 30 years.
CHAPTER 2. HISTORY EXPLORED THROUGH GENEALOGY: THE HISTORY OF SUBJECTS

The prologue that ends Chapter 1 provides a story, an historical narrative that describes how secondary teacher education came to be in Regina. The purpose of Chapter 2 is to explore the methodological questions and territory of genealogical inquiry, applied specifically to the brief history of teacher education offered in the prologue. The prologue acts not only as an historical account, providing the necessary factual information—to establish something of the context for teacher education—but also as a foil. Engaging with the more mainstream representation of history allows some of the distinctions of a genealogical rendering of history to be articulated. First, this chapter examines the prologue as history, genealogy as history, and then considers how the specific concerns of genealogy as both critical and effective history might take up the prologue. Next, this chapter considers some of the methodological/theoretical underpinnings of genealogy. The chapter looks at how genealogical history is made possible because of poststructural notions of subjectivity and examines Foucault’s theoretical tableaux, highlighting the ways that subjects are formed in discourse, through relations and technologies of power and through self-practices. After a consideration of Foucault’s analytic of practice, this chapter concludes with an articulation of the usefulness of genealogy in working against the production of dominant subjectivities.
2.1 Taking Up the Prologue

The prologue might be considered “reconstructionist history” (Munslow, 2006) or traditional history: It is the attempt to know “history as it actually happened” (Munslow, 2006, p. 22), literally reconstructing it to see how it transpired. This approach to history prioritizes the reasoned investigation of historical artifacts and documents in an objective and impartial manner. Given the kind of work that went into assembling the artifacts and archives that allowed the writing of the prologue, it was a self-conscious attempt on my part to reconstruct significant moments in the history of the training of secondary teachers in Regina. This reconstruction is but one attempt at sense making concerning the pre-service education of secondary teachers at the University of Regina. As an example of an historical account, the prologue illustrates that history is more than merely retelling the facts about what happened. It involves the choosing of particular facts and the creation of particular narratives to highlight specific ideas that the historian notices or feels are important. It is this need to impose sense on the facts that enables some historians to see history as less an empirical science and more as a literary art; as skillful narratives, rather than objective facts.

I began my account with the formal introduction of teacher education into the North West Territories (NWT). An account of Saskatchewan’s preprovincial history of education as part of the NWT might also begin with a discussion of the explicit subject-making orientation of the Ontario system that Saskatchewan adopted (Curtis, 1988). By starting further back, the inherited subject formation agenda would have put what followed into a clearer context: Teacher education was
explicitly about forming certain kinds of subjects/citizens. The absence of this context has an effect on how one can read the prologue and therefore understand the historical narrative being offered.

This teacher education history might also have been written to draw attention to a number of themes, as follows.

1. **Progress** – highlighting the desire for new and better approaches to teacher education, especially in the direction offered by the leadership of the Normal schools/university faculty. This theme might also have explored the growth and direction of legislated improvements to teacher education.

2. **Technical advancement** – looking at the similarities around the desire to be professional and the kinds of outcomes that were seen as a result of that desire, captured in the movement from physical observation to videotaping student teachers.

3. **Personalities** – beyond the mention of a few key figures, this history might have traced the key contributors to teacher education in a more formal way, highlighting the approaches and innovations that these people enabled, such as the development of the collegial relationship between teacher educators and the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation.

It seems clear that for most readers, the themes noticed here would be regarded as rather obvious; ordering this account in these ways seems like the history of what *really* happened. This obviousness, our reasonable expectations, and the taken-for-grantedness of history highlight the ways in which dominant norms in historical thinking have already shaped the conversation. These themes present
themselves, even to the casual observer, as unproblematic, as naturally the kinds of things that history might say about this period. The discourse of traditional history resonates for readers, even if we are unable to overtly account for those resonances; this just seems normal. These possible and normative histories resonate as “stock” stories (Delgado, 1995), circulating within the social stock of knowledge in ways that remind dominant groups of their shared story, reifying the stories as true and the dominant identities as valid and authorized. It is this sense of normalcy, of truth and validity, to which genealogy seeks to draw attention and to question.

2.2 Genealogy Takes Up History

Rather than seeing more traditional history as in competition with genealogical accounts, it is important to note that genealogy requires the accounts found in traditional history. These histories establish what can be seen and what can be thought, fixing particular dominant modes and discourses that enable the genealogist to notice those assumptions that traditional history is unable or unwilling to account for. In this sense, genealogy could be called antihistory, requiring these traditional narratives in order to “offer alternative accounts” (Prado, 2000, p. 40). Rather than being a competing historical claim that one has to choose between, genealogy here is represented as a necessary addition to more traditional history, always working to bring up the shadows and highlight those things that are not really noticeable. By bringing to the surface knowledge and ideas that the dominant order has either not seen or has not seen fit to use or canonize, genealogy makes the practices of dominance available to us. Thus, genealogy is always
marginal to the practices of mainstream history, always problematic and
problematizing.

Moreover, engaging in this antihistory involves openly acknowledging the
present orientation/location of the historian and taking that orientation as a
starting place: Genealogy is a history of the present\(^3\). According to Dean (1994), a
history of the present refers to how genealogy “is conducted in the presence of
certain issues problematised by contemporary social struggles.” For Foucault
(1988), genealogy starts with “a question posed in the present” (p. 262). Genealogy
is an analytic that acknowledges that “the things, values, and events of our present
experience have been constituted historically, discursively, and practically” (Mahon,
1992, p. 14); a history of the present takes this historical constitution seriously.

Historian Harry Harootunian (2007) connects historical work with Husserl’s idea of
a “thickened” present, one that is deeply historicized, weighted with the referents of
the past that have shaped and continue to resonate “long after the inaugurating
event has passed” (p. 476). The present, then, becomes the “scene where the ghosts
of the past comingle daily with the living ..., in a habitus of a haunted house”
(Harootunian, 2007, p. 478). Rather than presentism (i.e., interpreting the past in
terms of the present), a history of the present calls into question the very sturdy
ground on which the present seems to be built, in order to make better sense of the
concerns/struggles of the present, seeing these present concerns as being also
thoroughly historical.

\(^3\) This phrase “history of the present” represents Foucault’s own sense of the historical work of
genealogy.
In trying to engage history using Foucault’s genealogical approach, few sources directly describe this work in a systematic fashion. Probably the most useful in understanding how Foucault’s genealogies take up history is Foucault’s (1971) *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*. In this work, Foucault connects his own theoretical paradigm with Nietzsche’s work, while extending Nietzsche’s modes of analysis. It is this extension that allows Mahon (1992) to claim that “Foucault is the better genealogist” (p. 3). In *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*, Foucault details a sense of what genealogy entails through interacting with Nietzsche’s understanding of the notion of “origins.” According to Foucault (1971), Nietzsche is critical of the way that traditional history pursues origins as essence, looking for something essential and timeless in the origins of an event or an idea. Foucault explains two other concepts that are more useful to the “true objective of genealogy” (p. 80) than the traditional use of origin: descent and emergence. Exploring these concepts will chart something of how genealogy takes up history.

### 2.2.1 Descent and Continuity

An analysis of descent looks at “the subtle, singular and subindividual marks that ... form a network that is difficult to unravel” (Foucault, 1971, p. 81). This presumption of wholeness, (i.e., those features in history [the subject, progress] that are taken-for-granted as unities) is submitted to descent which “fragments what was thought unified” (Foucault, 1971, p. 82). Descent, then, is analysis that seeks to “to problematize accepted knowledge and truth” (Prado, 2000, p. 114). This analysis works against the necessity of continuity in traditional history which assumes “a continuous development, progress, and global totalization” (Young, 2004, p. 70). In
one sense, the writing of history is dependent on some form of continuity: The progression of time demands that events happened before and after. Beyond this basic sense of progress, history often is written in ways that accentuate progression, highlighting causality—the idea that this previous event enabled or is the reason why this later event was able to occur. Traditional history, then, is a retelling of the causal events that allow for history to unfold as it does, a depiction of the continuity of events leading one to another with some form of logical progression that can be traced after the fact.

Genealogical histories are alternative renderings to histories “that claim to depict underlying continuities” (Prado, 2000, p. 40). According to Prado (2000), Foucaultian historical accounts do not allow history “to pretend that it is an exercise in recollection”; for genealogy, “the past ceases to be a sort of frozen sequence of integrated, determinate events” (p. 42). Dean (1994) calls Foucault’s history “critical” because of this very capacity “to engage in the tireless interrogation of what is held to be given, necessary, natural, or neutral” (p. 20). *Critical*, here, does not mean critique as it is used in critical theory; it is not “the practice of a legislating subject passing judgment on a deficient reality,” but rather, “an analysis of the assumptions on which taken-for-granted practices rest” (Dean, 1994, p. 119). This critical approach is connected to both an emphasis on practices (literally, what people do) and the body. Foucault attaches the analysis of descent to the body, and the tracing of the body through history, as a body “totally imprinted by history” (Foucault, 1971, p. 83). Genealogy is a critical history because of this capacity to take
up the assumptions that support commonsense understandings, such as the notion of continuity that underlies traditional accounts of history.

2.2.2 Emergence and the Historical Subject

Emergence is concerned not with culminations or the inevitability of progress, but rather with subjections and, especially, dominations. According to Foucault (1971), emergence “is the entry of forces; it is their eruption, the leap from the wings to center stage” (p. 84). Rather than examining the ends of history, he articulates these ends as “merely the current episodes in a series of subjugations” (Foucault, 1971, p. 83). Emergence can be seen as the practical side of Foucault’s critique of history. For Foucault, an effective history cannot use the methods and philosophies that anchor the history of use to the academy; “the traditional devices for constructing a comprehensive view of history and for retracing the past as a patient and continuous development must be systematically dismantled” (Foucault, 1971, p. 87). This is because Foucault’s early work had already demonstrated the contingent nature of those devices as constructions of discourse with no recourse to universal value. This criticism also comes from an understanding of history as “a practice undertaken in a particular present and for particular reasons” (Dean, 1994, p. 14).

Foucault’s treatment of the subject provides a good example of emergence. Traditional history involves a prerecognition of the subject as foundational to our understanding of humanity; the subject always already bears cognitive and affective attributes and is seen as the initiator of actions. Effective history tries to “define a method of historical analysis freed from the anthropological theme” (Mahon, 1992,
p. 106). Rather than assuming a particular kind of subject, Foucault’s histories investigate “the conditions of the emergence of the subject as the basis of knowledge” (Young, 2004, p. 79). In order to be critical, Foucault’s histories problematize the very notion of the subject, choosing to analyze it and its constitution as one of those taken-for-granted, apparently necessary, constructs. In order for history to be effective, the subject “is understood as an historical product, as emergent” (Prado, 2000, p. 55).

The history of the subject is, then, a history of the production of certain subjects, the domination and struggle over what being a subject can mean, over which attributes or rationalities can be considered normal or ethical. Dean (1994) notes that this “critical historical enquiry into the various modes of the constitution of the subject ... is simply not available” (p. 114) within other approaches. By displacing the presumed norms and taken-for-granted nature of the present, and by rejecting the presentism and ahistorical foundations of the practice of history, Foucaultian genealogy produces a richer sense of the subject than had previously been imagined. Genealogy is an effective history because of this shift from an assumed subject (loaded with preexisting rationalities and capacities) to the production of subjectivity through discourse and practices; it is the history of how we come to take ourselves as particular kinds of subjects.

2.3 Genealogy Takes Up the Prologue

Genealogy is skeptical of the appearance of continuity that overlays more traditional approaches to history. What does the history represented in the prologue look like when the continuous application of administration/legislation is
fragmented? To the three themes discussed earlier in the chapter, we could add another theme:

4. *First Nations schools* – although this might seem on the periphery of this discussion, what sense could First Nations leaders make of the kind of education provided by teachers who were trained at Regina Normal? What did their education as teachers do to prepare them to teach in Aboriginal contexts? This theme takes on more significance given the reality that some of these trained teachers would end up teaching on reserve schools at some point in their careers. The fact that traditional history has chosen to not take up the connections between normal school preparation and the practices of residential schools speaks to the kind of inquiry that is avoided by more mainstream accounts.

While not within the flow of the narrative I produced in the prologue, it seems important to consider the racialization effect of the education of teachers. This analysis might open up other lines of inquiry that may not fit so easily within the narrative, if only because of the overarching need to produce historical accounts that focus on continuity. Moreover, genealogy draws attention to the production of particular subjects. In this theme, both the production of dominant subjects and the production of nondominant subjects through schooling are made more apparent. The role of race and the necessity of race, hidden somewhat in the more traditional account, are made more visible.

---

4 This theme represents an historical theme that is significantly underresearched. Miller’s (1996) *Shingwauk’s Vision* largely describes the lack of training. By examining the yearbook and, especially, the reunion materials from Saskatchewan Normal schools, it is possible to see that some of these teachers had experiences teaching in residential and day-school settings.
What other elements that comprise the context and understanding of teacher education are similarly unable to be thought? Or are difficult to call up? The way histories are written “renders some perspectives on education possible, and other perspectives unthinkable” (Fendler, 2008, p. 679). Genealogy historicizes the meaning of teacher education, enabling a denaturalization of our understanding so that it “becomes possible to see aspects of current educational practices in a new light” (Fendler, 2008, p. 686). As Foucault says, “People know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don’t know is what what they do does” (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 187). What does the education of teachers do? What if the practices of teacher education, as a part of the larger social context—and as the argument of this dissertation—racialize teachers as White? What if one of the outcomes of the teaching of teachers is the ongoing production of whiteness? Though this might be difficult to believe, schooled as we are in historical narratives that at best minimize this sort of thinking and focus it in a completely different direction, it seems to me to be worthy of our attention as a means of making sense of the continuing salience of race.

In the prologue, the illusion of continuity is underwritten by the idea of teacher education. While teacher education is not really anything, it functions as a thing, reified by the way others throughout the history treat it, speak it into being, shape it through practices and legislation, and produce it in and through the bodies of the teachers who are trained. The history of teacher education in the prologue focuses on a large-scale overview of the field of teacher education, but says very little about the education of those teachers. We may understand something of the
context for teacher education, the legislation and plans put in place, but the practices themselves remain unseen. What remains unexamined in the prologue is the actual education of teachers. Genealogy looks at the way that teaching is put into discourse, who speaks it and how they speak it, and examines how teaching is enacted. This dissertation traces the practices that constitute an assumed legitimate approach to teacher education within a period; the values, knowledge and skills that constitute an assumed legitimate teacher; the subject positions that teacher education makes available to students becoming teachers; and the practices that attempt to fix particular attributes and responses, normalizing particular ways of being a teacher.

Examining these issues will not provide what is lacking in more traditional accounts of this history. The findings will not list the shortcomings of others or function as a scandal or an exposé (Prado, 2000). When we are scandalized by the findings of a genealogical account of history, we miss the utter ubiquity of what is being explored. It is not how odd or scandalous it may seem to notice (as if for the first time) the centrality of race and racialization in teacher education. Rather, what is important is how central to the functioning of the discourse and to the practices in question that race and racialization prove to be.

As Paul Veyne (1997) describes it, Foucault is not dismissive of history; rather, he comes alongside those writings and attempts to demonstrate that there is more to notice: “There are crooked contours that you haven’t spotted” (p. 156). This dissertation uses genealogy to produce a critical history of teacher education, one that fragments the continuity of teacher education as an administrative/legislative
entity and emphasizes what teacher education accomplishes. This dissertation also uses genealogy to produce an effective history, one that focuses attention on the production of teaching subjects. To be explicit, this work shows how practices of teacher education produce teaching subjects racialized as White.

Having examined some of the ways that genealogy engages with history, the remainder of the chapter lays out some of the integral pieces of theoretical foundations that enable genealogical work. These four pieces include (a) a poststructural understanding of the subject, (b) Foucault’s range of analysis, (c) an analytics of practice, and (d) a political orientation.

### 2.4 The Postmodern ‘Subjected’ Subject

Because of the ongoing theoretical usefulness of the concept of subjectivity (Green & Reid, 2008) and the necessity of subjectivity to genealogical work, it is important to outline some of the central concepts around poststructural notions of the subject. Subjectivity can be described as how one comes to be known as “this or that identity” (Sumara & Davis, 1999, p. 195). It involves both a subject’s “sense and experience of her/himself; as well as her/his audiences’ understanding of ‘who s/he is and can be’” (Youdell, 2006b, p. 48). Although this echoes psychological notions of identity in some respects, a postmodern subject is always understood as a “person made in relations of productive power” (Youdell, 2006b, p. 48). Furthermore, a postmodern understanding of subjectivity de-centers/de-essentializes the unitary, rational subject (central to psychology and traditional history) and identity through two theoretical moves: first, by theorizing the availability, through discourse of
multiple subject positions; and, second, by offering an account of identification that is not merely rational (Henriques, 1984).

Persons “come to ‘be’ ‘who’ they are by being intelligible within discourses, the bodies of meaning that frame social contexts” (Youdell, 2006b, p. 2). This intelligibility is enabled through the creation of subject positions which can be defined as “empty spaces or functions in discourse from which to comprehend the world” (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 13). People take up subject positions, or perspectives, “from which discourses make sense” (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 13). Taking up a subject position within a discourse allows a person to make sense of the world (through the lens of that discourse) and for other people to see them as coherent or intelligible. Subjects are positioned within discourses, where language and meaning work to frame ways of being. Subjects take up a position, positioning themselves within and against discourses in particular ways. Subjects are also taken up by others, positioned within and against discourses. In this way, positioning others is also a means of positioning the self.

These multiple positions and the work of positioning divest the unitary rational subject of its essentialism. But there remains the question of why particular discourses are taken up and not others (Hall, 1996, p. 10). Judith Butler (1987, 1990) explicates notions of desire and the performative nature of identities. Butler starts with a Foucaultian understanding of subjection, which she supplements with psychoanalysis, “thinking power together with psyche” (Campbell, 2005, p. 85). Building on Butler’s work, Hall (1996) describes the connection between the subject and discourse as a process of identification, which he defines as a discursive process
of constructing a similarity between oneself and others. This process is never finished, is always contingent, and is never a perfect fit. To use Hall’s words, it is a “suturing of identifications” (p. 14). This process of identification is fueled by desire; desire rather than motivation (too biological), or drive (overly psychoanalytic and ‘instinctual’), or choice (misses the complexity)(Hollway, 1984b). Not that these desires are derived as essential, rather even the unconscious is located in the domain of the social. The content of desire “is neither timeless nor arbitrary, but has a historical specificity” (Henriques et al., 1984, p. 222). Lecourt (2004) is helpful here, connecting the psychoanalytic concept of desire with the “material conditions in which it [desire] is constructed” (p. 74). The subject learns desire through experience in the body and through multiple discourses that “provide meaning to those material interactions” (Lecourt, 2004, p. 74). It should not be surprising that although there is a range of possibilities within discourses, each position does not have the same attraction—dominant discourses, discourses with which we are familiar, or with which we feel some affinity, are more attractive.

To summarize, poststructuralist theorists foreground the inherent individualism of the term identity, often choosing to talk of subjectivity because at least this term hints at the relations of power in which subjects are made subjects. Identity is seen as “points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us” (Hall, 1996, p. 6), making available to theorists both the spaces that discourses offer from which a subject can be known—and known in particular ways—as well as desire which enables/invites the subject to choose in particular ways. These two modes allow for a “subjected subject” to
appear—one who is made a subject in discourse and one who also chooses (desires) particular attachments/identifications. Far from rational and unitary, the postmodern subject is fragmented (or at least multiple), potentially contradictory, and beyond merely rational, is moved by desires.

2.4.1 Seeing the Postmodern Subject: Tracing Discourse

It is this subjected subject, theorized as a product of discourses and practices and desires, that genealogy attempts to unearth. Genealogy does this by making available the content of the discursive context of a period, the relations of power at work in a given space, and by tracing the practices of self-making supported and sanctioned in an historical moment; genealogy establishes a range of possibility for the production of subjects. Tracing discourse, which involves tracing the technologies of power and techniques of the self, is tracing subjectivity because, for Foucault, subjectivity “is a matter of saying and not of being” (Prado, 2000, p. 11). Seeing the ways that subjectivity is spoken, conceived, and normalized (in/through texts and legislation) means tracing the discursive establishment of those subjects.

For some, this articulation of discourse is problematic. These theoretical issues are partly explained as a result of the divide between analytic and continental philosophic regimes. In analytic philosophy, discourse stands in as “a label for a narrow set of empirically observable linguistic activities” (Woolgar, 1986, p. 312). Thus, language is seen as separate from actions and practices. Continental philosophy tends to see discourse as constitutive of actions. As Fendler (2004) notes, it is necessary to distinguish between stative notions of discourse “praxis-is-separate-from discourse; action-is-different-from-language,” and ‘performative’
notions of discourse “praxis-is-inseparable-from-discourse” (p. 453). Seeing discourse as performative, as productive, actively shaping the actions and subjects it references, is necessary to the work of genealogy.

Because language cannot be meaningfully separated from actions and subjects, and because language constitutes these actions and subjects, it is unnecessary to investigate the particular actions of teacher educators. It is not required that I find accounts of classrooms, or stories of teaching, or particular instances of overtly racist practices (for example). A performative notion of discourse enables this work to investigate teacher subjectivity through a focus on, “the discursive context in which their identities [are] produced” (Schick, 2000, p. 304). Because “the performance of a category, such as teacher, can be recognized through the norms, functions and reiterative practices that are said to comprise it” (Schick, 2000, p. 304), this work traces the outline of teacher subjectivity through attention to the institutional norms, descriptions, and practices of teacher education: Tracing the discourse is tracing the subjectivities made available for subjects to enact.

2.5 Genealogical Analysis: Tracing the Discourses Through Foucault’s Range of Analysis

Building on this sense of the subject and subjectivity that underwrites genealogical inquiry, it is necessary to focus more intently on the specific fields of analysis that genealogy examines/draws on to make sense of this subject in history. This examination also grounds each of the next three chapters of the dissertation. In *The History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*, Foucault (1990) describes his
work along three possible axes of inquiry namely, “the analysis of discursive practices that made it possible to trace the formation of disciplines” (p. 4) (or archaeology), “the analysis of power relations and their technologies” (p. 4) (or genealogy), and “the modes according to which individuals are given to recognize themselves as ... subjects” (p. 5) (or the care of the self). Foucault refers to these as either “theoretical shifts” (p. 6) or as “dimensions” (p. 11) of his work. These axes have been expanded and used by scholars as a theoretical maps of Foucaultian concepts, sometimes referred to as *Foucault's triangle*.

More than a periodization—early Foucault and archaeology, middle Foucault and genealogy, later Foucault and care of the self—it may be useful to look at the theoretical tableau that Foucault offers in his analytical approach. On the one hand, it is possible to talk of genealogy and mean the specialized genealogical axes of Foucaultian analysis. On the other hand, it is possible to talk of genealogy as an approach to analysis and mean the more general usage that we have seen in Foucault’s work. Foucault’s exchange with Jana Sawicki, his encouragement for her to “do genealogies,” can only be taken in this second, more general sense. Coming as it does when he is supposedly most interested in ethics and care of the self (at a conference in 1983, cited in Sawicki, 1991), he refers to all of this work as genealogy.

It seems clear, then, that Foucault uses genealogy to refer to a range of inquiry that draws on his analytic framework with more or less emphasis on any of the axes (truth, power, and the subject) and, because of the interdependent nature of these domains, genealogical research necessarily involves all these concerns. This
makes more apparent the connections and interconnections between these concepts, as May (1993) points out, “these avenues have more in common than (their) general orientation” (p. 2). Looking at each of the three axes, it is possible to highlight some of the necessary components of Foucault’s contribution to social research. These axes, taken together, form an interrelated and comprehensive view of the terrain on which genealogy does its work. These axes also form the organizing tropes for the next three chapters—Chapter 3 takes up the archaeological dimension, Chapter 4 takes up the geneaological dimension, and Chapter 5 takes up the ethical dimension.

2.5.1 Tracing Discourse: The Archaeological Dimension

Foucault’s concern to show the history of truth, the contingency of what can be called truth or knowledge at a particular time, is manifest in the archaeological axis of his inquiry (sometimes called the truth axis). “(A)rchaeology marks the advent of a materialist approach to the analysis of knowledge” (Dean, 1994, p. 17), taking seriously the material reality of language or “the real existence of discourse” (Mahon, 1992, p. 119) and accounting for discourse in light of the conditions that make possible (and understandable) certain statements, ideas, and discursive formations. Archaeological inquiry looks at the rules by which discourses form, “rules that dictate what elements and structures a discourse must possess in order to be admitted into the arena of knowledge during a given historical epoch” (May, 1993, p. 29). More than seeing language as a system of signs or particular (self-evident) texts, Foucault chooses a complex investigation of language, seeing discourse as a set of “practices that systematically form the objects of which they
speak” (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). This view of discourse sees language as productive of utterances, concepts, and effects. Discursive analysis is concerned with the multitude of ways in which information is structured, circulated in society, and constrained.

Foucault uses two words for knowledge and their distinction is an important detail in this conversation. *Connaissance* refers to the formal knowledge that develops out of particular disciplines, especially the human sciences (psychiatry, anthropology, etc.). *Savoir* “is the set of conditions ... without which it would be impossible for a specific discipline or connaissance to appear” (May, 1993, p. 28) and includes the “broader and less rational array of practices, policies, procedures, institutions, politics, everyday life and so on” (Scheurich & McKenzie, 2005, p. 847). It is this informal, commonsense backdrop that forms the conditions of possibility for the existence and content of the more formal connaissance. The archaeological domain looks at the discursive formations, especially the savoir, that enable the construction/production of what can be called knowledge at a particular time; not producing truth, archaeology seeks to “grasp the conditions which hold at any one moment for ‘saying the true’” (Dean, 1994, p. 23). Chapter 3 of this dissertation attends to discursive formations for speaking and thinking about race in both the 1914 and the 1985 contexts. The chapter explores the savoir around notions of race, ways of speaking about race in teacher education, and the effects of these discourses in the production/formation of racialized subjects.
2.5.2 Tracing Relations of Power: The Genealogical Dimension

Whereas archaeological investigation searches out the savoir through the complexities of the productivity of discourse, investigation along the genealogical axis depends on a notion of the productivity of power. More than seeing power as repressive, negative, or essentially coercive, Foucault chooses to talk of “relations of power,” and imagines power not as something anyone holds/commands, but rather as something that is always active. Because power is theorized as impersonal, it is no one’s power, but is the dynamic environment for human action; there is “no escaping power’” (Prado, 2000, p. 76). Power, then, is the “field of possibilities” for human behaviour, providing a range of options/movements that are valid or sanctioned for any agent (Prado, 2000, p. 76).

Foucault’s (1980) establishment of a relationship between power and discourse or knowledge, power/knowledge, remains one of the most important contributions of his work. As Prado (2000) argues, power is not knowledge (or vice versa), rather “it is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge and it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power” (p. 71). Work in the genealogical domain sees knowledge as a product of power/knowledge or “the matrices formed by the interplay between knowledge and power” (May, 1993, p. 72). Related to power/knowledge is the notion of “technologies of power” or the techniques through which power is active or knowledge is produced. Technologies could refer to practices (e.g., examination), or to conceptual frameworks (e.g., panopticism) that influence other practices (e.g., architecture and the design of
prisons or schools), or to any of the practical or theoretical moves that shape practice.

Inquiry along the genealogical axis is interested in looking at the various technologies through which power is invested and through which power shapes knowledge which, in turn, produces knowledge that power can then utilize. Genealogy investigates how discourses relate to “organized and institutionalized forms of practice ... how the production of knowledge occurs within discursive, institutional and social practices” (Dean, 1994, p. 159). Chapter 4 of this dissertation examines the effects of the technologies of power through which teacher education is carried out in both the 1914 and the 1985 contexts. Practices such as the lecture, or student teaching, or clinical supervision are examples of technologies of power. Likewise, the conceptual frameworks of scientific rationality or technical rationality heavily influence how teacher education is imagined and carried out. This chapter explores the relationships between these practices and conceptual frameworks and traces the effects of these technologies of power on the production/formation of racialized subjects.

2.5.3 Tracing Subjects: The Ethical Dimension

The subject or the citizen is produced “through an ensemble of governmental practices as a subject with particular capacities and orientations” (Dean, 1994, p. 153). Analysis along the subject axis explores how a subject is made to produce him or herself in particular ways or is encouraged to take on internally particular right, or normal, or especially ethical ways of being a subject. To be a subject in this sense is to “define one’s subjectivity by ‘learning’ what one is through internalization of
the truths and knowledges power produces” (Prado, 2000, p. 69). The ethical domain enquires into the way that the experience of subjectivity is shaped and produced.

Whereas the genealogical axis concentrated on technologies of power, the ethical dimension looks into technologies of the self. In that they refer to a spectrum of practices, ideas, and approaches, these are similar concepts. Technologies of the self are focused on how the self can act on itself, name itself, and find itself within the discourses on offer at a particular time. This analytic space begins to demonstrate how subjects participate in their own subjection and how the subject comes to see him/herself as a particular subject, with individual attributes and values and identifications. This move towards subjectivity opens up a space to consider the subject as more than a product of discourse, or of power relations, or of political technologies and practices. The subject, considered from within the ethical domain, is now also formed in relation to practices of freedom and techniques of the self, by the historically specific complement of procedures, means, and instruments by which the self can act on itself.

Chapter 5 of this dissertation explores the technologies for self-making employed by student teachers as part of their teacher training in both the 1914 and the 1985 contexts. While student teaching and clinical supervision function as technologies of power, concentrating power/knowledge in particular ways, they can also be seen as self-making practices where the student is taught how to see him/herself and is given the means by which he or she can produce him/herself in ways that more carefully align with the dominant ways of being a teacher on offer.
through a programme of teacher education. This chapter explores the technologies of self, encouraged and made available to teacher candidates, and how these technologies affect the production/formation of racialized subjects.

The genealogical subject, then, is a tripartite subject formed in and through an historicized truth (shaped in discourses); an historicized power (shaped in relations/techniques of power); and an historicized ethics (invited to shape him/herself in particular ways). Dean (1994) clarifies this stance by explicating Foucault’s interest in subjectification or “how the individual is ‘subjectified’ in relation to forms of knowledge and discourse, ‘subjected’ in technologies or domination, and ‘subjectifies’ him or herself in relation to rules and techniques of ethical conduct” (pp. 112-113). This summary demonstrates the interconnection between poststructural notions of the subject and the detailed range of analysis that Foucault’s work enables. These are richly connected theoretical pieces that support genealogy as the history of particular subjects.

2.6 Mapping Power:
An Analytic of the Practice of Teacher Education

Moving from the theoretical tableau outlined above, what are the practical ways in which genealogy enables an engagement with historical materials? Having earlier established the texts wherein the norms, functions and reiterative practices of teacher education are located, I feel it is important to describe how to attend to them. In order to trace this establishment of subjects, I draw on Foucault’s (1990) analytic of practice (expressed in The History of Sexuality: Volume 2). Both Dean (1994) and Mahon (1992) devote significant attention to this articulation of
genealogical inquiry. An analytic, a rendering or mapping of power relations (Prado, 2000), enables a depiction of how power is operating in order to produce particular kinds of teachers. By this later stage, Foucault had become more explicit about what his historical projects entailed. The four elements of this analytic (mentioned in Chapter 1) include (a) an ontology (what needs to be governed in both the self and others); (b) a deontology (what is produced in the self and others when we govern this element); (c) an ascetics (how this element is to be governed—which methods); and (d) a teleology (what is the aim of these practices? who do we imagine ourselves to be?). Seeing how these texts respond to these questions will produce a map of the ways in which power is at work to produce subjectivity.

As I examine these documents, looking to create both a critical and an effective history of teacher education in Regina, it will be with the following analytic questions in mind.

- What is teacher education a response to?
- What is being governed in both teachers themselves and in society as a whole through the education of teachers?
- What is being produced in teachers by this governing?
- What is being produced in the students these teachers will teach?
- What are the practices that bring about or enable this governing?
- What are we trying to accomplish (i.e., who are we trying to become through these practices?) and, perhaps,
- Who are we?

Asking these questions of the texts that support and produce teachers will demonstrate the subjectivities on offer through teacher education.

2.6.1 The End of Genealogy: Grounded in the Politics of the Present
This dissertation as genealogy, working with a poststructural notion of subjectivity and within a Foucaultian field of analysis—discourse, power and ethics—provides a coherent sense of the production of historical subjects. The questions offered through the analytics of practice engage with the moments of teacher education under investigation in ways that allow the production of subjects to emerge and be noticed. This is legitimate historical investigation. As Prado (2000) notes, Foucault was obviously concerned that his historical work be taken seriously. Genealogies are recognizable as history: patiently documentary, deeply rigorous, and carefully source driven. This dissertation, then, provides a compelling argument for making sense of what was happening in teacher education, namely the production of White teacher subjectivity. In doing so, this genealogy draws attention to and questions the sense of normalcy and validity of the more traditional stories of teacher education. The remaining chapters build a coherent, alternative history of teacher education that calls into question the nature of the production of dominant subjectivities. But this coherence is not the end of genealogy, and it is not enough to commend genealogy as a useful methodological stance. This “antihistory” can be commended, however, based on how these “new metaphors” (Prado, 2000, p. 164) enable those who are struggling to (possibly) break with the dominations of the present.

To be clear, Foucault had a very limited sense of what the outcome of struggle and action might accomplish; he was not an apologist for revolution or liberation. For Foucault, this action is not a giddy throwing off of dominations. Foucault contends that there exists no subjectivity, no subjects, outside of
disciplinary regimes: “We cannot hope to escape power” (Prado, 2000, p. 170). The scope of change, then, is from “one set of subjectivity-shaping practices to another” (Prado, 2000, p. 101). The work of genealogy is “to separate out, from the contingency that has made us what we are, the possibility of no longer being ... what we are” (Prado, 2000, p. 110). As Fendler (2008) suggests, genealogy allows an “historical analysis to un-determine future possibilities” (p. 689).

Remembering the necessity of locating genealogical work within and against traditional history, it is important to underscore the politics of genealogy in opening up different, future opportunities. Because of the commitment of traditional history to the assumption of continuity/causality and progress, these histories reify and strengthen the status quo, making it more likely/possible to imagine the future within the arc that history prescribes. In contrast, genealogy “reorients the relationship of history to political possibility” (Brown, 2001, p. 103), possibilities that are shut down in the conventions that traditional history perpetuates. The extent to which genealogy disrupts these conventions, telling new histories that “disturb(s) our habits of self-recognition” is the “measure of genealogy’s success” (Brown, 2001, p. 106). Said another way, it is in the disturbance/undermining that genealogy can be legitimated: How enabling or empowering are these “alternative construals” (Prado, 2000, p. 175) in supporting both the resistance against dominant discourses and the reimagining of subjectivities?

Moving away from the administrative/legislative matrix that largely defines teacher education, this dissertation outlines and interrogates the discursive practices of teacher education: the production of the teaching subject. Tracing
discourse and practice (and their mutual effects) illustrates how a particular subjectivity is produced through teacher education. This genealogical account is covered in the next three chapters. Chapter 3 considers historicized truth, exploring the role of nationalist and racist discourse in the production/racialization of White teachers. Chapter 4 looks at the relations of power enshrined in technical-rational approaches to teacher education and displays the kinds of subjectivity engendered therein. Chapter 5 examines the techniques of the self, underwritten through education psychology, whereby teachers are made to act upon and thus produce themselves in particular ways. What emerges is a sense of how teacher education works to produce particular subjects, racialized as White, who can be recognized as teachers.

While this dissertation engages the historical material rigorously, the end is not merely representing history. In regards to the local context in which these questions reside, the need to disrupt the ongoing production of dominant White racialized teacher subjectivities is apparent. This genealogy attempts to denaturalize the tacit, commonsense ideas about race that inhere in teacher education. By drawing attention to, and generating understanding of, the production of White racialization, this work contributes to the struggle against the effects of this domination. Moreover, by demonstrating the constructed nature, and by tracing the tenuousness of this production, it is a contribution that offers the potential for not being as we are.
CHAPTER 3. DISCOURSES OF THE NATION: ANGLO-SAXON VALUES AND THE CONTINUING SALIENCE OF (UNSPOKEN) RACE

This chapter explores the general context of scientific racism that undergirds teacher education in the 1914 context and the transformation that discourses of race undergo in the 1985 context. This work looks at the specific ways that teacher education textbooks employ discourses of race and nation as taken-for-granted practices/understandings of becoming and being a teacher. The chapter illuminates the subjectivities that these various discursive spaces make (im)possible.

Specifically, Chapter 3 examines the teacher education textbooks mandated for First Class certification in Regina Normal School in 1914. These textbooks include:

- Painter (1886), *A History of Education*
- Halleck (1895), *Psychology and Psychic Culture*
- Shaw (1901), *School Hygiene*
- Chubb (1902), *The Teaching of English*
- Horne (1904), *The Philosophy of Education*
- Monroe (1907), *A Brief Course in the History of Education*.

This chapter examines the texts’ overt uses of race and the ways they express race concomitantly with nation and race, together with culture, to produce teacher education as White institutional space. This chapter also explores the way that race/culture/nation disappear and merge and shift in the later documents. This appearance of racelessness, together with an emphasis on culture as a stand-in for race, represents a discursive shift in the expression of race. Although race and
nation largely disappear from the overt and written documents that formally shape
teacher education in the later period, I suggest that race continues to function
through notions of culture, enabling dominant White subjectivities to continue to
form within an ongoing White institutional space.

While the textbooks form an essential part of this inquiry, it seems important
to note that each text cannot be understood on its own. To make sense of these
books and their place in the education of teachers within the 1914 context of
teacher education in Regina, Saskatchewan, it is necessary to also consider a range
of other sources, both local and more national, to fit these texts into the broader
social understandings of time and place. So, while I quote and explore the texts, I
also offer significant other pieces that enable the broader discursive context to
materialize. Moving between texts and their broader contexts reveals some of the
ways that these official offerings can be understood. Especially in the 1985 context, I
rely on a wide variety of texts to trace the discourses and meanings made available.
Memoranda, minutes of meetings, relevant articles, speeches, news clippings,
textbooks, and course descriptions all represent the space through which Foucault’s
“grey work” of genealogy can be accomplished.

It is important to state again that a primary assumption of this work is the
ongoing salience of race. Race, rather than any biological reality, exists within the
systems of meaning that transform over time and in different contexts. Whether we
use “racial formation” (Omi & Winant, 1993), or “racist discourse” (Goldberg, 1993),
or a “racial frame” (Feagin, 2010), race scholarship theorizes the mutually
constitutive nature of both race thinking and racialized social realities. Race
thinking, racial oppression, and racist systems of practice have been fundamental to the development of the modern world. More than backwards thinking, it is imperative to name the reality of race thinking on which the nation is built and the reality of racist exclusions that continue to function in the present. This chapter then traces the production and use of race to make meaning in teacher education.

3.1 Discourse in Teacher Education in the 1914 Context

In some ways, teacher education has proceeded in much the same fashion for the last 130 years. If a current teacher education student from 2012 were transported back in time to Regina Normal School circa 1914, he or she would have little difficulty recognizing where he or she was; little substantive change would mark the differences between the programs. To be sure, the modes of teaching (lecture or seminar), the content (psychology, pedagogy, management), and forms of preparing teachers (practice teaching) are easily recognizable and still operant. These overwhelming similarities, however, are met with one large exception.

Education has been defined as... the acquisition of the racial inheritance. (Monroe, 1907, p. 406)

The curriculum becomes but the epitomized representation to the child of this cultural inheritance of the race. (Monroe, 1907, p. 407)

The child finds his life in the race's life. (Horne, 1904, p. 98)

Education must mean a gradual adjustment to the spiritual possessions of the race. (Horne, 1904, p. 98)

Knowledge preserved in books that the race (of the child) has wrested from the bosom of nature and the heart of man ... His education, through reproducing in his own mind something of what the race has discovered and known, adjusts him to this intellectual element in his environment. (Horne, 1904, p. 112)
Curriculum is the accumulated racial experience, the product of human society as a whole living its life in the world. (Horne, 1904, p. 145)

These quotations come from two of the prescribed textbooks mandated for use in training teacher candidates towards First Class certification in 1914. These quotes are representative of the place of race in early teacher education. Each textbook from the period, and each of the supporting documents chosen for this study, adopts an overtly racialized view of the world and endeavours to explore/understand the task of education and the role of teachers in light of the realities of race; teaching, curriculum, teachers, and students are imagined first through a racial lens. This racialized view of the world illustrates the taken-for-granted assumption that, for the project of building a strong nation and a healthy race, the task of connecting nation and race with the work of education was imperative.

3.1.1 General Context: Scientific Racism

To understand these teacher education texts, it is helpful to set them within a broader intellectual context. Goldberg (1993) demonstrates the ways in which racism is thoroughly embedded within the growth of modern culture and liberal political theory. Today we might dismiss race thinking as aberrant, irrational, or marginal. Goldberg demonstrates that far from racism being irrational (as is argued in liberal theory), “Racist exclusions throughout modernity can and have been rationally ordered and legitimated” (p. 11).

The development of hierarchies of racial characteristics grew out of scientific classifications of human difference. These classifications carried the legitimacy of
science and were held to be rational, deeply scientific and, therefore, authoritative. Scientific racism reinforced racial hierarchies, seeking to place particular human groups above and below, ranking them in terms of their capacity for civilization/intelligence (see Linnaeus’ taxonomies or Blumenbach’s depiction of the five races in Smedley, 1999, pp. 160-164). Without fail, Aboriginal peoples and African peoples ended up on the bottom. A scientist’s own cultural heritage and stereotypes often determined which race occupied the top of the hierarchy. Sometimes it was German people and their cold rationality, or British people and their civilizing imperialism, and, increasingly, the pinnacle of racial prominence was thought to rest in the New World (Monroe, 1907; Painter, 1886). In Europe, Herbert Spencer’s broad racial vision linked biology and evolutionary changes with human development in the moral and mental spheres and with the material advancement of Western cultures. Darwin’s “survival of the fittest” seemed to dovetail with hierarchies of race, giving a biological and, therefore, authoritative imperative or explanation for the differences. This synthesis “elevated the racial worldview to a fundamental and virtually undeniable truth” (Smedley, 1999, p. 258). As Goldberg (1993) suggests, it is an astounding transformation to go from no real racial differentiation in the 1500s to the relative ease of Disraeli’s claim that “all is race” (p. 24) 350 years later. Race had come to dominate contemporary social understanding.

Another important example of scientific racism came out of the science of sociology, which attempted to offer general theories for the development of social realities. Popular in the 19th and early 20th centuries, recapitulation theory or cultural epoch theory posited that each culture had developed through a variety of
stages, growing increasingly complex, and growing in ways appropriate to their racial capacity. Education, then, was to involve progressing students through the stages of the mental development of the race, enabling students to come into the present, modern world through the experience of successive generations of the race. As a theory applied in other fields, one could look at the Peasant Farming policy at work in Canada. After 1889, First Nations people could not be allowed to skip a step in their development towards the modern world and were forced to use hand tools instead of modern machinery to work their lands (Carter, 1989).

Many American scientists researched the innate inequalities of those races deemed inferior. Whether it was Charles Whites’ studies of the anatomical differences of “Negroes, Europeans, and Apes” (Smedley, 1999, p. 228) or Morten’s “thirteen ways of measuring features of skulls,” (p. 232) and the permanent racial characteristics he posited, along with the equation of brain size with intelligence, respected members of the scientific community devoted time and effort to understanding the inequalities of the races. In 1854 Types of Mankind, a compendium of all the relevant scientific material pertaining to the “specific diversity of mankind” was published (Smedley, 1999, p. 234). Louis Agassiz, famed naturalist and Harvard scholar, came to the conclusion that “Negroes were human, but not of the same species” (Smedley, 1999, p. 235) and continued his career by promoting the inequality of human races. Smedley charts the influence of a rampant Anglo-Saxonism as a corollary to the deficiency prescribed especially (but not

---

5“The peasant farming policy was geared to protect and maintain the incomes of White farmers, ensure their contentment, and if possible, to allow them to become prosperous, thus attracting more immigrants to the Western prairies. Reserve agriculture suffered as a result.” (Buckley, 1992, p. 220)
limited) to Negroes. Thus Robert Knox (president of the Anthropological Society of London) can mimic Disraeli and announce that “Race is everything: literature, science, art—in a word, civilization depends on it” (Smedley, 1999, p. 246).

In history, society, civilization, science, and literature, everything depends on a racial understanding of the world; it can be no clearer. Race and race thinking thoroughly constituted the frame through which the social world could be ordered and understood. Science authorized these understandings, rooting race in those things that could be known categorically about the world. Race told us something real about societies and human beings; racialized knowledge infused notions of what people were and could be. It would be irrational to think about the world without the lens of race during this period. Although specific scientific understandings began to move away from race by the turn of the century, the various disciplines that fed broader understanding about education continued to speak/think in these terms for decades. Therefore, the textbooks that inform teacher education in 1914 draw from a thoroughly racialized psychology, a thoroughly racialized history and philosophy, a thoroughly racialized biology, and a thoroughly racialized anthropology that gives shape to teaching. Stanley’s (2003) critique of British Columbia textbooks of this same period is directly applicable: “racism as ideology and organization was so integrated in the forms and content of schooling that it would be almost impossible to question it” (p. 124). Even when race is not overtly mentioned or marshaled in the texts, the underlying academic disciplines themselves operate within a racial framework, infusing education with these ideas.
On a final note of general context, all these overtly racializing discourses were spoken and heard in the new province of Saskatchewan, within a political context that also featured racism as ideology and organization. Treaty Four, signed in 1874, secured for settlement and agriculture the southern third of the province, was followed almost immediately by the Indian Act of 1876. This legislation established and interpreted the relationship between the Crown and Indigenous peoples as paternalistic and embedded these various racist beliefs about First Nations peoples into policy and practice. The Riel Resistance of 1885, within 30 years of the period in question here, and the growing use of restrictive policies controlling the ability of First Nations people to prosper economically, and the development of residential schools to support the mandate for “aggressive civilization” policies form part of the context for understanding the Saskatchewan context as already colonial and already racialized. These texts can be heard in particular ways because of the context that enables them to speak; race matters in both the texts and the context.

3.2 Discourse in Early Teacher Education

Given this international, national, and provincial context, it is now possible to look at the language of the texts of teacher education in 1914. These texts use race in a variety of ways to describe teaching and, therefore, to shape teachers. First, biological race is marshaled overtly, using language and ideas that are explicitly connected to the scientific racism previously described. Second, the texts use race and nation together. Third, the texts equate race with culture.
3.2.1 Overt Discourses of Race

The most accurate way to describe these discourses would be “racist”: More than bad feelings and prejudice, these discourses support an unequal, systemic racial ordering of the society. The examples of overt racism are plentiful and, as has been stated, completely rational and normalized within the confines of the established thinking of the time. It follows that Calgary MP, R. B. Bennett, could acknowledge in an Empire Day speech in 1914 the “responsibilities of his race and breed” towards the “subject races of the world” (Berger, 1970, p. 229). While the subject races and “all that is non-English” may have been despised, the responsibilities of the Anglo-Saxon race in bringing about “racial fusion” centered on the education of “non-English races” (Anderson, 1918, p. 89). J. T. M. Anderson, a school inspector and future Saskatchewan premier, further suggests that the “solution of the racial problem lies almost wholly” (Anderson, 1918, p. 135) in the hands of teachers as they pursue the task of racial assimilation. Education and race were intimately connected.

Race explained the intellectual, emotional, and spiritual environment into which a child was born and toward which his education was preparing him (Horne, 1904, p. 130). Curriculum, then, represented the “accumulated racial experience” (Horne, 1904, p. 145) and the role of schools could be described as the reproduction of this “spiritual environment of the race” (Horne, 1904, p. 150). The educated man had reproduced his race’s achievements “and so (had) identified his own thinking, feeling, and acting with that of his race” (Horne, 1904, p. 146). While some educational theorists panned the scientific value of the idea of every child having to
go through the historical experience of their race (Halleck, 1895; White, 1893), cultural epoch theory remained attractive as possessing “some suggestive value” (Halleck, 1895, p. 326) as an educational theory. The role of schools, especially in the development of the intellect, could be seen in terms of recapitulation: “Schools play the same role as time played in the development of the race” (Horne, 1904, p. 2). By moving the child through stages of development, he became increasingly civilized, gradually “becoming... a citizen of the scientific age” (Chubb, 1902, p. 56).

The child can only live partly in the modern world “and must rise to an understanding of its difficult phenomena by retracing the main steps of the race’s growth” (Chubb, 1902, p. 82).

Race could account for the limits that any racial group might be expected to achieve. Racial capacity was linked to notions of breeding, of heredity, or of racial “stocks.” Certain races were seen to more naturally embody the ideal characteristics for progress and development. The Anglo-Saxon race, for example, “displayed a special genius for self-government and political organization” (Berger, 1970, p. 117). This connection with the racial hierarchies discussed earlier is worth exploring a little more carefully. The races of the North (symbolizing “energy, strength, self-reliance, health, and purity” [Berger, 1970, p. 129]) and of the West were generally assumed/described as superior to the races of the East and the South, which were characterized by “decay and effeminacy, even libertinism and disease” (Berger, 1970, p. 129). Canada was to be a Northern nation “inhabited by the descendants of Northern races” (cited in Berger, 1970, p. 53). Because of our Northerness, as William Foster suggested, Canada was “the true out-crop of human nature, more
manly, more real, than the weak marrow-bones of superstition of an effeminate South” (cited in Berger, pp. 62-63). These typologies of North/West, South/East were applied vigorously to categorize European immigrants.

More than North and South, racial characteristics were codified and teachers were taught what it meant to be of a certain race. Textbooks listed characteristics of various races, as the Chinese (Mongolian race) who, in spite of their genius—“the early invention of paper, printing, gunpowder, and the mariner’s compass” (Painter, 1886, p. 9)—and good traits—“industrious, economical, polite, kind, patient, longsuffering” (p. 10)—were thought to be “unchangeable” (p. 10) and unable to be assimilated (Woodsworth, 1909). Teachers could learn of the Poles’ penchant for criminal behavior, or the Slav’s “natural disrespect for the gentler sex” (Anderson, 1918, p. 143), or even the Hindoo’s aversion to physical labour (Painter, 1886). Other races fare better as “even those who detest ‘foreigners’ make an exception of Germans whom they classify as ‘white people like ourselves’” (Woodsworth, 1909, p. 100). It follows, then, that education was to be differentiated according to racial capacity and cultural needs; curricula should be adapted to “develop the particular gifts that nature has given each race” (Horne, 1904, p. 166). As Horne (1904) suggests, “you cannot make a good Filipino, or a good African, by supplying an education that would make a good Anglo-Saxon” (p. 166).

Given the utter ubiquity of race in the texts, and the centrality of the necessity of race to the work of education in 1914, what might this mean for the production of teacher subjectivity? Education itself is overtly racializing; both content and practice supported racial differentiation in Saskatchewan society. From
the colonial realities of the province and the ongoing separation of First Nations peoples and settlers, to the differentiation between desirable immigrants and undesirable Others, these social realities are constituted through the lens of race. What is being governed in teachers themselves and in society as a whole through the education of teachers? Racial formation is being governed overtly through the education of teachers. Racial knowledge is being transmitted, racial identity is being produced, and the realities of a racially differentiated world are confirmed and rationalized. Indeed, I argue that much more is happening: teacher education involves the overt racialization of teachers as White teachers. Teachers, racialized as White, not as Other, are invited into the ongoing work of propagating and supporting a racially divided world.

3.2.2 Discourses of Nation as Race

This racially divided world supports a particular idea of nation. The official texts do not overtly say much about a Canadian nation, especially given their American orientation; however, the supporting documents enable a reading of these works that makes clear the connections between nation and race. While it might be argued that race is a more universal value for the 1914 context under investigation, Benedict Anderson (1991) posits that it is the idea of “nation-ness” that has become the “most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time” (p. 3). He defines nation as an “imagined political community” (Anderson, 1991, p. 6). As an imagined (or discursive) entity, nations are best described not as political realities as such, but as “cultural artifacts of a particular kind” (Anderson, 1991, p. 4), rooted within the larger cultural systems of meaning that surround and produce the idea of
nation. This production of meaning concerns the school, especially around the commonsense goal of education as the production of citizens for a nation. Because the nation cannot be remembered (i.e., Canada cannot be remembered because not long ago it did not exist), “it must be narrated” (Anderson, 1991, p. 204). This becomes one of the important functions of education and of schools, the rendering of a particular narration of nation as valid, as reasonable, as true. Combined with other narrators, such as religion and popular media, schools are a discursive site where the public is “continuously reassured that the imagined world is visibly rooted in everyday life” (Anderson, 1991, pp. 35-36). The nation, then, emerges as something reified, and schools play a large role in this reification.

At the time, many people considered the result of what was happening in Canada to be the forming of a “new nationality” (Berger, 1970, p. 4). The problem in Saskatchewan at the turn of the century was a “racial problem” (Anderson, 1918, p. 135) concerning the influx of racially inferior southern and eastern Europeans, and the intermingling of the “race stocks” (Berger, 1970, p. 147); the nation—imagined as White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant—was at risk. Through education, it was thought that “it was possible to make these heterogeneous nationalities into British subjects” (Berger, 1970, p. 149). That said, it was also important to limit immigration to “those who in time can take their place as worthy fellow citizens” (Woodsworth, 1909, p. 289). “Many of these people will be very slow to understand and appreciate the higher ideals of our civilization” (Anderson, 1918, p. 55); however, their offspring “born under the Union Jack” could become valuable Canadian citizens. This citizenship can easily be connected to race in education as “it is surely manifest that
the greatest agency in racial assimilation is the common or public school”
(Anderson, 1918, p. 96).

We could return to R. B. Bennett’s definition of an Imperialist as “a man who accepts gladly and bears proudly the responsibilities of his race and breed” (cited in Anderson, 1918, p. 37). In the Canadian context, these responsibilities constitute a Canadian nationalism, most often linked to an imperialism reflected in “a certain understanding of history, the national character, and the national mission” (Berger, 1970, p. 9). This certain understanding of history (narration of nation) focused on Canada’s relationship with Great Britain. This idea of a limited or soft imperialism is reflected in a push for closer union with the British Empire and a desire to position Canada to wield more influence on imperial policy (Berger, 1970, p. 36). While this limited notion of imperialism has credence, it is impossible to ignore the real effects of even this limited imperialism in the ongoing oppression of Aboriginal peoples. The ease of Bennett’s “subject races” is salient here as well. Limited imperialism may describe the Canadian nation in contrast to the imperial conquests of the British Empire, but the realities of settler-colonial imperialism⁶ within Canada had consequences for those races deemed subject.

As we have seen, the nation required particular efforts from teachers to support the production of an Anglo-Saxon society. The texts of teacher education at the time supported this effort. In addition to the overt recommendation of Anglo-

---

⁶ Settler-colonial imperialism refers to the often slow processes by which the land is colonized by settlers. The staking of claims, developing the land, and the reproduction of settlers allows this form of colonization to target ownership of the land itself. This form of imperial domination is often characterized by lower intensity conflict with Indigenous populations rather than sustained, full-on, warfare. Furthermore, this settler-imperialism requires the “disavowal of conquest, genocide, slavery, and the exploitation of the labour of peoples of colour” (Razack, 2002, p. 2).
cultural ascendancy, the teachers in training could read in their psychology textbooks that “The Indian lost his broad lands more from lack of altruistic than of selfish motives. He was too often at war with other tribes, too revengeful, and his sympathies were too narrow” (Halleck, 1895, p. 256). Likewise, the English text can equate epic literature (racial texts) with the stories of great discoverers, explorers, and colonists who “have lent their fame and given their names to the places of the globe” (Chubb, 1902, p. 127). This naturalized take on colonialism and imperialism narrates a particular version of nation and fits the teacher into their role in the narration. As the ones who will inculcate new Canadians with ideas about the kind of nation that Canada is, who will help immigrants learn English, gain insight into Canadian life and “march upward” (Anderson, 1918, p. 37) from their own station, teachers have an important place in producing and reproducing a national narrative.

Teacher education, then, responds to the crisis—the potential for racial degeneracy, the potential for the nation to fail as a White space—by producing teachers racialized as White, committed to an education that is also intent on racializing students. Given the role of education in producing a particular narrative of nation, both race and nation are being governed in teachers themselves and in society as a whole through the education of teachers. Who are we trying to become through these practices? By imagining education and teachers in these ways, we are trying to become a White nation. Whiteness here is synonymous with strength, intelligence, dominance, and morality.
### 3.2.3 Discourses of Race as Culture

Benedict Anderson’s (1991) idea of the nation as an imagined community applies specifically to the production of culture. More than the overt references to biological race or even the connections between nation and race, this construction of a particular narrative is highly visible around notions of culture. The constitution of “a” culture, a “Western” culture, is infused with ideas of race in which race and culture are mutually constitutive.

The texts represent a moment in the construction of a Western identity, giving substantive content to the racial hierarchies described above. The books work to connect various cultural referents and make them into a more cohesive expression, constructing a particular version of culture. In this way Greece, “the brightest race that ever lived” (Halleck, 1895, p. 97) and Rome could be seen as the earliest representatives of European civilization; as Painter (1886) suggests, “this is ‘our’ heritage” (p. 32). According to Painter, Greek culture, plus Roman culture, plus Christianity produced “the highest form of manhood” (p. 6). Gladstone, a British politician, was a great statesman partly because of the hints he received from studying the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (Halleck, 1895, p. 232). According to historians of education, the Greek educational approach offered the closest parallel to the questions being asked in education in 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} century North America (Monroe, 1907, p. 28).

It is interesting to look at the way Germanic culture is represented in these writings. In Painter’s (1886) work the Teutonic race, the “noblest branch of the great Aryan family” (p. 87), is carefully placed in a prestigious place towards the end
of the histories: “They are the great leaders in education, as they are in every other
weighty human interest” (p. 87). The Teutonic peoples were seen as preservers of
civilization, carrying on from Rome to “purify, preserve, and disseminate”
civilization (Painter, 1886, p. 87). In retelling European intellectual history, both
Painter and Monroe’s history textbooks pan the educational significance of the
Renaissance partly by conflating the Renaissance with the (seemingly more
important) Protestant Reformation. This preference is explained somewhat because
of the “moral and... religious bent” (Monroe, 1907, p. 189) of Teutonic civilization, as
compared to the more secular Latin mind. This preference moves beyond religion
because of the choice to pattern North American education largely after the German
model. These histories highlight the influence of German/Prussian schools in the
thinking of Horace Mann, especially the weight these models have in educational
thought in the US (Monroe, 1907). German schools have “reached a higher degree of
excellence than any other schools” (Monroe, 1907, p. 346).

These various components of a Western culture, seen here under
construction, are secondary to the establishment of the preeminence of the Anglo-
Saxon culture for Canadian education. These texts highlight the necessary place of
British culture as the pinnacle of culture and politics, in part because “in the West,
with the Anglo-Saxon race, arose the consciousness that all are free; man as man is
free” (Horne, 1904, p. 135). Progress and the impulse to progress and freedom are
linked with the British Constitution and “racial capacity” (Berger, 1970, p. 116).

Moreover, Anglo-Saxon cultural achievements and the English language are
made predominant in these education textbooks. The examples of “high” culture
constantly reference Shakespeare and Milton because “England has furnished to the world the greatest literature of all time” (Halleck, 1895, p. 53). References to Anglo-Saxon culture, achievements, and the primacy of the English language are ubiquitous. Chubb’s (1902) The Teaching of English includes this acknowledgement to his parents, who taught him to love and revere the English language’s “noblest utterance in those familiar household volumes, The Bible, The Pilgrim’ Progress, and the Book of Common Prayer” (n.p.). While the multitude of references to English culture connects with Smedley’s (1999) recognition of a “rampant Anglo-Saxonism” (p. 246) so prevalent in this period, it is also important to see the attempt to connect the previous strains of an imagined Western culture, with this emphasis on English culture, as a necessary and vital expression of that culture: Anglo-Saxonism represents the pinnacle of Western culture.

This culture was so powerful that it could require and guarantee the success of assimilation. The “Slavic racial or religious ideals” would never become dominant because the children of these immigrants had “found a higher social level” (Anderson, 1918, p. 61) in an Anglo education. The ideal teacher, as the example of Canadian womanhood, merely by her presence among the children of immigrants, shaking hands and smiling, could cause the children to dream “of bright sunlight and beautiful flowers” (Anderson, 1918, p. 145). J. T. M. Anderson (1918) warns teachers of the importance and vitality of the work of Canadianizing new immigrants lest “the future of our Canadian citizenship ... fail to reach that high level of intelligence which has ever characterized Anglo-Saxon civilization throughout the world” (p. 240). Anglo-Saxons might “shudder” at the thought of their descendants marrying
“Poles or Bohemians or Ruthenians or Russians” (Anderson, 1918, p. 158), but a considerable number of these ethnic immigrants will guide Canadian national destiny bearing “the Anglicized forms of such names” (p. 178). J. T. M. Anderson highlights the potential contribution of these foreign-born citizens, as well as their transformation into more acceptable citizens; Anglo-Saxon culture has uplifted them, marking and remaking them in both name and substance.

White, Anglo-Saxon, and ... Protestant. As a corollary of Western culture, Christian religious convictions are embedded overtly and tacitly throughout the texts in question; God and nation are deeply linked to each other. It is important to connect White racial identity with Anglo-Saxon culture and its expression within Protestant Christianity: These three are synonymous. The biblical references coded into the arguments of the texts or used to prove an author’s point in a few places, testify to the ubiquity of Christian beliefs in the general culture. A history text can refer to “the schools of Christendom” (Painter, 1886, p. 211). Because of this ubiquity, Tompkins (1895) could cast all of education as the “realization of the divine life of the individual” (p. 218). Education could be imagined as leading “the individual out of the Egyptian bondage of his lower nature into the realm of spiritual life and freedom” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 218). In the history and philosophy of education on offer, it was possible to equate Western Christian education with “the ideals of contemporary education” (Painter, 1886, p. 289): Education was de facto Christian education. White (1893) argues that the love that the teacher embodies is the same kind of love that “lifts up the fallen, carries light into darkness and ’sends
the missionary to the heathen’” (pp. 31-32). In fact, it was possible to consider the similarities between teaching and the priesthood.

We should come nearer to priests than purveyors; and indeed, it is in the growth of the feeling that is beginning to pervade our ranks of our being a lay priesthood, called to the cure of young souls, that we have cause for highest hope. (Chubb, 1902, pp. 392-393)

Teaching, then, is overtly seen in religious terms as a spiritual work, as a ministry, and as a calling.

The teacher was seen as the most important factor accomplishing this moral work; his character and morality were essential (White, 1893, p. 43). “If devotion to God, to truth and duty, does not glow within his heart and life, his outer efforts to secure such devotion in the pupils will avail little. His words must bear the stamp of a true man” (White, 1893, p. 44). The teacher, his character, his Christianity, his rational self-control, and his manhood must be above reproach. Teachers should have a “burning desire to quicken the soul of the child into the highest good of life” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 143). A classroom sets up an opportunity for the “religious life in the teacher to touch the germs of the religious life in the student” (Horne, 1904, p. 125). Thus, Christianity can be seen to underwrite the affective components of teaching: the motivations, the desires, and ultimate goals. Teaching is cast as a Christian ministry, with education as the potential for spiritual growth, freedom, and salvation. The idea that teaching was a ministry and that teachers were best thought of as lay priests indicates the depths to which Christianity was woven into foundations of education. It imagines teaching as more than mere content, as something that is to have an effect on the soul and spirit of the student. Teaching is
this high calling, the opportunity to save students or to impact their destinies in coming to full Christian manhood that represents the affective desire of teachers.

Protestant Christianity, then, forms a constitutive part of the scope, purpose, and substance of the Western and Anglo-Saxon culture being narrated and established in and through these texts and, therefore, is also constitutive of the White racial identity that is being constructed. More than merely a cultural affect, a preliminary differentiation between Protestants and Catholics illuminates how religion here is also a racial demarcation. Given the context of the immigration to Saskatchewan, it was Protestants who were easily connected with those desirable groups, Anglo-Saxons and Northern Europeans. Their whiteness was not in question; rather, it often stood out as exemplary. Therefore Anglicans, and at least Lutheran Protestants, were desirable immigrants. Who was easily defined as Catholic? It was the French (given their history in Canada vis-à-vis the English they could be considered second rate), the Italians and, of particular relevance to Saskatchewan, many Eastern European peoples such as the Ukrainians, the Ruthenians, et cetera. The earlier descriptions of the limitations of these kinds of people and the division between Northern and Southern peoples—the masculine versus the feminine, the moral versus the libertine—seem especially salient. Saskatchewan was to become a Northern place—White, pure, strong, moral, Christian. The connections between a Protestant Christianity and a Northern Europe are clear. Religion here carries racist and racializing baggage; to be Catholic or to be Protestant meant to carry the (in)capacity of being more fully White and more or
less desirable. In this way, religion is also a racial marker; Protestant Christianity is a marker of whiteness.

Which teachers are best suited to embody the Western and, specifically, Anglo-Saxon values that the nation required? Which kinds of teachers can best be trusted to discharge the duty of (religious) education? What work does teacher education need to do before this duty can be entrusted to teachers? Who then can/not be a teacher if these aspirations are to be realized? Teaching depends on the uprightness of the teacher, depends on the teacher being a particular kind of person, and depends on a particular teaching subject. The teacher has to be White, has to hold Anglo-Saxon values, and has to be (at least morally) a Protestant Christian.

3.3 Teacher Education as White Institutional Space

Taken together, these discourses of race and race/nation and race/culture as found in texts about and for teacher education in Saskatchewan in the 1914 context are mutually constitutive: The overt connection between Christianity, nation, and race is central to the discourse that shapes schooling. Regina Normal School, literally across the street from the Anglican Diocese of Qu'Appelle, with its gardens in the shape of the Union Jack, is positioned at the crossroads of these discourses. Schools are a sign of the success of these connections and a guarantee of the continuing success of this soft imperialism in producing a White nation. The irony is that these connections between Christianity and nation and race need to be underlined and proclaimed and said again and again in the texts, not because they are somehow true, but partly because of the fear that whiteness and the nation have not yet been
accomplished. The connections continually need to be narrated, held to, fought for precisely because they are in danger of slippage. After all, as the new Canadian nation comes out of a colonial history, its citizens may not be White enough, may not stay White enough. Teacher education is a place where this slippage could be guarded against; where the values, culture, race and religion of the nation can be narrated; and it is a place that produces teachers who can narrate again to their students. Overtly about White racialization and overtly about speaking and producing whiteness, teacher education represents the possibility (necessity) of becoming a superior nation, a better nation, and a more Anglo-Saxon nation. The fear of the Other and their dilution of our imagined nation in 1914 is countered by the production of racialized and racializing teachers.

3.4 Discourses in Teacher Education in the 1985 Context

Fast forward almost 70 years later and the empire has changed. The major influence on Canada has moved from Imperial England to American cultural, economic, and social hegemony. Much of the research and conversation around education and teacher education comes from the context of the US. While 70 some years have passed, there are still “fearsome troubles besetting education” (Joyce & Weil, 1972, p. xiii). Authors can refer to an “impending educational Armageddon” (cited in Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 1) and to teacher education as a disaster (Howsam, 1979). The field of teacher education is represented as being contested and “not just surrounded by critics, it is inhabited by them. Its graduates, current students, faculty, and administrators generate at least as much fury toward it as do
the politicians, pundits, and serious scholars who reside outside it” (Joyce & Clift, 1984, p. 5). How do we account for these new fears/crises?

### 3.4.1 The Ongoing Fears of the Nation

It is necessary to place the 1985 period into a politico-economic context. Many mark 1968 as a watershed moment around the world with civic protests, student antiwar movements, and demands for equality all over North America and Europe. In the US, the civil rights movement pushed back repressive laws around legalized racial segregation and pushed towards legalizing equality for African American peoples. Schools themselves were part of this struggle, as seen in the fight to desegregate. This period was also marked by intense calls for school reform as in Holt’s (1964) *How Children Fail* and *How Children Learn* (Holt, 1967); Kohl’s (1967) *36 Children*; Kozol’s (1967) *Death at an Early Age*; and Illich’s (1971) *Deschooling Society*. Social, political, and intellectual movements coalesced at the end of the 1960s to push towards greater equality on many fronts.

“And then suddenly it was over. Like a summer cloudburst... does its sound and fury, and leaves no trace of itself” (Postman, 1979, p. 7). According to Postman, while radical school reformers called for change in the late 1960s, the 1970s saw those reformers disappear. What was left was largely conservative or back-to-basics reforms (Postman, 1979; Shor, 1986). The relative prosperity of the postwar economic boom had been tempered by the oil crisis of 1973 and the stock market crash of 1973-1974. In 1982 this decade closed with the worst recession since the Great Depression. With the backdrop of the Cold War, the “Space Race,” the American failure in Vietnam, and an ongoing nuclear threat, there could be many
factors that contributed to the sense of losing our place in the world.

Publicly, education policy in the US articulated these concerns in a number of ways. Education policy in the early 1970s emphasized career education, with a focus on “work discipline and job-training” (Shor, 1986, p. 4). Education policy in the mid-1970s announced and addressed both a literacy crisis and a return to basics as a response. The crisis was based on a limited reading of SAT and other test scores.

Education policy in the beginning of the 1980s spoke against rising mediocrity and pushed education discourse towards “‘excellence,’ ‘standards,’ ‘competence,’ ‘accountability,’ and ‘quality’” (Shor, 1986, p. 25). In 1983, the US government’s National Council on Excellence in Education (NCEE) published a report entitled *A Nation at Risk* suggesting that,

> If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war.... We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (p. 1)

Students were deemed as not having the basic skills required to contribute to the new economy where science and technical skills had become increasingly necessary.

Broadly speaking, this crisis in education was, and still is, the result of the fear of losing ascendancy as a nation and a broader Western culture.

In this context, we could consider the late 1960s and 1970s as a time of the push back of dominant White society. The civil rights advances gained in the 1960s were blunted, almost as quickly as they were won, by the beginnings of postracial ideals/policies criticizing “compensatory or preferential treatment for blacks” (Wise, 2010, p. 29) as those programs that would become affirmative-action initiatives. In fact, the civil rights movement may have gone too far in the minds of
some so that for dominant White culture “any attempts at addressing persistent racial inequality would be resisted, if it were understood that such a goal was intended” (Wise, 2010, p. 31).

In consideration of the literacy crisis, Shor (1986) suggests that a careful reading of the standardized test scores show major increases in the overall school performance of African American students, including basic literacy. Whose literacy was in crisis? Even the return of the language of excellence over and against mediocrity can be established as being about the maintenance of dominant cultural norms—around standard English, around basics, and what constitutes those basics—and the reentrenchment of particular forms of culture. This undercurrent can be plainly seen in the Newsweek cover photo for May 9, 1983. The cover story is about the release of A Nation at Risk. Shor (1986) describes the cover this way:

The very White teenage girl is at the center of the photo, surrounded by dark-faced students. She wears a pink shirt which nicely sets off the paleness of her skin, as she eagerly raises her hand in class. All the other students surrounding her are dressed in dark blue, which accentuates the shaded hues of their faces. (p. 143)

These calls for reform and for theorizing around education policy include this backdrop of a racializing history and present, even in the 1985 context. Whatever else might be imagined, race is a feature of the risks that must be addressed.

The nation is apparently (always?) still at risk. Again, because so much of the conversation about education/teacher education and education theory came out of the US, it is necessary to position this Canadian context as nested within the debates and discourses emerging in America. In the 1985 context, it is the fear that the nation is not capable enough, that its students do not have the right skills and,
therefore, cannot contribute to the new economy. It is the fear of falling behind—behind communist China, behind communist Russia. Students are not as capable in science and in technology as their counterparts in these communist nations. Schools must not be doing the right things; teachers must not be doing the right things.

In schools of education, the response to this crisis is a technical one: better teacher education. Better planning, more complete systems to produce teachers who can more effectively teach and produce the kinds of workers that are needed to remain ascendant. These concerns and emphases can be heard in the voices of principals, boards of education and universities—all pushing for a greater emphasis on skills and competencies (Lang, 1978). It is also clearly discerned in the voices of the graduates of teacher education in Regina from the late 1970s, whose top three recommendations for change include that (a) theory must be applied in practice; (b) there be an increased emphasis on instructional skills, techniques, methods or competencies; and (c) more emphasis be placed on knowledge about, and skills in, classroom management (Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 6). We can read the transformation of teacher education in Regina in secondary education against the backdrop of these concerns.

3.4.2 Professional Studies and the “Technical Core”

Starting in the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, many teacher educators worked to identify the generic skills that made for effective teaching. Competency Based Teacher Education (CBTE) became an important example of this push towards achieving effective teacher education through research. Bob Howsam, considered one of the pioneers of CBTE, and a Saskatchewan native, worked with
researchers at the University of Texas to outline effective models for educating teachers. In Florida, the effort to move beyond identifying “what an effective teacher is” and towards identifying “what an effective teacher does” (Olivia & Henson, 1980, p. 117) culminated in a list of 23 generic competencies (validated through research methodology) that every teacher would be required to perform in order to pass teacher-competency tests for state certification.

These approaches to teacher education identified the skills of teaching and broke them into components that could be practiced, modified, and evaluated. These approaches figure heavily in the development of the new secondary teacher education program. Lang and Petracek (1984) outline recommendations for teacher education such as “the professional core should be in keeping with a set of competencies similar to that provided by the University of Florida” (p. 21). Their proposal for the secondary program included “15 sem-hrs Generic Skills and Strategies (i.e., Florida Competencies)” (Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 26). These actual lists of skills may not be identical, but it is clear that the architects of the new secondary program were convinced that this emphasis on identifiable, discrete skills of instruction was very important.

The early emphasis on competencies becomes synonymous with the generic education (edgen) courses that were foundational to the new program. It was in the generic education courses (later Professional Studies courses) that students were
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7 Hellmut Lang was a longtime faculty member and published author. The number of times his writing is referenced in this dissertation points to both his prolific work in the Faculty of Education and the imprint he left on the program. As an instructor, and eventually as a professor, Dr. Lang captures the work being done in teacher education in Regina as a voice of the faculty. The ideas and practice came from a variety of people, but often the writing/formulating was Dr. Lang’s.
taught the skills of teaching, practiced those skills in articulated laboratory experiences, reflected on their learning and the application of those skills and, eventually, each year of the program, practiced those skills in increasingly realistic experiences in the field, culminating in a semester-long internship. It is this sequence of courses, labs, and field experiences that comes to define teacher education at the University of Regina.

Although there is space in the program objectives to consider the social context of education, the technical core of the program must have a “clear instructional focus” and thus, “is not the place for other topics” (Lang, 1992, p. 7). While Lang (1992) is careful to insist that these other topics are also important, he is clear that

Professional studies classes can’t do it all. And there are faculty who have expertise in these areas. While EPS instructors should reflect or model some of the above as they instruct, students do take other classes, students can take modules! (p. 7)

The territory of the technical core was not the place to consider matters of educational foundations or to encounter questions raised through the sociology of education. Ostensibly, this is because the inclusion of other topics spreads the emphasis too thin, because “we have four short years, not all ‘goods’ can be achieved!” (Lang & Schaller, 1985, p. 7). Thus, professional competence is made the centre of the program, the focus around which all other courses are to be integrated in support. Those other courses or modules may have a place, but that place lies outside the core. The social context of teaching is not constitutive of teacher education in the same way as technical competence.
3.4.3 The Ongoing Presence of Race

It is this social context of teaching that marks the significant difference between the texts of 1914 and the texts of 1985. While the fears and urgency around teacher education represented in both texts are certainly similar, it should come as no surprise that the single largest difference between the texts concerns their treatment of race: The later texts do not reference race at all. This shift from race defining teachers and teaching and race being at the centre of what we imagined education to be about, to the appearance of the absence of race is startling. It is a significant change to go from the ubiquity of race and the crisis of race at the turn of the century, to the celebration of cultures and multicultural policy in the later period.

But, race is not absent from the faculty. The effect of the work of assimilation and the production of whiteness is marked on the walls of the third floor of the Education Building at the University of Regina. The hallway connecting the Student Program Center with the General Office displays graduating class photos from 1974 until the present, marking time, marking the successive production of graduates. Casual observation shows the near absence of visible minorities; the few in most graduating classes stand out as exceptions. The faces of the overwhelming majority of graduates whitewash them. A more careful examination reveals some of the contours of this whiteness. The graduates of the teacher education program in 1988 include these family names: Andrusiak, Bobinski, Dozlawa, Bzdel, Elaschuk, Heshka, Hackywicz, Giczi, Galenzoski, Kryzanowski, Osiowy, Lorenz, Perepeluk, Tymiak, Shewchuk, Wicheruk, Yantz, Zwarych. Given the overt effort to produce White
teachers who would reproduce Anglo whiteness and racially and culturally acceptable students, these graduates represent an emphatic sign of the success of this project. The formerly Ruthenian, Galician, and other ethnics could not have participated in Regina Normal School in 1914. The great grandparents of these graduates would have been the Other of Anderson’s (1918) writing, “slow to understand and appreciate the higher ideals of our civilization” (p. 55). However, their offspring, through public education, the “greatest agency in racial assimilation” (Anderson, 1918, p. 96) could themselves become teachers precisely because of the effectiveness of education in producing the children of immigrants as White.

This movement—from non-White to White—fits within the elastic nature of race and, specifically, whiteness as an ongoing, socially constructed category. As the example of the Irish in America (Ignatiev, 1995; Roediger, 1991) who were Black and who became White, whiteness represented a moving target. For the Southern Europeans who had settled in Saskatchewan, assimilation had completed its work. They, too, could be considered full citizens and as fully White in a way that could not have been contemplated 70 years previous. In some ways, this transformation coincides with the shifting terrain of discourses of race. That the surnames of these teachers are not even Anglicized speaks to the increasing acceptability of difference in this period.

The discourse has changed from the paradigm of “biological difference” to the paradigm of “ethnic difference” (Marx, 2006), whereby genetics are replaced by culture. Given the horrors of the Second World War, and especially the treatment of racial minorities during the Holocaust, Western democracies adopted a liberal
culturalist discourse (Malik, 1996). This move towards a more pluralist cultural relativity was a contrast with the early assimilationist policies in Canada. This cultural pluralism became enshrined within Canadian policy, as Canada adopted a multiculturalism policy in 1971 and passed the Multiculturalism Act (Revised Statutes of Canada, 1988). Difference, especially respect for cultural difference, became enshrined within the legal structure of the nation and, more importantly, within the narration of nation: Canada was a multicultural nation.

Day’s (2000) study of the discourses surrounding Canadian diversity is helpful to nuance this multiculturalism. He describes the administrative moves in the 1951 census, for example, to speak of origin instead of racial origin or the official language of Canadian immigration in 1955 where racial origin became ethnic origin (Day, 2000, p. 172). This is how formerly racial differentiations became ethnic and cultural—with an administrative swipe of the pen. Official multiculturalism, then, imports racial ways of knowing into a new set of categories. Phrases such as national origin or ethnic origin still rely on the older tropes of biological race for meaning, thus “skin colour, clothing, mode of government, intelligence” (Day, 2000, p. 189) can still find their way into the conversation about multiculturalism. These pieces from the old racial hierarchies are now subsumed under the ethno-cultural banner. Stuart Hall (in Jhally, 1996) suggests that nature (read biological race) has come to equal culture and that the two ideas operate metonymically; it becomes “the function of the discourse to make these systems, nature and culture correspond with one another in such a way that is possible to read off the one against the other” (n.p.). In seeing culture, one is able to still see race, so that the culturally Other is
really, still, and always, the racial Other. Culture as a distinction is made to carry the historical baggage of race and racialized understandings, blending race and ethnicity in ways that reproduce “a hierarchy of problematized human types” (Day, 2000, p. 191). Day suggests that Canadian multiculturalism is “a creative reproduction of the colonial method of strategic simulation of assimilation to the Other” (p. 197).

In a reapplication of Graham and Slee’s (2008) critique of inclusion, multicultural policy fails, “due to the existence and extension of uninterrogated normative assumptions” (p. 278), a pre-figured norm to which a multitude of cultures is added. Whiteness then is at the heart of what multicultural policy can mean, the centre around which the inclusion of Others revolves. While a swipe of the pen might work more easily to incorporate largely White European immigrants, the crisis of multiculturalism in the seventies and eighties is amplified by the demographic shift around the kinds of immigrants that are increasingly making their way to Canada. Asian, East-Indian, Pakistani, African, Caribbean—it is these immigrants whose difference will be noticed, and which cannot be so easily celebrated. Bannerji (2000) notes that those ethnic ‘others’, by their presence, “provide a central part of the distinct pluralist unity of Canadian nationhood” and that this centrality, “is dependent on our ‘difference’” (p. 96). Canada’s multicultural stance depends on those marginalized others to give it substance. But, because this invocation of difference occurs in a context that is read as “power-neutral”, at the moment when difference is invoked—in official multiculturalism—it is also neutralized.

Speaking here of culture without addressing power relations displaces and trivializes deep contradictions. It is a reductionism that hides the social
relations of domination that continually create “difference” as inferior and thus signifies continuing relations of antagonism (Ibid., p. 97)

Officially, then, race is gone, legislated away, lost in the goals of a multicultural nation. Whereas the reality of race dominated the writings from the 1914 context, the writings of the 1985 context were raceless. Race no longer matters, at least to a dominant public sense of understanding the self. Multicultural policy is the sign of a Canadian commitment to cultural diversity and, therefore, a commitment to moving beyond race, even while racialized ideas continue to underpin the documents/policies that support official notions of multiculturalism.

3.4.4 Teacher as Outside of Culture

Traces of this discursive shift from race to culture can be seen in the documents supporting the development of the new secondary program. The Report of the Secondary Planning Committee (Subcommittee of the Secondary Planning Committee, 1983) states that students should develop the “capacity to tolerate ambiguity, change, and differences” and the “capacity to be non-judgmental” (p. 3) and that students should understand “the role of the school, in the contexts of the community (political, social, multicultural, economic, historical, etc.)” (p. 7). More than merely “understanding... the ‘socialization’ function of the school” (Subcommittee of the Secondary Planning Committee, 1983, p. 8), teachers should be able to demonstrate an “awareness of the unique cultural characteristics of Saskatchewan and Canada and their relevance to the role of the school” (p. 8). These objectives manifest this move towards embracing difference and the move away from race.
However, as in the 1914 context, some of the barriers to success in schools are connected to difference. Howsam (1979) puts forward a model of teacher education that includes many of the skills, practice, and fieldwork that reflect the technical push described earlier. However, his depiction of the model is literally overlain with the words *multicultural* and *handicapped*—these have become “central concerns and major thrusts… they pervade the system” (Howsam, 1979, p. 9). These markers of difference are set apart for special consideration. As before, difference is part of the problem and explains some of the reasons why teachers cannot teach as effectively as they would like. Recent teacher education graduates voiced similar concerns—Item 13, out of 15 recommendations, was to “give more attention to multi-cultural education” (Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 6). In spite of assimilation, and in spite of the new discourses around inclusion and culture, difference is still acknowledged as a problem that must be dealt with; culture discursively stands in for the negative, problematic baggage of race.

Meeting the multicultural requirements of the new program was problematic. Locating these topics in modules or in other courses outside the technical core of the program made it difficult to achieve these aims, especially as all programming was designed to serve the needs of the professional cycle. More than the placement of these topics within the program, another barrier to meeting these requirements was the perception that University of Regina students were “culturally and socio-economically homogenous; they have had few opportunities to explore cultural difference” (Lang & Friesen, 1993, p. 25). White students, White middle-class students, representing the assumed norm of the teacher, were presumed to not
have culture. The problem then became “how can we provide them with the opportunities and experiences to understand the diversity of backgrounds their pupils bring to the classroom?” (Lang & Friesen, 1993, p. 25). Notice that it is the future students who are bringing culture and diversity into the classroom space, not the teacher who occupies an unnamed, and presumably neutral, technical space. In this way, the report produces an image of teacher that is cultureless. How could the program provide experiences to understand difference to those who in themselves were not different or, rather, were normal? In a discursive context where culture equals race, where being cultural means being racial, what can it mean to be outside culture? Who gets to be outside culture?

### 3.5 Responses to the Problem of Culture

Discussions about multicultural education occurred in the faculty in a number of places. In 1977, Hellmut Lang generated *A Model for Teacher Training for the Education of Minority Children*. This one-page working document is one of the first official acknowledgements of the need to prepare teachers for the realities of multicultural classrooms. The model presented features important to working with minority children in three categories: first, “knowledge about self and minorities”; second, “knowledge about techniques and skills for working with minorities”; and third, “developing functional techniques and skills for working with minorities” (Lang, 1977, p. 1). Within the context of the technical direction of the program described above, the language of describing, developing, and mastering skills and techniques seems to fit with the overall direction of the program. The knowledge component included both “awareness of own feelings about minorities” and
“awareness about the cultural heritage of minorities” (Lang, 1977, p. 1). How does a teacher, who is imagined to be cultureless, or at least neutral, develop awareness about the heritage of minorities?

The need for multicultural education continued to be discussed at Program Development meetings and Ad Hoc Multicultural Committee meetings between 1981 and 1985. In November of 1981, there was a general consensus that a cross-cultural education class was desirable in the elementary program, although there was concern there would not be enough money to support another option in the secondary program. By December, the first cross-cultural education (ECCU) course, designed by Sherry Farrell-Racette of SUNTEP\(^8\), was approved for SUNTEP students. Hellmut Lang felt this decision was discriminatory; if it was a course, it should be good for everyone. This first course became part of a sequence of three classes offered for SUNTEP students and not for others. In the official minutes from a faculty meeting held on December 2, 1981, it was noted that “in this day and age we need a different kind of teacher with different skills to handle the kinds of students in the schools. We need to be looking at Special and Cross-Cultural Education” (Minutes of Faculty Meeting, 1981, n.p.).

Sherry Farrell-Racette was invited to present a report to the Program Development Committee on December 11, 1981. In the report, she outlined both the need for and the scope and sequence of a cycle of cross-cultural education courses

\(^8\) Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program—an institution dedicated to Métis teacher education, inaugurated in 1980, in Regina. While providing certificate qualification to train First Nation and Métis students to become teachers, SUNTEP also has worked towards cultural revitalization, producing teachers who see themselves as more fully cultural beings, and who can strengthen the cultural identities of their students.
(ECCU) for SUNTEP students. Questions for this meeting were to be submitted in writing ahead of time. The sixth question reads, “If students choose a cross-cultural sequence of three classes, do you see this as limiting in any way their marketability?” (cited in Lang, 1981). In this way, it becomes clearer how culture might be taken up as a problem—students might become less likely to get a job if they spent too much time in this subject area.

SUNTEP, as a teaching space, existed administratively beneath the mantle of the Faculty of Education and, physically, on the same campus. SUNTEP was created to produce teachers to serve the needs of the Métis Nation in Saskatchewan and is itself also a response to the problem of culture under consideration in this chapter. It is the scholarship, experiences, and leadership of SUNTEP faculty that enabled this series of courses to be imagined and offered to students. The ECCU courses were developed to accomplish the decolonizing and antiracist aims of a Métis teacher education programme. Dr. Farrell-Racette’s visionary work and the leadership of SUNTEP in the process of developing and arguing for multicultural education in the Faculty of Education have yet to be fully recognized.

In response to the December 1981 presentation, the Program Development Committee established the Ad Hoc Multicultural Committee to consider the place of multicultural education in the teacher education program, more generally, and the specific usefulness of these courses. The elementary program eventually required
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9 SUNTEP serves many important roles and by invoking SUNTEP in this dissertation I am not offering a critique or a dismissal of its necessary decolonizing function, but rather to look at the subtle ways in which its presence enables the Faculty of Education to position itself in relation to race and culture and the reproduction of whiteness. The presence of SUNTEP allows the Faculty of Education to remain raceless, while shifting the responsibility for ‘culture’ elsewhere.
students to take two ECCU courses to fulfill their course requirements. In their report of January 1983, the Ad Hoc Multicultural Education Committee recommended that the program institute a secondary minor and an elementary specialization in multi/cross-cultural education. Other recommendations from the committee included the need to develop expertise in multicultural education, provide in-service opportunities for faculty, generate research in multicultural education, as well as review and revise courses and programs to allow greater focus on cultural diversity and multicultural/cross-cultural emphases. It is interesting to note the second recommendation that faculty should “draw upon the resources of SUNTEP, NORTEP, and SIFC when they are appropriate and available” (Ad Hoc Multicultural Committee, 1983, p. 8).

3.5.1 Teacher Education and the Politics of Race(lessness)

Given these responses to the problem of culture, how can we understand the ongoing production of race? First, it is necessary to notice the positioning of the Other in the documents and discussions of the time. Lang’s 1977 model positions the normal/neutral teacher as a technician, outside of culture. Training teachers for the education of minority teachers establishes teachers as separate from students and, in this way, the minority student is the one who inhabits a cultural space, the space of the Other, and who needs education done “for” him. This distance between the teacher and the cultural Other highlights the discursive necessity of the teacher being and remaining neutral, outside of culture, in order to enact technical responses to the problems that culture here represents. The technical teacher remains outside of culture and thus outside of race.
Another example of this positioning occurs in the 1983 recommendations of the Ad Hoc Multicultural Committee. The committee urges the development of multicultural studies area within the faculty. This area was to include “multicultural studies, cross-cultural methodology, ESL, and women’s studies” (Ad Hoc Multicultural Committee, 1983, p. 8). All of these are not considered the norm; they are not representative of the normal teacher. All these examples of difference and otherness in one location, and especially with the inclusion of women’s studies, as well, highlight what is outside the norm, while the norm—White, English, male—remains unspoken yet reified in its absence. The technical teacher, the normal teacher is (un)marked by the naming of those things outside of normal. In this way, the norm of whiteness is kept outside the discussion, even while it is being maintained.

More than the positioning of the Other, a second feature of the production of race concerns the knowledge of the Other. The impetus for the inclusion of multicultural education is located in the work and the knowledge of Sherry Farrell-Racette and SUNTEP. They provide the model and the content (at least initially) and, while it is laudable for the faculty to consider and then institute a cycle of courses for elementary students, this move is predicated on the work of minoritized people. We could add the second recommendation from the Ad Hoc Multicultural Committee’s report that urges the faculty to “draw upon the resources of SUNTEP, NORTEP10, and SIFC11 when they are appropriate and available” (Ad Hoc
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10 Northern Teacher Education Program
11 Saskatchewan Indian Federated College (SIFC) eventually became the First Nations University of Canada (FNUC).
Multicultural Committee, 1983, p. 8). It is important to trouble not the necessity of these resources—each of these spaces adds a tremendous amount to an understanding of the multicultural situation in Saskatchewan—but rather the context for the use that faculty can make of these resources. This use of the knowledge of SUNTEP enables two spaces to be enacted: (a) the cultural space, where the knowledge, details, experiences of racism and the cultural knowledge required to teach “those kinds of students” can be generated; and (b) the technical space where the knowledge of teaching and the methods, techniques, and technical core reside. In the minds of some of the architects of the program, ECCU courses gave University of Regina students access to culture and to technical strategies for teaching and dealing with “those” students who are culturally different. Teacher education students needed to know how to “handle these kinds of students in the schools.”

In this approach, White students remain cultureless and, therefore, raceless and unaware of their own ongoing racialization. The White teacher is again fixed as the assumed norm for teacher. White teachers get to be “good,” get to spend time with the knowledge of the cultural Other, and get to gain cultural awareness and learn techniques that will make them better teachers. In this way, however, cross-cultural education “focuses on explaining the cultural difference of Aboriginal students to White teachers rather than discussing the practices of exclusion that implicate the racially dominant” (St. Denis, 2002, p. 303). Culture is again reified as something only the Other has and mostly as something that one has to work against/around in order to achieve success. Culture is a barrier to be crossed using
particular techniques. ECCU courses, then, provide a technical response to the problem of culture.

ECCU courses were excellent attempts to address the need to explore multicultural education with teacher education students. But these courses need to be understood from within a context that also works to limit/fix the meaning of the course. So while these are important interventions, even best efforts and best practices are constrained within dominant discourses; it is about what else these courses can mean, as in the “what what we do does” of Foucault (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 187). This critique is an attempt to understand how dominant discourses of race reproduce themselves. In a multicultural context where culture equals race and where whiteness and dominance are not really part of the conversation, these attempts to deal with “the problem of culture” can only reproduce the norm. Multicultural education imagined/practiced in this context keeps the Other as a cultural Other as, therefore, a racial Other. These dominant readings of “the problem” are not challenged when the subjectivity of the White dominant teacher education student is not made part of the problem as well.

A third feature of the production of race concerns the choice of the Faculty of Education to not offer a cycle of ECCU courses for secondary students. Given the way that culture is taken up as a problem, what can be made of the decision to not take up this challenge within the secondary program? There is a history of secondary education being perceived as more important than elementary education: It is seen as more rigorous, more structured, and more necessary to the ongoing work of public education. The disciplines within secondary education exercise much more
specific control over the content deemed necessary for teachers to be able to adequately do their work. Multicultural and cross-cultural education were not deemed important enough to be worked into secondary programming. Maybe this is the concern raised earlier of either not having enough money to support yet “another option” in secondary or the concern about eventual marketability. Regardless, whereas the elementary program was able to prioritize cross-cultural education and require two courses, the secondary program was unable to move beyond the technical core. This marginalization of the ECCU content further delineated its separation from the core of teaching and away from the highly valued, mandatory courses. It might be acceptable for elementary education students to spend their time in these matters, but it is not worth it for secondary education students.

3.6 (White) Teacher Subjectivity and Racelessness

Given the need for a technical response to the crisis of education in this later period, what is teacher education trying to accomplish? On the surface, teachers are being produced as professionals—technically competent, capable. The result of this technical production is that whiteness is again reinforced. First, in the technical core, teachers (and teaching) are made to be practitioners, technically competent professionals as separate from cultural beings—they are made neutral. This racelessness amounts to a denial of race and to a denial of racialization, at least for the White teacher. In the same moment, the production of the good teacher is dependent upon both the position and the knowledge of the cultural Other. While the White teacher is assumed as neutral, the Other is leaned upon for their expertise
and their cultural insight. *Cultural otherness* stands in for *racial otherness* and maintains the separation between “us” and “them,” the unmarked norm and the marked periphery. In deep ways, these discourses work together to produce White teachers who are unaware of their own racialization at the same moment that racialization is being accomplished.

Teacher education in both 1914 and 1985 produce teachers racialized as White. The similarity between the two periods concerns the necessity of the otherness of the Other. In both contexts, otherness is required to set up the contrast with the norm. Race and culture are marshaled as signs of the Other in all kinds of overt ways early on. Later, culture stands in for race as the sign of otherness. The difference occurs in that, early on, whiteness is named, detailed, explored, and lauded; later, whiteness is assumed. The silence around it speaks of its ubiquity. It does not have to be named. Talk of the cultural Other serves to tacitly reinforce the cultural norm, marking them (always) as Other, while reifying and making manifest the normality of the norm. Teacher education, then, remains White institutional space. This whiteness is deeply engraved on the choice to avoid race in favour of a paradigm of technical skills and competencies. But who can avoid race? For whom can the neutrality and objectivity of the technical position work? The gap between the cultural (racialized) SUNTEP students and the technical (raceless) Faculty of Education students is wide.

In the face of a nation at risk, teacher education represents one guarantee of legitimacy. As protecting maternal health for the benefit of future generations, teacher education is imagined to have an effect on generations of school children,
and there is a great interest in who might be eligible for this role. We can have legitimate, confident, capable citizens to make a strong nation, to work in our economies, and to contribute to our civilization. Schools ensure these things, and good teachers ensure good schools. In the 1914 context, this legitimacy was guaranteed through racialization, overt race, and overt whiteness. Teacher education produced White people who, in turn, could effect a whitening of the schoolchildren in their care. In the 1985 context, the efficacy of the earlier work is demonstrated viscerally by Andrusiak, Bobinski, Dozlaw, Bzdel ... and the graduation photos of the many formerly Other subjects who can now lay claim to the legitimacy offered by teacher education. In this later context, the problem of difference is overcome and that legitimacy is guaranteed by the right technique. This technique appears raceless, even though the cultural norms and centre remain racialized as White.
CHAPTER 4. TECHNICAL TEACHER EDUCATION: REASON/TECHNIQUE/(WHITE) CULTURE

Whereas Chapter 3 engaged broader discourses of race and nation and worked to make sense of the subjectivities these discourses enabled, Chapter 4 makes a slight switch in emphasis. Although still interested in discourse, this chapter focuses more concretely on the practices that fix discourse, moving somewhat from an overt focus on the archaeology of knowledge to a more overt emphasis on technologies of power. This explicit emphasis on technologies of power is dependent upon the context and exploration of race in Chapter 3; rather than leaving behind that material, this chapter explores how that discursive context is realized in teacher subjectivity.

Chapter 4 explores the discourses of reason produced through the practices of technical rationality. The 1914 material uses the language of science in making the case for the validity/importance of teacher education. The establishment of teaching as a profession is dependent upon linking teaching with the scientific disciplines on which teaching derives its foundational ideas. Biology, psychology, sociology, philosophy and history give education a place within the establishment as a rational and, therefore, legitimate discipline. These discourses are fixed in Regina Normal School through technologies such as lectures, the modeling of proper teaching practices, and practice teaching.

While the language of science is overt and made significant in the early period, it is largely assumed in the later period. Rather than marking scientific disciplines, in 1985 the lens and practices of science are increasingly applied to
teaching itself. The need to mark education as a legitimate field is filled by an emphasis on technique, through a science of pedagogy, a “clinical” supervision of teaching, and an emphasis on the development of technical skills. These discourses are enacted within the Faculty of Education through the technologies of carefully articulated professional studies courses, laboratory microteaching, and clinically supervised field experiences. As Chapter 3 demonstrated, discourses of race and culture are closely aligned. This chapter concludes with a consideration of how technical-rational approaches stand in for White culture in the later period, marking the space of teacher education as White space.

*Technical rationality* refers to the particular expression of reason that flows out of the Enlightenment and characterizes a modern Western sensibility. Technical rationality is the response of the rational subject to problems encountered. This form of reason emphasizes objectivity and the scientific neutrality of the practices of experts, privileging the language and practices of science. The application of reason embodied in techniques is at the heart of a technical response to the world.

### 4.1 Technical Rationality in the 1914 Context

In 1914, education was not yet a profession; at best, it was striving to become a profession. The need to secure teaching as a professional activity is present to some extent in the language of each of the texts of the period. Part of the difficulty of being seen as a profession was rooted in the amalgam of professions and scientific
interests that made up the academic territory of education—each academic discipline represented a professional, or a scientific, or a legitimate interest. How this would work out in education as a discipline was not yet certain. Normal schools represent an attempt to professionalize, to make standard, to articulate what these disciplines might look like in the training of teachers, and to secure a legitimate standing for education as a professional discipline in its own right.

4.2 Making Education Rational

At the turn of the 20th century, education is carving out a place for itself among the professions. Is teaching a profession? Is it a craft? Is it best left to Normal schools or should those Normal schools become attached to universities? Some authors highlighted the need to have both the Normal school, with its emphasis on professional training, and college training, with its emphasis on subject area knowledge (Tompkins, 1895). The early 20th century is a time when a professional space for teacher education is being created and struggled towards. What follows are some of the themes that are representative of this struggle towards legitimacy for education as a rational discipline.

4.2.1 Teaching As a Science

Painter (1886) can suggest that “mankind has reached manhood” (p. 6) and, therefore, intelligence prevails to a degree unprecedented in the past. In education then, “correct” views of the nature and end of education are becoming prevalent. “The work of education is no longer left to novices destitute of any training except an acquaintance with the defective methods by which they were themselves
instructed” (Painter, 1886, p. 325). Teaching is being elevated into a profession. According to Monroe (1907), “the general movement of education and instruction becomes more definite, more scientific and more universally followed; within education teaching itself is becoming increasingly a profession” (p. 401). There is an emphasis on increasingly scientific methods, especially regarding “scientific methods of instruction” (Painter, 1886, p. 298) and Normal education is designed to “give teachers a scientific training for their vocation” (p. 321). “The science of education attempts to … discover the theoretic basis upon which the art of education rests” (Horne, 1904, p. 9). While education may be seen primarily as an art, it can become a science “only as it grounds itself upon universal principles, applicable to all individuals alike, deduced from the sciences of man” (Horne, 1904, p. 10). Becoming a science increasingly appears to be the goal—the sign of progress and legitimacy as a profession.

It should not be surprising to see the way that science is integrated with the practices and demands of teaching. Shaw's (1901) *School Hygiene* represents a scientific collection of those features necessary to schooling that will enhance the mental and physical development of children: light, space, air, posture, etc. It is a very technical piece, showing the minutiae of measurements and collecting the scientific evidence for the optimum physical setting of schooling. A chapter explores the choosing of desks and suggests that “the one condition on which we would judge any desk is, how fully it embodies the hygienic principles which have been shown to be indispensable for health, posture, and unimpairment of vision” (Shaw, 1901, p. 151). This striving for a scientific truth about hygiene is evident throughout,
linking a set of practices/sciences (hygiene) with the judging of desks, or the correct posture for handwriting, or even the optimum size and shape of windows. The teacher, then, is inserted into a scientific practice and therefore becomes legitimate in the ability and understanding of how to marshal the sciences in the service of teaching.

4.2.2 ‘Scientific’ Rationality

It is important to notice the way that science is used to authorize a particular view of rationality. With the rejection of revealed religion as the only basis of authority, educators sought “to find a sufficient basis in the development of rationality in the child” (Monroe, 1907, p. 402). The intellect (i.e., reason) was seen as the highest form of thinking in the psychology of the mind (Halleck, 1895, p. 51). The intellect was described in many textbooks, using Huxley’s phrase, as a “clear, cold logic engine... ready like a steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work” (Horne, 1904, p. 250; Monroe, 1907, p. 360; Painter, 1886, p. 3). Schools were to develop that logic engine, making it run more efficiently and more able to be applied to a variety of subjects and tasks.

This efficiency can also be connected to a primary purpose of schools, articulated in the texts as the development of “the mind as the governor of the body” (Horne, 1904, p. 2). Teaching aims to cultivate “a power and habit of orderly mental procedure” (Chubb, 1902, p. 176). This mental work, of course, was “not necessarily noisy, but necessarily silent” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 80). What students need “is to be controlled in school, control being every child’s birthright” (White, 1893, p. 209). Somehow, the child is naturally in need of being controlled and managed,
necessitating a controlling response on the part of the teacher. This controlling was to result in the student developing self-control. Schooling, in its rules and instruction, “trains the pupil in rational self-control and in the spirit and forms of institutional life,” and thereby embodies the “character end” of education (Tompkins, 1895, p. 104). Even school discipline served these ends, training “pupils in habits of self-control and self-direction; i.e., to prepare them to be self-governing men and women in life” (White, 1893, p. 14).

Rational self-control is manifest in the teacher who displays a “true professional spirit,” demonstrated partly through the skillful manipulation of school “machinery”: “calling the roll, asking questions, manipulating devices, ornamenting school-room—in short, the perfect military and material side of the school” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 52). While there may be danger in “machinery for its own sake, danger also lies in the other direction—too little attention to the military side of the school” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 104). Learning to teach, then, is partly about learning to marshal the mechanisms of control; to order the classroom so that students themselves can be and become self-ordered.

### 4.2.3 Management

The main metaphor for teaching throughout these texts is management, and the themes that are central to this metaphor are order and control. Many textbook titles of the period include management in their titles; school management equals teaching, to a great degree. Management is so central that it can be said that “all managing resolves itself into teaching, and all teaching takes form in managing. The two are the outside and the inside of the same process” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 36).
Management begins with the qualities of the teacher, and teacher education is concerned with “securing those qualities in the teacher which are in unity with the best interests and highest aims of the pupil’s life” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 38). Given the difficulties of managing the learning and behaviour of large, split classes, the textbooks devote some time to describing how a teacher handles study, recitation, questioning, et. cetera. Rather than focus on the content of teaching, for example a particular subject area, the texts argue for the addition of “skill of execution” because it is “actual skill in the arts and devices that enter into school management that increases the teacher's power of easy control” (White, 1893, p. 22).

The application of reason through particular techniques is the way to improve education. It is easy to notice the ways a technical rationality is embedded within an emphasis on teaching as a science, or on the privileging of a scientific rationality, or even the overt control and management of students and learning through the application of reason. The education of teachers binds technical rationality with education. This discursive work is also clearly seen through the practices of teaching teachers.

4.3 Making Rational Educators

Unfortunately, few sources in the records concern the actual practice of teacher education in this early period. In reading the annual reports, the textbooks, and even student yearbooks, there is little description of the actual methods of teaching teachers to be teachers. Partly, this lack pertains to the supposed obviousness of education; there were certain norms that did not have to be talked about because they were assumed and, therefore, natural/naturalized. Partly, this
lack is also reflective of the move towards greater description of content evidenced in the various courses of study prescribed for teacher education. In this early period we see the names of textbooks standing in for content areas. Even a decade later, content areas are described with greater precision and textbooks are offered to support each of the content areas. Three educational technologies stand out as foundational: lecture, modeling, and practice.

 Mostly, teacher education was centered on the delivery of content through the large group lecture. Direct-instruction techniques, especially the lecture and the copying of notes (from listening or a chalkboard), were primary methods utilized by Normal school faculty to teach the content. Students were to copy, memorize, know, and embody the proper content of education. Connected to this content orientation is a reliance on textbooks. Not only were these required reading in the schools, but also extension programs and professional-development courses consisted of reading courses where students read a particular group of texts and submitted essays on questions that were provided by the Normal school. A particular relationship to both the knowledge about teaching and to the practices of teaching was established through this technology; knowledge and how to deliver that knowledge were accomplished in the same moment.

 The lectures and the faculty of the Normal school served as models of education as well. Faculty members were selected partly for their excellent credentials as teachers themselves. Before the construction of Regina Normal

---

13 “History, Philosophy, and Psychology of Education, methods of teaching particular school subjects, books on Nature Study, Geography, etc., and Biographies of great men were topics included in the list of books prescribed from year to year.” (Langley, 1944, p. 145-146)
School, Normal education was accomplished in proximity to a model school. Teacher education candidates could observe master teachers working with real students in a classroom setting. Thus, the proper approaches to various content and students and issues could be observed, studied, and copied; copying excellent teachers could reproduce excellent teaching. When the model school was closed, observations continued in other public schools in the city.

Students who were learning to teach were also afforded opportunities to practice teaching in these schools. After the construction of Regina Normal, students observed and taught classes across College Avenue at Regina Collegiate Institute. A typical day, as described in Miss C. E. Sheldon-Williams’ remembrances (cited in Langley, 1944), included a morning series of lectures, observing and practice teaching in the afternoon, and a critique of classmates’ teaching in the evening by both observing peers and faculty.

Given these practices and their work to shape subjectivity, who could these student teachers become? The content of the lectures and texts articulated a particular scientific rationality for student teachers to operate from within, especially around the ordering and controlling of classrooms and, therefore, the minds of students. The modeling of the practices that would ensure this control was further embedded: The fact of the visible success of the practices worked as a guarantee of legitimacy. Practicing these behaviours and critiquing/being critiqued around teaching also deepened the way these ideas of rationality could be taken up by student teachers. Through these three technologies, teachers in training were produced as rational managers of the classroom.
4.4 Technical Rationality in the 1985 Context

It is not surprising that so much is similar between the 1914 and 1985 periods; the practices of teacher education do not change much in the intervening years. The language, the metaphors, and the practices all are familiar and normalized as proper to teacher education: Teachers are still professionals and are to be rational managers. With the new secondary program at the University of Regina, what has changed is not the direction of teacher education, rather the transformation concerns the intensity with which teacher education can function. The power of teacher education to effect/produce student teachers in particular ways has dramatically increased. Science has enabled teacher education to produce teachers in a much more total and totalizing way. In the early period, teacher education was technical; in this later period, teacher education becomes hyper-technical.

4.5 Making Education Technical and Rational

The discourses of reason and technique that make up this later period are ubiquitous. Three significant themes emerge as central to the conception of “teacher” at the University of Regina: (a) the articulation of pedagogy as a science in its own right, (b) the adoption of a more clinical and technical approach to the supervision of student teachers, and (c) the primary conception of the teacher as a rational decision-maker. These themes support an overarching emphasis on the development of the particular technical abilities that guarantee greater success in teaching.
4.5.1 Science of Pedagogy

This later period marks not the move of scientific discourse into the background, but the move from a general connection with the sciences—biology, philosophy, and other formally bounded disciplines—to the application of science to the acts of teaching and learning. According to Joyce and Weil (1972),

The art of measuring the outcomes of learning are still in its infancy, particularly with respect to the education of the emotions, the growth of personality, intellectual development and creativity. It seems reasonable to suppose that as our technology for studying teaching and learning improves, people will discover regularities in the teaching-learning process that have not been apparent before. A few general methods may emerge as superior.

(p. 4)

Through the more careful scientific study of teaching and learning, increasingly effective approaches would be discovered. While there may be “no evidence (yet) of a single, reliable, multipurpose teaching strategy that we can use with confidence” (Joyce & Weil, 1972, p. 4), the word “yet” holds out the hope that science may yet help us determine such a strategy.

It is this interest in scientific study that fueled the “explosion of research on teacher education” (Lang, 1992, p. 5). This research largely centered on the “identification of generic performances correlated positively with student outcomes” (Lang, 1992, p. 5). In this way, instruction becomes the “scientific part of teaching, including skills and strategies that must be mastered” (Lang, 1978, p. 3). Teacher education becomes that space where teachers can learn to control these performances and thus impact student outcomes more powerfully. Ellis concludes that “the central purpose of a faculty of education is to disseminate and discover
skills and knowledge concerning the process of instruction” (cited in Lang, 1978, p. 3).

This push towards what has been called *competency-based teacher education* (CBTE) or *performance-based teacher education* (PBTE) was a factor that encouraged change in the transformation of teacher education at the University of Regina (Schaller & Lang, 1982). “The science of teaching is supported by a large and growing generic and subject-specific declarative and procedural pedagogical knowledge base” (Lang, 1992, p. 3). These generic competencies were processed into lists and—while these lists of instructional techniques “may be too technical”—this critique is tempered if the list can be “research based” (Melvin, 1993, p. 14). The fact that the list of 23 Florida Competencies is included in the description of the content for professional studies courses in the new program demonstrates the deep incorporation of these ideas.

Goble stresses that the “teacher’s competence in the management of the encounter with the learner” is the most important measurement of quality in teaching: “the task of teacher education is the continuous improvement of that competence” (cited in Lang, 1978, p. 15). Goble goes so far as to suggest that “no activity is justifiable in a teacher education program if it is not related to a rational analysis of the teaching function” (cited in Lang, 1978, p. 15). Some of the language of the new program reveals this new scientific and technical approach to making sense of the teaching function. Whether it is “laboratory simulation” and “micro-teaching” or the use of “clinics and ... clinical studies” to go with “diagnosis and prescription” (Howsam, 1979, p. 14), the new program reflects the pursuit of
increasingly scientific approaches to teaching that would ensure better learning outcomes for students.

4.5.2 Clinical Supervision

A prominent example of this turn towards science and more scientific methods is the move to adopt clinical supervision techniques. It was thought that the supervision of various teaching practica could be improved “by more frequent, purposeful visits employing clinical techniques, improved training of faculty supervisors and co-operating teachers” (Lang, 1978, p. 52). Goldhammer (1969) describes the anxiety and mistrust that teachers felt around supervision, especially the expectation of punishment. He argues that these anxieties can “only be alleviated if teachers of the future learn that supervision is (or can be) an essentially rational practice, that its methods are those of logical reasoning and forthright analysis” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 64). This transformation of supervision to an increasingly rational process also served to create an “increased awareness of the teaching/learning behaviours which actually exist in the classroom” (Copeland & Boyan, 1975, p. 30). Because teachers cannot account for all that happens in the classroom, clinical supervision can help the student teacher “become more aware of the target behaviors that seem to be the source of the problem” (Copeland & Boyan, 1975, p. 30).

Of note is the description of a more clearly scientific procedure for observing student teaching. Observation of teaching should extend beyond general descriptions. The supervisor/observer should “get the stuff down verbatim: everything that everybody says, if that’s possible, and as objective an account of
nonverbal behaviour as he can manage” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 61). This is because, in the supervision process to follow, “the main job will be to analyze what has taken place in the teaching. Data has to constitute as true, as accurate, and as complete a representation of what took place as possible” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 61). Often, according to Copeland and Boyan, feedback is “global, impressionistic and judgmental. Feedback based on data derived from systematic observation is specific, focused, deliberate and free from judgmental bias” (cited in Lang, Trew, & Cornish, 1980, p. 2).

In order to facilitate this transformation of supervision, the Faculty of Education developed an integrated internship seminar consisting of “30 hours of laboratory training in human relations and clinical supervision” (Lang et al., 1980, p. 12). By training both student teachers and their cooperating teachers in this method of analysis, the seminar enabled the “improvement of teacher performance through the application of the supervision cycle” (Lang et al., 1980, p. 13). Through attendance to a particular technical-rational process, better performance outcomes and, therefore, learning outcomes for students could be ensured.

4.5.3 Teacher as Rational Decision Maker

Hutcheon and Malikail (1973), professors involved in the Faculty of Education during the period of the revamping of the elementary program, offered this critique:

When the central principle on which we plan a teacher education program is the development of competencies, are we not emphasizing again, on a more systematic and scientific level, the production of the technician as in the earlier history of teacher training? (p. 12)
In response, they offer that the “rational-decision maker is the preferred way of looking at teachers” (Hutcheon & Malikail, 1973, p. 14) in order to temper the overt skills orientation of the past.

Others echo this insertion of a rational function into the idea of teacher in this later period. The teacher has to be looked upon as “a clinician and decision maker” (Howsam, 1979, p. 9). Rather than seeing teaching as either a technical-rational enterprise or as a reflective practice, Lang (1996) echoes Schön (1983) and insists that “graduates must become reflective practitioners” (Lang, 1996, p. 5). The word most used in Lang’s writing to describe the teacher is effective. “[T]eacher education must be based on what is now known about effective teaching” (Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 20), and this “research is overwhelming” (Lang & Schaller, 1985, p. 2). The effective teacher has

command of theoretical knowledge about learning and human behaviour;
display of attitudes that foster learning and genuine human relationships;
command of knowledge in subject matter to be taught; control of the technical skills in teaching that facilitate student learning. (Smith, Cohen, & Pearl cited in Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 1)

The role of the teacher is “especially” that of the “educational decision-maker” (Lang & Schaller, 1985, p. 21). More than seeing teachers as “skilled technicians,” teacher education programs “need to prepare students to make and act on professional judgments” (Crozier-Smith, 1993, p. 11).

Teacher education at the University of Regina was “designed to systematically help each student become a self-analyzing, self-actualizing teacher decision-maker” (Schaller & Lang, 1982, p. 12) which, according to Lang and Schaller (1985), is “the ultimate goal of teacher education” (p. 20). This emphasis on
the use of rational processes to make decisions “revolved very much upon a central view of the teacher as an educational decision-maker” (Subcommittee of the Secondary Planning Committee, 1983, p. 2).

This decision-making emphasis is supposed to complicate the narrow emphasis on technique of the earlier era. But “the wise teacher,” according to Joyce and Weil (1972), “will master a limited repertoire of strategies which he can bring to bear on specific kinds of learning problems” (p. 20). The scope of problems the teacher is to be prepared to address is learning problems, and the skill set to master is a limited one. In a similar way, Lang and Schaller (1985) describe how teacher education must focus on what the “teacher is able to do, on the development of a decision-making arsenal, a cadre of rapidly-retrievable, practical pedagogical knowledge and skills – the key descriptor being the word 'skill’” (p. 4). In spite of the concerns expressed at the beginning of this section, it seems that, in theory, the rational decision maker ends up as the technical-rational decision maker in practice: Technical skills predominate.

4.5.4 Skills and the ‘Technical Core’

The science of pedagogy provides the general context for teacher education in this later period. Both the application of this scientific approach, through the mechanism of clinical supervision, and the desire to produce student teachers as rational decision-makers, highlight the degree to which a particular version of rationality pervades teacher education in this moment. Clinical supervision and the vision of the rational decision-maker hinge on an understanding of the technical skills required to be an effective teacher. It is these skills, and the emphasis on “skill”
as the key descriptor, that come to define teacher education at the University of Regina.

The function of teacher preparation institutions is that they “provide training that can make students competent practitioners of the teaching profession,” and competence is defined in terms of “the repertoire of competencies he or she possesses” (Lang & Schaller, 1985, p. 13). It is this emphasis on competencies that “has been largely neglected” (Lang & Schaller, 1985, p. 13). Teacher education should be organized around what could be termed the “professional component,” which included a “set of generic professional capabilities” (Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 21). “The core of teacher education should be the knowledge and skills of a practicing professional,” which included an “extensive repertoire of pedagogical knowledge, principles, skills, processes and procedures” (Lang, 1996, p. 8).

Students were to be exposed to 15 hours of “Generic Skills and Strategies” (Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 26). This skills emphasis, similar in some ways to CBTE, had only been “employed full scale with minority and/or institutionalized populations in Canada such as retarded and prisoners” (Cordis & McBeat, 1982, p. 3). This narrow and technical emphasis was not to be the whole program. Students were to have 6 hours of undergirding disciplines such as sociology or anthropology, and significant course hours were given to subject-area specialties. However, the generic skills component was to become the technical core around which the rest of the program was to be integrated and serve.

In the new secondary program at the University of Regina, this professional or technical core was organized in the Education Professional Studies (EPS) courses
(that replaced the earlier Generic Education course [EdGEN]). EPS courses would
“start off with those skills that are basic to classroom teaching and provide
opportunity for practice until they master them. This would suggest an initial
emphasis on classroom management, basic planning and lesson giving, tutoring,
questioning and responding” (Lang, 1992, p. 9). The EPS cycle of courses focused on
the practice of skills, working from the simple to the complex, including “sequences
of practice and feedback” (Cordis & McBeath, 1982, p. 7). As a vehicle for the
practicing of skills, microteaching labs enabled breaking “the teaching act into small
enough segments to be practiced and learned in isolation” (Cordis & McBeath, 1982,
p. 12). These microteaching labs were somewhat interrelated with a sequence of
progressive field experiences, taking prospective teachers into classroom settings
and building on the complexity of those experiences towards the successful
completion of a 4-month internship. Microteaching and field experiences utilized
clinical supervision techniques to develop student teachers in effective ways. It is
this professional sequence of classes, labs, and experiences that became the
developmental model of teacher education that characterized the University of
Regina program.

The articulation of the technical core was in contrast to teacher preparation
conceived as “exposure to a collection of lectured Arts and Science classes,
unarticulated Education classes and scantly-supervised practice teaching” (Lang,
1990, p. 1). While it was thought that good teacher education “values but moves
beyond the technical,” it was considered “foolish to place inordinate emphasis on
critical reflection” (Lang, 1996, p. 6). Partly, this is the tension between “TELLING
students what a teacher should be doing” and “BEING ABLE TO DO” (Lang & Petracek, 1984, p. 2, emphasis in the original), between theoretical and technical concerns that permeate the documents. Moreover, “attempts to have students combine study about and preparation for teaching need to be done cautiously” (Lang, 1996, p. 8).

What is clear from these themes, and especially from this description of the professional or technical core of teacher education in this later period, is the whole-scale insertion/explication of technical-rational language at the heart of the development of teachers. The new secondary program with its emphasis on adherence to teaching disciplinary subjects at the University of Regina is predicated on and produces technical rationality as the goal of teacher education: Technical rationality is the norm. Given this narrow articulation of a teacher, it is necessary to also see the powerful use of technologies, following Foucault as described in Chapter 2, that produce technical-rational teachers.

4.6 Making Technical (Rational) Educators

In some ways, the technologies of power at work in teacher education look very similar to those of the 1914 context: lectures, modeling and practice teaching; however, there are some important differences. Whereas the early period required 8 months of instruction to earn First Class teacher certification, the Faculty of Education required 4 years of instruction/preparation at the university. While Normal school practice experiences were limited in both time and scope, the university program included four field experiences, building from observation, increasing in complexity and responsibility for teaching, and culminating in 4 full
months of teaching, with 3 weeks teaching as a full-time teacher. The difference in scale between the programs is significant. A last difference is the adoption of increasingly sophisticated and scientific approaches to teaching; the effect of the intervention at the University of Regina was designed for greater impact that was impossible to miss.

EPS classes attend to the “ability to teach” (Lang, 1992, p. 3). They were thought to be effective because of the “dialectical nature of (their) delivery system. Theory is modeled, studied and practiced” (Lang & Friesen, 1993, p. 22). Instructors, whether faculty or practicing professional teachers, introduced students to a range of skills and ideas, modeling a range of behaviours that students would be able to practice themselves in their microteaching labs. Some of these themes include:

Simple lesson planning, setting objectives, systematic observation, classroom management, motivation, lesson presentation skills, assessing readiness and development, questioning, unit planning, concept teaching, teaching for thinking, problem-solving, inquiry and discovery, teaching for transfer, teaching for skill development. (Schaller & Lang, 1982, p. 17)

Considerable EPS class-time was spent exploring these ideas.

Microteaching labs of about 10 students were connected to each EPS course. Each lab was sequenced with a corresponding EPS class so that the discussion/teaching in the course was reinforced/practiced in the lab. These labs provided extra contact hours with students each week. Usually staffed by retired teachers, these labs were carefully articulated processes wherein teacher education students concentrated on “specific aspects of the teaching act” while reducing “the number of variables that must be accounted for” (Lang, 1990, p. 2).
Students prepared lessons to teach to their peers, concentrating on specific, professional targets prescribed each week (at least initially; later, students had some choice). By taking these targets in small pieces, students were exposed to the skills of teaching in more manageable ways, targeting set or closure 1 week, concentrating on movement around the class another week, and questioning techniques in the next. Sometimes these microteaching lessons were videotaped to enable students to better analyze their own teaching. Microteaching was also a way to introduce students to clinical supervision techniques in a more relaxed atmosphere. Students learned how to observe nonjudgmentally, ask for and provide feedback appropriate to professional targets, and how to pre- and postconference in ways that supported clinical supervision.

These laboratory settings were articulated together with field experiences—often the microteaching setting provided material, planning, targets on which to build for teaching in the field context. Student teachers observed practicing teachers, built relationships with students, and taught classes in the field environment. The practices of clinical supervision were used to pre- and postconference with the cooperating teacher. These field experiences culminated in internship where the professional expectations and collegial relationships were increased in intensity. Together, cooperating teachers and interns underwent 30 hours of training in clinical supervision techniques prior to internship. These cooperating teachers were required to report on a wide range of competencies that the intern demonstrated, filling in a graph to visually represent the technical capabilities of interns.
4.6.1 Normalizing Technical Rationality

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1995) describes the normalizing work of technologies of power. These technologies function to insert within the subject a particular orientation both to knowledge and toward him or herself. Foucault identifies a series of technologies at work: hierarchic observation, normalizing judgment, and examination. It is impossible not to see these elements at work within the technologies of power under investigation here. Hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment are particularly evident in the Faculty of Education.

According to Prado (2000), hierarchical observation involves physically managing institutions to “maximize visual and/or auditory access” (p. 63) to the subject. The developmental model involves an increase in this observation, moving from the 1:20 ratio of instructor to students in an EPS class, to the 1:10 ratio in the microteaching lab. Most field experiences had a 1:2 ratio of cooperating teacher to students (with occasional visits from a faculty advisor) and this improved to a 1:1 ratio during internship. In some microteaching labs, students used video technology to capture their teaching, thereby enabling their performance to be visible to both themselves and their lab instructors. The program is characterized by an increased visibility to supervision through observation. This observation could be combined with the technique of surveillance whereby the observation also involved the compiling of detailed dossiers and reports on subjects. In the developmental program, these reports included the written comments of teachers, reports of cooperating teachers and faculty advisors, and meetings held at the end of both semesters to determine each candidate’s fitness for continuing into the next year of
teacher training. Fitness was determined by a combination of grades and success in classes, growth and effort in labs, attitude and success in field experiences, and general attitude towards the process. All this surveillance culminated in the internship report, a detailed and comprehensive accounting of both the skills and the deficiencies of the teacher education student in demonstrating teacher competencies.

Normalizing judgment involves the negative assessment of individuals or groups. It is interesting to note that this judgment is not criticism, but instead the negative comparison with a particular paradigm that is considered right. This paradigm becomes the norm, and the judgment establishes the distance from the norm, calibrating how much and how far actions and subjects are from that right way of thinking. As an example, Foucault (1995) describes what he calls “micro-penality” (p. 178) or the way that microjudgments in prisons are calculated around time (lateness, absence, interruptions), activity (inattention, negligence, lack of zeal), and behaviour, speech, et. cetera. We might extend his analysis to consider “micro-teaching” and the normalizing judgment developed through “target behaviours.” Student teachers and students are placed within a system whereby the components of the teaching act (and student responses) are coded and analyzed around various micropractices. These desired practices organize and legitimize both the classroom space and the actions within it in particular ways, enabling staff and students to compare teaching to the favored paradigm.

Imagine a grid laid over the top of the teaching that depicts the teacher, the students, the activities, speech acts, and nonverbal cues. In this way, everything in
the classroom can be judged against a norm of practice. A cooperating teacher, a faculty advisor, even a peer could observe, mark out pieces of the grid, noting which students were able to follow instructions, or where in the room the teacher walked by checking off student names, or drawing lines connecting those that the teacher addressed. These data could then be used to analyze and change student teachers’ behaviour in the classroom. An elaborate series of methods for observing, coding, and naming were developed that produced a normalizing judgment about what was happening in the classroom. As Foucault describes that perpetual penalty (in this case maybe a perpetual micropractice) that “traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it normalizes” (Foucault, 1995, p. 183).

Establishing the micropractices of effective teaching worked to normalize those practices.

Notice the density of these technologies—how they interact with each other by design, building systematically in an integrated way towards the development of a skilled teacher. Notice the feedback loops that are put in place to communicate both with the student and with the program. The student is able to reflect on his/her own practice, compare where and how s/he fits with the professional targets that are set out. The program is also in contact with the student’s progress throughout—the EPS instructor, the lab instructor, the peer evaluations, the cooperating teachers—and there are a variety of reporting mechanisms each semester that determine if and how the student can continue in the program. Unlike courses that might be redone, field experiences, especially the extended practicum,
were difficult to do again if a student was not performing; there was tremendous pressure not to fall out of step.

It is important here to return to an earlier point. Foucault’s (1981) work in *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1* shows that the flourishing of discourse about sex was not really about sex, rather sex became a discursive site where discourse could be produced and governmentality exercised. In a similar way, this dissertation is the study of how these processes of education became something about which there could be this precise type of technical discourse, and more than whatever this tells us about education, also a site where governmentality can flourish. The education of teachers (and through them, the education of students) is partly about the management of these populations. The incitement to discourse in and about technical rational education produces both “the elements on which it acts” and “the means to control these elements” (Macherey, 1992, p. 178). A technology like education establishes, normalizes and enacts discourse, producing subjects who can be managed by the discourses that have been produced. Discourses about teaching, about pedagogy, about technique and psychology produce both ‘teaching’, forms of pedagogy and management and 'subjects’ who recognize and respond to the teaching. Technical rationality is a preferred lens through which to incite discourse partially because of the control of teacher behaviour; a technical rational orientation offers the most efficient means of controlling teacher (and wider) populations.

Who can the student be/become in light of this developmental model? While this question will be taken up in detail in the next chapter, we can say that the student is placed into a process designed to shape him/her in a very specific way, to
orient him/her towards teaching and valuing in prescribed ways. The technical core recreates at the core of the teacher a technical-rational primary orientation to teaching. The teacher not only has a skillset of carefully chosen, modeled and practiced skills, but also he/she has an appreciation for the value of these skills. The effectiveness of this formation can be seen in the importance that recent graduates placed on skills and classroom management (Lang & Petracek, 1984) while, at the same time, students were panning courses in education history or philosophy of education and ethics as meaningless (Lang, 1978, p. 6). A practical orientation, a process of developing effective classroom skills, and a general, technical orientation are supported and encouraged. The developmental model produces technical-rational teachers, well-skilled, proficient in teaching, and able to continue to develop those skills throughout their practice.

The history under investigation in this dissertation starts with a Normal school, a school whose purpose involves the inculcation of a norm or a standard in which the aspiring teacher can be legitimated and through which the teacher can mark society. What then is this normal of Normal schools? Given the investigation of Chapters 3 and 4, this norm is whiteness, White racial dominance, Anglo-Saxon culture, and Protestant Christian values; the normal teacher is the White teacher. From the Normal school of 1914, we move to the less overt Faculty of Education in 1985, but where processes of normalization are even more present and refined. What is the norm of the Faculty of Education? Technical rationality comes to be the centre around which the technologies of power organize and imprint, normalizing a technical-rational vision and practice of teaching.
4.7 Technical Rationality and White Institutional Space

Let me be clear: Being a technically skilled teacher is not a bad thing. Teaching is partly a technical exercise, and the training in skill development that became the heart of teacher education at the University of Regina was very proficient at turning out graduates who were competent in a variety of skills that make up the teaching function. This inquiry is partly about seeing what else is accomplished when we insert technical rationality so deeply and so narrowly at the heart of teaching. Consider the weight of the technical core and the mass of the presentation and formation pressing the student into a particular form. The technical core becomes the norm—the core of teaching, the place from which students operate. Adding one foundations course, postinternship, either because “students are more ready to concentrate on deep thought after they have completed their extended practicum” (Lang, 1990, p. 1) or because EPS courses are “not the place for other topics” (Lang, 1992, p. 7), does little to shape or diminish the fundamental role accomplished by the professional core.

The discursive context explored throughout the last half of Chapter 3 equates culture with race; claims to culture, being positioned as having culture or being cultural, all work to racialize the bearers of culture as Other. The Faculty of Education is positioned as a cultureless space where largely homogenous, middle-class, normal students learn the techniques of teaching and train to become good teachers. That they might need to know something of the cultural Other who might be their students furthers the separation between those who have culture/race and those who are positioned as cultureless/raceless or, rather, those who can be
positioned as technical and rational. Chapter 4 explored the content of this technical rationality that is imagined at the heart of teaching, normalized through techniques of power; culture is relegated to the periphery, both physically and conceptually. This inscription of technique and technical rationality as somehow beyond culture requires work to erase the history of the ideas and practices that shape that rationality. Technical rationality is taken for granted as the history of Western thought and Western culture, and fits easily within a Western modernist self-understanding. The culture/reason divide that can secure racelessness does not quite work because Western reason is itself part of culture. Technical rationality is *de facto* White culture.

### 4.7.1 Technical Rationality as Whiteness

According to Kincheloe and Steinberg (1998), the “dominant impulse of whiteness” is constituted within an Enlightenment notion of rationality “with its privileged construction of a transcendental White, male, rational subject” (p. 5). In the explosion of the scientific framing of human nature (18th and 19th centuries), this rationality is deemed constitutive of what was unique about human beings, what separated us from other biological life. Mankind is the “reasoning animal.” Enlightenment rationality focuses on objectivity, applying the knowledge gained through the techniques of science to all forms of thought. This essential reason—also a social/cultural construction—becomes a central feature of the modern man, of modern societies, and thus as the aspiration of humanity justifies and underwrites colonialism/imperialism. In this way rationality becomes “inscribed in a variety of hierarchical relations between European colonizers and their colonies”
Notice the difference between reason and ignorance, science and traditions: “philosophies of mind versus folk psychologies” (Kinzeloe & Steinberg, 1998, p. 7). This separation “not only made Europe's place in the world sensible and secure... but also left it with a mandate for distributing its civilization to the rest of the world in return for governing that world” (Willinsky, 1998, p. 25). Thus, the linking of a particular way of thinking—rationality—with a particular way of being—Western, colonial, imperial, dominant—represents a piece of the constitution of White subjectivity. To be White is to be rational.

Technical rationality, as an extension of Enlightenment rationality, is the concrete response of reason to the problems of the day. Expressed in industrial concerns for mass-production techniques, applied in the design and practice of mass administration regimes, technical rationality is partly the belief that technical solutions to problems will provide the best, that is, the most efficient answers and become the guarantee of success. Schön (1983) defines technical rationality as “problem-solving made rigorous by the application of scientific theory and technique” (p. 21). These beliefs are deeply insinuated into modern societies and taken up in various systems approaches and systems models of interaction and development, forming what Adams (1990) calls “the managerial metamyth” (p. 285). Technical rationality as the offspring of Enlightenment rationality, and because of its deep insertion into the culture of dominant Western nations, is taken as a sine qua non of whiteness.
4.7.2 The Cultural Register of Whiteness

A particular form of rationality might be the most obvious way to depict a feature of whiteness, but it is not the only feature relevant to our discussion. Dyer’s (1997) notion of the “cultural register of whiteness” (p. 14) is helpful to encompass some of the variety of ideas represented within whiteness: orderliness, self-control, objectivity, capability. Each of these ideas resonates within the cultural register of whiteness, while otherness represents chaos, irrationality, violence, and the loss of self-control (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998). Whiteness privileges the abstract mind over the body, reason over passion, and objectivity over interestedness. Whiteness, also, has taken on a universalized aura, underwriting much of the way that what is normal in modern society can be taken up. The way that teacher education in Regina inserts and produces technical rationality as normal contributes to the way that White culture is normalized in and through those techniques of power. Themes of neutrality, control, and racelessness become important sites to explore this production further.

The colour White, carrying the idea of neutrality (at least in the palette), “already suggests its usefulness for designating a social group that is to be taken for the human ordinary” (Dyer, 1997, p. 47). In Western representation, Whites are “placed as the norm, the ordinary, the standard.... whites are not of a certain race, they’re just the human race” (Dyer, 1997, p. 3). The invisibility of whiteness depends on its normative nature, upon it being at once nothing in particular and at the same time a universal; “to be normal... is to be white” (Dyer, 1997, p. 12). According to
Dyer, White can paradoxically be “at once a sort of race, and the human race, an individual and a universal subject” (p. 39).

With the advent of biological approaches to race that also describe the racial characteristics of whiteness, there have been other discourses that stress those things that cannot be seen or measured in order to account for that “little something more that makes white people different” (Dyer, 1997, p. 23). This intangible might be called spirit.

Get up and go, aspiration, awareness of the highest reaches of intellectual comprehension and aesthetic refinement. Above all, the white spirit could both master and transcend the white body, while the non-white soul was a prey to the promptings and fallibilities of the body. (Dyer, 1997, p. 23)

This control can be seen in the lean body, straightened posture, tightness in movement, tidiness, privacy, abstinence; these elements of a controlled manner “display the fact of the spirit within” (Dyer, 1997, p. 23). This was not only self-control, but also the control of others expressed as imperialism: “White cultivation brings partition, geometry, boundedness to the land, it displays on the land the fact of human intervention, of enterprise” (Dyer, 1997, p. 33).

The development of White dominant identity depends on “the attainment of a position of disinterest—abstraction, distance, separation, objectivity—which creates a public sphere that is the mark of civilization, itself the aim of human history” (Dyer, 1997, p. 38-39). Dyer argues that it is this position of disinterest that “provides the philosophical underpinning of the conception of white people ... as everything and nothing.” This point seems crucial to understanding the effect of the racelessness and culturelessness of the developmental model; objective disinterest
enables technical rationality to be everything (the core) and nothing (of no cultural import, whatsoever).

Dyer (1997) suggests that “As long as race is something only applied to non-white peoples, as long as white people are not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm. Other people are raced, we are just people” (p. 1). The same thing could be said about culture: As long as culture only applies to teacher education in the context of ECCU courses, and as long as technical rationality is the unnamed White centre, then whiteness can function as the norm. Again, “they” have culture; we have civilization (Khan, 1982). Laying claim to being just people is powerful. With this claim, one can “speak for the commonality of humanity. Raced people can’t do that—they can only speak for their race. But non-raced people can, for they do not represent the interests of a race” (Dyer, 1997, p. 2). In the same way being just a teacher is a powerful position. Removing race and culture from the language of teacher education, or imagining that the core of the program is above or outside of culture enables teacher education to speak for all, to represent itself and its work in a universal way. By being positioned outside of culture, the Faculty of Education can be seen as not representative of the interests of whiteness, even at the same moment as it is the fruit of White culture that informs and shapes the program.

**4.8 (White) Teacher Subjectivity and Technical Rationality**

What is being governed in the production of teachers? It is the otherness of the teacher, whether it be racial or cultural otherness or class otherness, the education of teachers offers a homogeneity that minimizes these differences. What
is being produced in and through the education of teachers? What is normalized? Technical rationality is \textit{de facto} White culture; thus White culture is normalized at the heart of teaching. Through technologies of power, White culture recast as good teaching is made to be the centre of the developmental model.

The powerful work of placing a technical-rational skillset and value system at the heart of the teacher is productive of whiteness: an orientation to values that historically connect with Western culture and history and a neutrality and objectivity that can continue to diminish, or at least not notice, the ongoing racial and racialized constitution of subjects. Technical rationality, especially with the necessity to embrace neutrality, objectivity, and reason (as above culture), is another marker of whiteness and further claims the space of teacher education as White-institutional space. The technical approach inserts that whiteness into the heart of teaching—whiteness, then, equals good, proficient, and skilled teaching. The technical process of the developmental model inserts whiteness into the heart of student teachers—shaping/conforming them to a particular vision/version of teaching/whiteness. The good teacher, the effective teacher, the skilled teacher is also the White teacher.

In much of the literature represented here, the technical is tempered by either the idea of rational decision-making or a psychological push towards reflection. In the next chapter, the undergirding psychology and limitations of both clinical supervision and reflection are considered. While Chapters 3 and 4 provide both the discursive context and the nuances of power/knowledge at work around the teacher-to-be, Chapter 5 explores the ethical dimension or how this subject acts
Clinical supervision and reflection are those pieces that are presumed to temper the technical, enabling students to personally apply the technical processes in ways that humanize. Chapter 5 examines this invitation to self-work in the production of teachers.
CHAPTER 5. TECHNIQUES OF THE SELF:
(SELF-) SUPERVISING AND REFLECTING THE WHITE TEACHER

It is useful at this time to revisit the analytic terrain that Foucault opens up for investigation as laid out in Chapter 2 of this dissertation. Foucault (1990) casts his work along three axes of inquiry namely, (a) **archaeology** or “the analysis of discursive practices that made it possible to trace the formation of disciplines” (p. 4); and (b) **genealogy** or “the analysis of power relations and their technologies” (p. 4); and (c) the **care of the self** or “the modes according to which individuals are given to recognize themselves as ... subjects” (p. 5). These “theoretical shifts” (Foucault, 1990, p. 6) or “dimensions” (pp. 11-12) describe how Foucault has approached his analysis of the subject. Dean (1994) clarifies Foucault’s interest in subjectification along these axes describing “how the individual is ‘subjectified’ in relation to forms of knowledge and discourse, ‘subjected’ in technologies or domination, and ‘subjectifies’ him or herself in relation to rules and techniques of ethical conduct” (pp. 112-113).

It is this triple sense of the subject, in particular the teaching subject, that has been the focus of this study. Chapter 3 explored the archaeological dimension (forms of knowledge), examining the subject formed in and through historicized discourses of race and nation. Chapter 4 explored the genealogical dimension (technologies or practices of power), examining the subject formed in and through historicized discourses and practices of technical rationality. Chapter 5 explores the ethical dimension (practices of the self), examining the historicized government of the self made possible in and through teacher education.
According to Dean (2010), "government entails any attempt to shape with some degree of deliberation aspects of our behaviour according to particular sets of norms and for a variety of ends" (p. 18). The government of populations, or schools, or our own bodies, encompasses an attempt to form “who and what individuals and collectives are and should be” (Dean, 2010, p. 20) and includes both practices of government and practices of the self. It is possible to see the education of teachers as a form of governing in such sites as the professional development of teachers, their desires/aptitudes and their skill-sets and tendencies. The genealogical emphasis of Chapter 4 concentrated on technologies of power and the application of a rational process to the production of teachers as professionals. Governmentality was emphasized through the discourse and practices of technical rationality. The genealogical emphasis of Chapter 5 concerns the governing of the self, looking at technologies of the self that include “operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, that people make either by themselves or with the help of others, in order to transform themselves” (Foucault, 1988, p. 18). This chapter, then, focuses on how the self can act on itself, name itself, and find itself within the discourses made available through teacher education.

Specifically, Chapter 5 looks at the discursive production of the teaching self through conceptions and technologies of the self. Articulated in teacher education in the 1914 context, these discourses produce teachers as White, Canadian, Christian, and rational. While psychology is present and informs conceptions of the self, especially through notions of development and the individual, at this early stage psychology is more like philosophy than science. The techniques of the self are less
apparent and lacking in technical force; the emphasis is on being the right kind of person, rather than making the right kind of person. In the 1985 context, psychology is ubiquitous as a fully formed science. The developmental approach to teacher education and conceptions of the individual are still central to conceptions of teacher education. The techniques of the self in the later period are more articulated, as clinical supervision and reflection offer students useful tools through which to see themselves, write themselves, and act on themselves. To the extent that clinical supervision and reflection are focused on applying a technical approach and refining of technique, and the extent to which they exclude the social context of teaching, these technologies enable the production of the teaching self as a technical-rational professional, and further embed the raceless neutrality that whiteness requires.

5.1 Discourses of the Self in the 1914 Context

Let me restate that genealogy requires a performative understanding of discourse where “praxis-is-inseparable-from-discourse” (Fendler, 2004, p. 453); discourse actively shapes the actions and subjects it references. We can trace teacher subjectivity through attention to the norms, descriptors, and practices of teacher education because tracing the discourse is tracing subjectivities. That said, what notions of self or what kind of teaching selves are imagined, spoken, and therefore made possible in the early period of teacher education under consideration? In one sense, these discourses represent a review of the terrain that has already been covered in the last two chapters. It will be no surprise to see a racialized self, a Christian self, and a rational self emerging from this material.
However, it is also necessary to recast these discourses slightly, to draw attention to the way the self is specifically referenced in these discourses.

To highlight again the centrality of the necessity of race to the work of education in 1914 is to underscore the necessity of teachers being White. Through teacher education, racial knowledge was transmitted, racial identity was produced and, ultimately, through teachers, reproduced in the classroom. These White teachers were integral to the development of a national identity. Thus, only certain examples of being Canadian are appropriate for the classroom. For students to “develop into strong types of Canadian manhood and womanhood” (Anderson, 1918, p. 96), it was necessary that the teachers were, in themselves, examples of Canadian manhood and womanhood. Anderson (1918) calls for “enthusiastic, sympathetic, thoroughly qualified Canadian teachers” (p. 37) to teach, especially in those schools where new Canadians were present. This was because the “unqualified, half-Canadianized ‘foreign’ teacher cannot properly inculcate those ideas so essential in laying the foundation of true citizenship in Canada” (Anderson, 1918, p. 37). Notice the emphasis on the good teacher being a particular kind of person, in this case a Canadian, and the necessity of this particular selfhood to the task of education. As we have already noted, “Canadian,” here, refers to an Anglo-Saxon racial and cultural heritage that was presumed to be both necessary to the success of Canadian Imperialism and under attack in the presence of so many...
‘Others’. Good teaching required teachers who were White and Anglo-Saxon in and of themselves.

These White teachers should also be Christian as a “central function and duty of the school” (White, 1893, p. 4) was moral training. “The finished result is a noble manhood, whose highest exemplification, the ideal of all culture, is Christ” (Painter, 1886, p. 2). We can see the movement in the literature from more overt, “authoritative, direct religious teaching to the banishment of these from the public school” (Monroe, 1907, p. 60). Increasingly, a general Christian ethos came to stand in for overt religion, and “moral conduct must be developed through schoolroom instruction and rational training” (Monroe, 1907, p. 60). Even if the overt aims of teaching were modified, the teacher was of vital importance. The ability to carry out this result depended upon the character of the teacher who must “believe and feel the truth which he teaches” (White, 1893, p. 241). Teaching, as has already been demonstrated was almost a priestly task, a chance for “real service, a chance to live a life, an opportunity to develop and guide and save” (Anderson, 1918, p. 144). Thus, while the overtly religious material was moved to the background, the focal point for Christian education became the Christian teacher; in order for education to succeed, a certain kind of Christian person was required to teach.

Similarly, Chapter 4 explored the way a particular rationality became embedded within education and the education of teachers. Education was becoming increasingly a science, it privileged a scientific rationality, and both schools and learning were best managed through the application of reason. Thus, reason could be seen as the highest form of thinking in the psychology of the mind (Halleck,
1895) and could be described as a “clear, cold logic engine” (Painter, 1886, p. 3). Schools, then, required similarly rational teachers who could run school systems, model logical processes, and produce students who could function as rational beings. If teaching is to cultivate “a power and habit of orderly mental procedure” (Chubb, 1902, p. 176), it is necessary that teachers themselves be so governed, so ordered by their rationality.

5.2 An Undergirding Philosophy of Mind

Because psychology will so dominate the later period, it is important to examine the nascent discourses of psychology that are present in this earlier period. While psychological discourses of the self are present in all the textbooks under consideration, and while psychology is a centrally important scientific discipline contributing to education, this early period represents a time before the hegemony of psychology, as a science, has been asserted. Psychology was rooted in philosophy and was a subset of philosophy at most universities until the 1920s, and most Canadian universities did not develop separate faculties of psychology until the 1940s (Gleason, 1999). The scientific study of children and their development was not yet the ground for understanding children (Wong, 2007, p. 80). The science of the mind that is increasingly being established begins in earnest just before this early period under consideration, with Binet and Simon starting their work on intelligence testing in 1904. According to Wong (2007), “They made it possible to reason objectively about children in developmental terms both physically and psychologically” (p. 82). The confluence of evolutionary science and the push towards a more accurate and scientific understanding of the mental development of
children would make psychology a driving force in education and would make education more scientific and professional. This early period sits at the cusp of this transformation.

Throughout the texts, the language and themes of psychology are everywhere. Two themes in particular—development and the individual—will support the development of particular selves, especially in the way that these themes prefigure and support the rise and ascendancy of psychological models of the self. These themes are also consonant with the liberal democratic ideals that constitute the modern state.

The first theme, the principle of development, is a taken-for-granted assumption of education. Education itself is a form of development, a working towards the development of the student towards certain ideals. “The scholar, the gentleman, and, with our form of faith, we may add the Christian, are the natural psychological ideals of human education” (Horne, 1904, p. 226). Framing these ideals as both natural (normative) and psychological (the weight of science) increased the forcefulness with which these ideas could be seen as ideals. Education, then, becomes the development of the scholar, of the man, of the Christian. Wong (2007) suggests of this period that “development comes to be the law that governs organic life” (p. 82). “The view that there is a rate at which individuals developed and their development compared” had only just come into vogue, had only just become the basis for “detailed management of individuals” (Wong, 2007, p. 80). The rate of development and comparison of students is seen in the explicit instructions for the ways the teacher is to take on the role of doctor (for example), conducting
eye and hearing tests as basic interventions to enable students to succeed (Shaw, 1901). Moreover, “after testing the ears of a great many average persons” (Shaw, 1901, p. 199), teachers can help establish scientific norms and account for the deviation from these norms. Development, philosophically akin to education, is becoming technically a function of the work of the educator. The scientific work around which psychology will be built is drawn from and shapes the classroom in powerful ways.

The second theme, the individual, is also present throughout the textbooks. In the history texts, Oriental cultures are presented as philosophically hostile to individuality (Monroe, 1907), while the “free moral personality” (p. 33) of the Greeks is lauded. The Italian Renaissance was “dominantly personal and individual” (Monroe, 1907, p. 164). These texts were charting both the differences between the educational realities of different eras and cultures and also tracing those strains of thought that were believed to comprise/account for the best of the present era. Therefore, according to Painter (1886), “The highest object of humanity is now the development of individuality” (p. x). The theme of the individual is traced throughout the text, showing how the individual is either supported or denied in each of these moments and cultures. These history texts represent a moment in the discursive construction of the individual as an individual.

This burgeoning individuality becomes a focal point in the management of schools and classrooms. Tompkins (1895) notes the “young students who are beginning to assert their individuality against everything else. This is the young American who knows no law but his own caprice” (p. 171). While this individuality
might be problematic, it also represents the goal of education as “the only end of study is complete autonomous manhood” (Tompkins, 1895, p. 195). This autonomy is useful in regulating classrooms, as the pupil is increasingly seen as responsible for himself, as a “law to himself, his sense of right and propriety becoming at once the principle and the impulse of duty” (White, 1893, p. 182). Thus it is the autonomous individual that the school is producing.

To some extent, the principle of development and the centrality of the autonomous individual become useful connections between this early material and the psychological conception of the human being who would become hegemonic. The groundwork for this hegemony is laid both in the increasing adoption of the language of psychology and in the requirement to offer courses in psychology in the education of teachers. The unitary, rational subject, the individual central to a psychological conception, is being built through the discourses of self that are at work at this time. The eventual power of psychology to effect particular transformation on this subject has yet to be determined; there are limited practices and limited scientific insight into the processes of transformation. This explains somewhat why getting the right kind of person into education is so important. The individual can be assumed to be of a certain type, with certain characteristics. Because a teacher should be a particular type of person—a Christian (at least morally), a White person, an Anglo-Saxon person, and a rational person—then getting the right kind of person becomes important. In this early period, psychology might be a central recurring undergirding discipline, but it is underdeveloped and lacks the scientific force it will soon wield.
5.3 Techniques of the Self in the 1914 Context

There are very few clear hints in the texts that describe the overt ways that students would produce themselves. In a similar way to Chapter 4, there was not yet a need to describe these things; they could be taken for granted as good pedagogy. That the successive records of Normal school ordinances increasingly detail the kinds of practices, activities, performances that students should embody point to the discovery of the need to spell these things out. Moreover, as teaching developed as a profession, professional approaches to teaching were increasingly codified in textbooks, school cultural practices, and government standards. There exists, however, some traces of the self-activity of students that should be explored, namely the general activities through which students produced themselves as moral and rational and the specific activity of student teaching. It is in the description of student teaching that techniques of the self—both hyper-visibility and self-surveillance—emerge as particularly salient.

It was clear to early Normal faculty that not a lot of transformation of the self could be accomplished in only 4 months. A. M. Fenwick (Regina Normal Souvenir, 1902), Acting Principal of Regina Normal, wrote in the Normal School yearbook that Normal training presupposes that students come with high morals and are developed as scholars. Similar to Prentice (1990), we see these concerns over moral behaviour, especially the relationship between the sexes. Boarding homes, the Normal school staff, and the community at large would have been concerned with and would have facilitated the many surveillances of students that were required throughout their teacher education experience. Church groups would have held
events to encourage (legitimate) socializing, and teacher education students would have been invited to practice modesty in their dress and behaviour, demonstrating their suitability for a position in working with children. Church attendance of some kind would have been expected of most and would have been a guarantee of the moral standing of the teacher education candidate. Thus, priests/pastors and congregations played a role in the ethical development of new teachers. Being and being seen as Christian, even in only a nominal sense, was absolutely appropriate to the becoming teacher. Because students had already demonstrated their scholarly abilities, and because the course of study to receive a diploma was perceived to be deep and rigorous, their success at high school acted as a guarantee of their future success. Obviously, maintaining these rational credentials was important; students had to continue to do well. They were invited to participate as rational people, showing themselves to have the credibility that being rational individuals allowed.

5.3.1 Practice Teaching

What opportunities to become a teacher did a Normal school education allow for? An account by Miss C. E. Sheldon-Williams, written exclusively for Langley’s (1944) dissertation, recounts her experiences as a Normal school student in 1894. It was Miss Thompson who taught lessons in kindergarten teaching: “We adjourned to her classroom after 4 p.m. on the designated nights, sang kindergarten songs with appropriate gestures, and studied the intricacies of paper cutting, weaving, modeling, etc.” (p. 116). According to Sheldon-Williams:

All other subjects were taken by Dr. Goggin of whose excellent lectures we were expected to take notes, and to develop these in the “Lecture Book” which he examined at the close of the term.... Following each lecture, a
student was required to prepare and copy onto the blackboard, for the following lecture period of that particular subject, a brief class lesson covering the important points brought out in the lecture. The students were then required to criticize their fellow pupil’s effort, and could, if they wished, copy the amended lesson into their “Lecture Book.” (cited in Langley, 1944, pp. 116-117)

It is possible to see something of the formation of a Normalite, with the lecturing, the lecture book as a means to ensure that students were getting the right content and the teaching of content and method in the same moment—singing and gestures, methods for cutting paper and weaving. They are also getting practice in setting standards through surveillance of peers.

The important feature to highlight in the experience of Normal education is that of practice teaching. As Sheldon-Williams described it,

Towards the close of the term, we were divided into groups of four students, and sent around the Public School classes. One student would teach while the others jotted down criticisms. Each student was expected to teach four lessons. .... We taught for an hour, beginning at 9 a.m.; then returned to our classroom, situated on the top floor of the combined Public, High School, with a loose tin covering to the roof, which rattled incessantly in the ceaseless gales, and heated by the kind of stove which at that period was favoured by the C.P.R. for its lesser railway stations. Then, the three critics of each group gave their opinions of the various lessons taught; and then Dr. Goggins (sic) continued the day’s lectures. (cited in Langley, 1944, p. 117)

Her description of practice teaching resonates with other descriptions; practice teaching continues to be described in similar ways in the yearbooks of the Normal school up into the late 1920s and beyond and applies to Normal education in Alberta as well (Hollihan, 1997).

In the Regina Normal Souvenir (1904), one student described the experience of student teaching in a poem called “The Chronicle of the Normalites.”

He goeth forth into the public schools; aye even unto the seven rooms of the public schools.
He riseth up to take the Senior class, and his heart fainteth within him, and his knees do smite one another, and he wisheth the earth would open and swallow him up. He taketh a class of Juniors, and they respond not, but hold their peace, and the leader delayeth to arise, so he crieth in anguish, “How long! Oh, how long!” (n.p.)

This kind of fear is echoed some 20 years later as M. Irene Mooney, herself a Normalite, offers her description of practice teaching in the yearbook *Aurora* (1924).

For some time rumours of practice teaching had been in circulation and even students who had taught suffered from terror of the known, while those who had not had experience lived in the fear of the unknown; and one morning we awoke to find that we too were listed. As in a trance we prepared our lesson slips and taught. The dreaded ordeal was over, and like so many other events it was not so awful in reality as in anticipation, and soon we were back to Normal lectures. (p. 25)

As a central feature and formative moment in the training of teachers, practice teaching represents a significant place to examine the self-formation work in which student teachers are engaged.

### 5.3.2 Hyper-Visibility and Self-Surveillance

As Hollihan (1997) notes, practice teaching was traumatic, filling Normalites with “apprehension and self-doubt” as they “were in a position that demanded acquiescence” and they responded with a “desire to please their critics and instructors” (p. 247). Hollihan highlights the identity-shaping function of practice teaching. But how is this identity being shaped? In particular, how do student teachers participate in the production of this normalized identity?

*Hyper-visibility* refers to the normalizing function of being both able to be seen and also to be seen in particular ways. Specifically, a teacher is seen as a
particular type, a category already loaded with meaning and, when combined with
the actual visibility of teaching (i.e., standing up front, wearing particular clothes,
carrying him/herself in a particular way), the teacher is made hyper-visible. The
process of learning to teach was partly about becoming the hyper-visible teacher,
filling the space already marked out as normal and appropriate for the teacher.
Noticeable on the streets of Regina, recognizable not as people, but as teachers,
Normalites are held to a moral standard/professional standard already. For
example, a Normal student participates in legitimate forms of socializing, mediated
through church groups or reputable organizations. The student teacher produces
him/herself, then, into the already visible category of teacher.

Think about the actual visibility required in a program of Normal education,
through classwork, various committees, impromptu speeches, formal and informal
debates—many avenues through which the teacher is made to be visible and to stand
up and be noticed. Of course, the primary technology for being made visible is
practice teaching. As a member of a group of four, the student teacher is an
onlooker, a voyeur, participating in the production of visibility through attention to
and criticism of classmates. Moreover, as a practitioner, the student teacher
watches/critiques knowing they are next, taking their turn to be visible, to take on
the duties and performance of teaching, and to bear the gaze and critique of the
watchers. This hyper-visible space of teacher invites the Normalites to produce
themselves, acting in ways that will be recognizable and congruent with the
normalized view of the teacher, ensuring that the individual teacher fits with the
notion of teacher already circulating and approved.
In a similar way, the surveillance of the actions and activities of Normal students becomes a means for the production of the self through the adoption of self-surveillance. Imagine the myriad ways in which Normalites were made visible in their training and made available to be surveilled, graded, marked, observed, and commented upon. Self-surveillance occurs when the direction of these comments—the end to which the surveillance is aiming to push the student towards—is adopted by the student him/herself, surveilling him/herself, checking him/herself. Practice teaching, again, is a particularly useful example of this self-work. All the student yearbooks used the word *criticism* in place of *supervision*. To deliver a lesson was to be criticized, with three members of the group and a faculty member offering the critique afterwards. The three watchers are surveilling and, in the same moment, they are learning how their own performance of teaching will be surveilled; concurrently, it is an instance of surveillance and the constitution of self-surveillance. The criticism that followed served to strengthen the power of that surveillance, cementing the things that were noticed and acted upon and offering up new things to notice and act upon. They learned to perform normativity.

It is in this way that students learned about how to plan for lessons, how to present content, how to discipline students, how to move in the classroom, and how to use the voice—all these would have been modeled, discussed, and practiced in their practice teaching. Through surveillance, Normalites became increasingly conscious of the parameters of their own performance and increasingly molded by the designs and forms of their Normal schooling. The right way to do these things becomes the intimate concern of the self-surveilling teacher; he or she, themself,
checks that these things are being done in the appropriate way, quite apart from any external supervision. In fact, one of the things Fenwick (*Regina Normal Souvenir*, 1902) contends that a Normal education could offer students was the “the power to criticize his own work” (p. 11). The development of this kind of self-surveillance was seen as a proper result of Normal education.

While this early period of teacher education does give us some insight into a few ways in which students produced themselves as legitimate teachers, there is less evidence than we will see in the later period. Teacher education in the 1914 context was limited because of the lack of time, because the psychological tools were themselves limited, and because of the privilege placed on the raw materials of the individual. Starting with White, Anglo-Saxon, Christian, rational students was the guarantee of the success of the product: Good teachers came from the right stock.

### 5.4 Discourses of the Self in the 1985 Context

Whereas the raw materials were still important in the later period, technique and scientific knowledge had dramatically changed the effectiveness of pedagogical intervention. As a science, psychology could outline the processes of the mind, the processes of learning, and the processes of both cognitive and emotional development. Using these significant scientific touchstones, teaching could become more powerful. In the early period, philosophical psychology offered little intervention in the classroom; choosing the best material was the best option. In the later period, it was possible to imagine making the right kind of teacher in increasingly transformative pedagogical interventions. Forming/shaping teachers,
and eventually students, in a particular way comes to the forefront of teacher education.

The raw materials of the Normalites in the 1985 context were indeed very similar to the earlier period. The population of student teachers was still almost exclusively White and still almost exclusively operated from within a broader Christian consensus. In considering what this dissertation has already asserted, it can be said that this later period of teacher education maintained the production of racialized subjectivities—either through the raceless discourses of culture and the enabling of White subjectivity or through the promotion of technical-rational discourses that stand in as culture—further marking both the good teacher and good teaching as White. The connection between previous school work/success and entrance into the program was still strong. While it is obvious that similar good stock was available, the largest difference between the periods in regards to the production of teachers concerns the way that psychology had come to direct and shape teaching and teachers. Psychology became the dominant way to imagine and act on the development of good teachers: Good teachers can be made.

5.5 An Undergirding Psychology

Psychology had become legitimate through objective, scientific approaches to its object of study: the individual human being. Psychological theory moved away from its basis in philosophy and “was based to an increasing extent on experimentation, research, and replicated empirical evidence” (Saylor, 1976, p. 54). With an overlapping interest in legitimation, a scientific movement in education was influenced and directed by psychology. As Britzman (1991) notes, teacher education
has an “historic dependency on the field of psychology in defining learning and development” (p. 30). By the time of the 1985 context, psychology had become thoroughly normative, underwriting and legitimating both teaching and learning and teachers and learners.

According to Buri (2009), post-World War II Canada was marked by the “cult of psychology” (p. 37-38) around marriage and childcare; this cult was also embedded within the education system. Psychologists came to be important experts, giving leadership and shape to the welfare state and they placed a great deal of emphasis on the role of teachers and schools in the development of normal personalities (Gleason, 1999). The psychological construction of an idea of normalcy, in its infancy during the early period, had flourished. Earlier, we saw the beginnings of the constitution of norms through the testing and averaging of the development of school children. By this later period, psychology had a large scientific base from which it developed and furthered notions of normal development, normal personalities, and even a normal family. But whose normal was represented?

In Chapter 4 the normal of Normal schools was identified as a White racial identity. Also, in and through psychology then, a particular normal was being offered. Schools “promoted and reproduced the ideas, values, and priorities of a particular Canada: White, middle class, heterosexual, and patriarchal” (Gleason, 1999, p. 120). Schools, in effect, became places where psychology’s “technologies of normalcy” could be diffused and enacted (Gleason, 1999, p. 9). Here normal does not refer to the majority; rather, it refers to the normative and socially dominant,
expressing a desire for these values (whiteness, middleclassness, heterosexuality) to represent the rule, the standard by which other values/identities are judged and are the goals to work towards. These constructions of normal, given the weight of science and social credence through psychology, were worked into teacher education, school curricula, and school guidance offices.

In the influential *Models of Teaching*, Joyce and Weil (1972) highlight the connections of psychology with particular approaches to teaching, such as training psychology (a response to military needs) or cybernetic psychology where "the human is likened to an electric machine" (p. 350). It is within the conception of systems development that the connections between psychology and teaching practice seem most salient. The authors suggest that psychology, the military, industry, and "educational planners are coming to see that human behaviour functions within organizational systems" (Joyce & Weil, 1972, p. 351). To this we might add that "a teacher must always be regarded as a personality system with needs, predispositions, a set of past experiences, unique values, modes of behavior, sets of capabilities, competencies, and talents" (Saylor, 1976, p. 3). The language of psychology has been infused into the very definition of the teacher.

According to Howsam (1979), we should "look upon the teacher as a clinician and decision-maker" (p. 9) and, also, teacher education should involve "laboratory simulation" and "micro-teaching," and clinics, clinical studies and "diagnosis and prescription" (p. 14). Lang (1978) captures the recommendations of the Dean of Education at the University of Saskatchewan expressing how "an understanding of the growth and development of children and facilitation, measurement and
evaluation of their learning, make for better teaching” (p. 35). Thus, all programs should require adolescent growth-and-development studies, theories of learning, and systems of management and evaluation. It is necessary for students to “be taught contemporary theories of behavior and learning which they must practice in real situations” (Lang, 1978, p. 35). This prevalence of the science of psychology (psychology of learning, behavioural psychology, and developmental psychology) encompassed the education students themselves as a feature of the new program and included giving students “a vocational interest test, a reading test and a differential aptitude test” (Schaller & Lang, 1982, p. 7). Psychology shaped the approach to education, it formed some of the content of teacher education, it was a crucial lens through which teaching/learning/managing could be viewed, and it was a fundamental tool in evaluating and managing teacher education students.

Similar to the earlier period, it is possible to trace the major themes of development and the individual throughout the texts of this later period. The fact that the University of Regina adopts a developmental model of teacher education speaks to the centrality of the theme. As previously noted, the program was based on the work of major developmental psychologists, and both structure and content were marked by this emphasis. The program was intentionally sequential, spiraling from the more basic skills and ideas towards the more complex over 4 years. Students’ experiences were very carefully planned—which kind of schools, how much observing, and how much to teach. These experiences were supported by microteaching labs, faculty advisors—all to enable the development of the student towards competency as a teacher. While the basis of the program and the structure
of the process were developmental, the content of core classes also included developmental theory as normative and useful for understanding teaching and learning. The theme of development is ubiquitous in the University of Regina secondary program.

The early emphasis on the individual is clearly present in the 1985 texts. Goldhammer (1969) cherishes “the notion of individual human autonomy” and is driven “by images of teaching that enhance the learners’ self-sufficiency” (p. 55); the individual as individual is made central to the development of the teacher. Joyce and Weil (1972) describe how a personal-development approach to teaching emphasizes “the maximization of unique personal development ... prioritizing the individuals construction of his own reality—his task of finding personal identity” (p. 209). Thus individual (personal) identity becomes a main outcome of instruction. This teaching identity is constituted largely through the “peculiar set of patterns” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 14) that make up an individual's performance of teaching. Because these patterns are continuously repeated in the classroom, and are reinforced through the repetitions, inserting new, effective patterns was seen as an important way to create effective teaching. By addressing those repeated behaviours, educators gained access to the “cumulative effects, five hours each day, 180 days each academic year of their existence” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 14) of those practices.

*The Report of the Secondary Planning Committee* (Subcommittee of the Secondary Planning Committee, 1983) lays out this personal emphasis, initiating in the first year of the program the processes and skills of “self-knowledge, self-
assessment, reflection, and communications” (p. 9). The University of Regina program was designed “to give students a strong ego-base through the therapeutic model” (Cordis & McBeath, 1982, p. 19), focused on the development of the personality of the teacher. This can be seen readily in the first area of focus for teacher education within professional studies classes which emphasized the development of the ego: “Knowing oneself, responsibility, concern for others, being objective and honest, development of a positive self-concept, increasing self-esteem” (Lang, 1992, p. 1). Even pre-internship “extends self-development through the extensive use of clinical supervision techniques” (Cordis & McBeath, 1982, p. 15).

The development of the individual, as an individual, is an essential part of the program. Given the need for autonomous, rational individuals presumed by the rational decision maker (as discussed in Chapter 4), it is easy to see the insertion of the unitary rational self/subject of psychology into the heart of teacher education.

### 5.6 Techniques of the Self in the 1985 Context

The new program at the University of Regina featured a professional development process that focused on specific professional targets. These target behaviours/skills were engaged through three components:

1. a cycle of theory presentation and modeling and reflection, microteaching and reflection, and teaching in a school classroom and reflection;
2. a cycle of preconference, observation, data collection, and postconference; and
3. use of a helping relationship and provision of nonjudgmental feedback (Editorial, 1993, p. 8)

This description of the developmental model includes an emphasis on the formal ways that students were invited to work on themselves. The first component draws
attention to the central role of reflection, the invitation to think about instruction and performances of teaching with a more objective view, analyzing and critiquing the performance, suggesting ways to enact and reenact teaching to ensure different results. The last two components focus on elements of clinical supervision. This, too, is an invitation to work on the teaching self in a particular way. It invites a particular kind of mindfulness and awareness about what and how the self is involved in the teaching process and opens up a space where different performances might be made possible. It is these two technologies of the self that require some consideration.

5.6.1 Clinically Supervising the Self

Although the supervisory cycle at the University of Regina was adapted directly from the work of Copeland and Boyan, they actually worked from the concepts of clinical supervision that Robert Goldhammer developed (Lang et al., 1980). Goldhammer’s (1969) work sought to enable more powerful and effective forms of intervention in student teaching. Goldhammer notes the term clinical as being potentially problematic and limits it to a descriptor that captures “close observation, detailed observational data, face-to-face interaction between the supervisor and teacher, and an intensity of focus that binds the two together in an intimate professional relationship” (p. 54). He offers a prototype of a sequence of clinical supervision as “Preobservation, Observation, Analysis, and Strategy, Conference and Post-conference” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. xi). Compare this to the description of “a cycle of preconference, observation, data collection, and postconference” (Editorial, 1993, p. 8) noted above.
According to critics, traditional supervision models did not effect change because teachers were unaware of the specific behaviours that they might change or the “affecting behaviours” supporting (more indirectly) what was happening in the classroom. These affecting behaviours were quite problematic to Goldhammer (1969) who identified that it is “worse to discover that the greatest portion of the teacher’s behaviour is unplanned, ad hoc, unexamined, unknown, and unrelated by the teacher to the possibility of its having significant positive or negative consequences for the children” (p. 19). It seems that the teacher at large was the worst possible thing, not for what he/she may do, but for the lack of self-discipline. Copeland and Boyan (1975) thought that an “increased awareness of the teaching/learning behaviours which actually exist in the classroom can help the student teacher” (p. 30). This awareness would enable the teacher to more effectively focus on behaviours that might enable a change in their teaching. Clinical supervision was an intervention that could encourage this awareness. In the language of Copeland and Boyan, the most important features of the “technology” of supervision included both “systematic observation and analysis of classroom behavior” and “face-to-face interaction” between the cooperating teacher and intern “in a helping relationship” (p. 32).

The focus of the systematic observation was to be exclusively on behaviour. More than a general description of the class, the supervising teacher was taught to record classroom interaction with as much detail as possible, including “as objective an account of nonverbal behaviour as he can manage” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 61). These observations would provide the raw data that could be analyzed and around
which different approaches might be built and tried. In the University of Regina program, students would preselect targets around which an observer would collect data. These targets would dominate the thinking of the student teacher in their planning, they would provide a focus for the observation, and they would provide the content of the intervention in the postconference as cooperating teachers and student teachers discussed how and what to do to continue to improve around that target. So a teacher might opt to target “with-it-ness” behaviours, or movement-management behaviours, or attending, or clarity, or stimulus variation (which might include movement, pausing, focusing or varying the interaction), or even levels of questioning (Evaluation, 1979). While these targets are themselves practical and focused, it is important to notice that the possible aims of the clinical supervision conference include as a best measure “something concrete in hand, namely, a design for his next sequence of instruction” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 70). This overt emphasis on the concrete/practical connects with the technical-rational discourse discussed in Chapter 4.

The second important feature of the technology of supervision concerns the face-to-face helping relationships between supervisor and student teacher. To overcome the anxiety surrounding supervision, clinical supervision employs “an essentially rational practice” that focuses on methods that use “logical reasoning and forthright analysis” (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 64). These rational processes are intended to remove the expectations of punishment and the mistrust and partisan nature of some supervision, replacing it instead with a more objective, collegial attempt to analyze the data and come up with solutions. The scientific distance and
the study of data work to depersonalize the encounter and offer the potential for more constructive meetings.

The language of governmentality here is appropriate. It is important to see these educational acts as attempts to govern or to shape teachers into very particular types. Clinical supervision represents a combination of technologies of power and technologies of the self. Considerable institutional energy positions, trains, models, and insists upon the use of these techniques in practice. Students were exposed to various components of clinical supervision in a progressive way, starting in their first year of the program, learning communication skills, and learning to observe. In subsequent years, components of supervision were taught through many of the professional targets in EPS classes, modeled in labs (students set targets, preconferenced, observed and postconferenced with each other), and practiced in the field. The internship seminar was essentially an intensive course in clinical supervision. An almost 5-day residential experience “in a retreat setting” (Lang et al., 1980, p. 3) enabled faculty leadership to develop both the helping relationship between supervisor and student teacher and the specific competencies (communication skills, processes) that would support clinical supervision. Then students would take a full semester of internship and extensively practice these competencies every teaching day, using clinical-supervision processes to eventually increase and determine the success of the intern.

As a technology of power, clinical supervision became the calling card of the developmental model. Educators from around the world came and attended the internship seminars, highlighting these processes as valuable and unique (Tymchak,
1988). Because of the partnerships with teachers in the field, these processes became normalized in the profession. These ways of thinking about teaching, effective teaching, and intervening on teaching became ubiquitous.

But what about the technologies of the self? How did clinical supervision function as self-work? How did student teachers, through clinical supervision, produce themselves as teachers? First, clinical supervision processes enabled student teachers to adopt a particular “gaze”—the technical-rational gaze—a way of seeing themselves and teaching. In preparing to teach, they would look to enact particular target behaviours. By observing in the microteaching labs or in the field experience, they would look for particular, targeted behaviours, for the minute ways in which good teaching was being enacted or not. In the pre- and postconference, they announced and considered their behaviour around those targets. At every turn, student teacher performances of a good teacher are shaped by clinical supervision. In a sense, participation in clinical supervision processes allowed these students to fix their gaze on a limited range of “being a teacher” and thereby defined their teaching within a limited range of practices. The emphasis on observable behavior and the repetitions of these cycles of gazing, focusing on targets and gazing again—over 3 years of field experiences, microteaching labs, internship seminars and internship—ensured that this way of looking at themselves became habitual, became deeply engrained, automatic. Student teachers increasingly took up these ways of viewing themselves teaching.

Second, these clinical processes involved a codification of the teaching self, a way of writing the self that was also productive. For teacher education students,
lesson planning involved detailed attention to professional targets, making physical and mental space for these targets in the design of the lesson. Students had to think about and plan for how they would ask questions, how they might introduce the material, and how they might manage a discussion. By also creating a form for data collection, student teachers were enabling a particular kind of surveillance and expectation to be watched. As the observer, the student teacher was noticing and capturing on paper either the signs of effective teaching or those moments when a technique was used with little effect or misused. In the postconference, student teachers were given some feedback, something written from which they could draw conclusions about how they might enact their teaching differently. This feedback informed the next round of lesson planning. This writing worked to deepen the penetration of targets and behaviours, training students to view and enact their teaching selves in these ways.

Third, through clinical supervision student teachers were enabled to intervene in their own practice. Actively, in and through careful observation, analysis, and dialogue, students used the technology of clinical supervision to produce themselves (slightly) differently the next time they taught. The moments of observation (and the visual performance cues that are noticed), the hard data about the results in the classroom, and the collegial conversation with peers and cooperating teachers, enabled student teachers to choose different ways to teach. Next time, I will concentrate on longer wait-time for questions; next time, I will move around the room more carefully; next time, I will ask my questions in a different way. This active component works with the gaze and with codification to
move student teachers to try different ways of being teacher, again, and again, and again. Perhaps, more importantly, it works with and on their bodies. Notice the similarities with one of the goals of early Normal education: “the power to criticize his own work.” The newer technology represents an increase in both the number of opportunities to surveil the self and the potential effectiveness of that self-surveillance. In the end, clinical supervision induces the self to learn to act on itself, to produce its embodied self in terms that are increasingly seen as professional, as competent, as effective. With practice, the student teacher could come to the postconference and speak the supervisor’s words before they did. Through clinical supervision, student teachers were habituated to see teaching, write about teaching, and to intervene in their teaching through a technical-rational lens of self-surveillance and control.

5.6.2 Reflecting (on) the Self

In a similar fashion, student reflection was an essential component of the developmental model. As Lang and Petracek (1984) recommend, “a developmental schema is required—action-feedback-reflection cycles” (p. 20). Reflection is worked into the process of development in fundamental ways, as a constitutive part of the process of developing as a teacher. Within professional studies courses, reflection was useful to support instruction where “emphasis is on reflective acquisition and integration of professional processes and procedures into instructional designs” (Lang & Friesen, 1993, p. 22). This reflection on experience was deemed crucial as “unexamined experience is not the answer” (McBeath, 1979, p. 16). The work of the cycles of “action-feedback-reflection” allowed students to “holistically assimilate:
fostering a positive classroom climate; attitudes and values teaching; direct, indirect, interactive, experiential and individual study strategies; teaching for thinking; critical and creative thinking capability” (Lang & Friesen, 1993, p. 22).

It is important to notice the way reflection was conceived in the program. Reflective teaching needed to be rooted in “a broad understanding of the concrete material world in which teachers work” (Lang, 1990, p. 1). This practical orientation and the technical skills of the program were “essential to getting things done” thus, “much of teacher reflection is very concrete” (Lang, 1990, p. 1). As Lang (1992) suggests, “Reflection before action, reflection in action, and reflection after action are critical to professional development” (p. 3). Said another way, McBeath (1989) suggests that the student teachers’ professional growth requires a “continuous interplay between the two principles of technical rationality and reflection in action” (p. 7).

“Reflection-in-action”—Schön’s (1983) response to the limitations of technical rationality—enables teachers to work with the messy knowledge of the practitioner, applied to the real-world problems encountered in the field. This resists the “science-like corpus of propositional knowledge... that ... can lead to predictability and control in practical affairs” (Grimmett, 1988, p. 9) that characterizes a technical-rational approach. Cast in this manner, reflection represents the attempt of practitioners to “create meaning of the problematic aspects of a practice situation through ‘problem setting’ and ‘problem solving’” (Grimmett, 1988, p. 9). It is this malleable context, where practice and practitioner
are actively in conversation with each other, that is thought to break the slavish control or direction of a merely technical approach.

In spite of the use of reflection-in-action, reflection at the University of Regina demonstrates the technical-rational concern for concreteness. If reflection is to effectively support the technical core of the developmental model, it must help teacher education move “beyond the technical” (Lang, 1996, p. 6). “But it is just as foolish to place inordinate emphasis on critical reflection (constantly floating on a safely distanced ideological cloud) at the expense of technical or decision making capability” (Lang, 1996, p. 6). It is in this way that reflection is made to be a limited reflection, staying away from the ideological cloud and focusing on those things that are seen to be most applicable, most useful to the classroom teacher. Reflection is to be concerned with actual practices and with concrete and changeable habits in the classroom. A narrow focus would enable the teacher to have the most control over those factors that had the most effect on their classroom teaching.

Similar to the discussion about clinical supervision, Fendler (2003) notes that reflection is also a form of governmentality where technologies of power and the self meet. Reflection is a technology through which students look at themselves and their practices. This training of the gaze and shaping of the lens through which student teachers see teaching is an important effect of this technology of the self. In using Schön’s depiction of reflection-in-action, from what base of ideas and with which gaze does the student teacher engage? It seems obvious that the way student teachers come to see the problems/issues is not itself neutral. “It is impossible to draw a line between an authentic experience of reflection and what has already
been socialized and disciplined” (Fendler, 2003, p. 21). Reflection occurs within and is supportive of already normalized practices and ways of viewing teaching. Teacher education works to enable students to see certain problems, to notice certain behaviours or outcomes, and to choose from a list of interventions that might be applied to those problems. In the case of teacher education, rather than limiting technical rationality, reflection further embeds technical rationality within the teacher-in-training, helping students to see and reify teaching from within the parameters that the program offers up. They are trained to see and to reflect on what they see, thereby strengthening their seeing; as a reflection within a reflection, the gaze is endless, but always the same. Reflection here is a limiting experience of reflection that engages students within a narrow spectrum of legitimate problems to consider, schooling the gaze towards technical and concrete visions.

Writing of the self in reflection is even more pronounced than in supervision. Students choose particular moments to reflect on, searching their experience for those meaningful and demonstrative moments whereby they can produce and verify themselves as teachers. They will see themselves in a particular light and education from a particular perspective. Because of the gaze and the narrow technical interest of the developmental model, these reflections would necessarily include matters of technical import. The writing, the details, the interactions, the imagining, and the casting of the teaching moment in a precise way all create the teacher in formative ways. Reflection invites the student teacher to codify the self in a way that will be identifiable to those reading the reflection; the desire to be and to be seen to be competent and reflective is a powerful, internalized loop.
While the intervention attached to reflection would be limited compared to the immediate and practical work of supervision, there was a need to at least write about how one might act differently as a result of reflection. This could either reinforce seeing how particular methods/approaches/issues work out because of how the teacher acted or it could involve the reimagining of how the teacher might choose to act in the future. Both of these responses are invitations to act. Through reflection, the self is invited to act on itself in particular ways. Student teachers, through reflection as a technology of the self, see themselves/their experiences, write about themselves and their experiences, and imagine acting as a teacher from within a technical-rational articulation of teaching. For the student teacher reflection reifies a normative technically rational self.

5.7 Self-Government and White Institutional Space

After considering two of the contours of the technologies of the self on display in this program—clinical supervision and reflection—it is necessary to ask about the effect of the narrow gaze that codifies the self as teacher in technical and management terms.

First, consider the effect of the program that is so heavily psychological in both its development and practice, especially in light of the fact that psychology itself is not a neutral space. Wong (1994) highlights the “unproblematic construction of ‘whiteness’ as a privileged site in psychology” (p. 134), constituted through an emphasis on difference—especially the difference between racial, ethnic, gender others—from the assumed White/male norm. The work that psychology has done to highlight normalcy, to catalogue difference, has been done over and against
a presumed White norm. Wong’s description of this norm for psychology applies well to education, as whiteness appears “as a subject that asserts its centrality or dominance on social and cultural levels yet remains shrouded within a veil of transparency that ensures its absence, thus evading the subject of discourse” (p. 136). Like psychology, researchers in education also have, “positioned Whites as the normative referent” (O’Connor, Lewis & Mueller, 2007, p.541). This normative referent acts like a “ghostly centre” (Graham & Slee, 2008, p. 284). Produced as an effect of discourse, this centre is, an “apparition that eludes critical examination for it has no essence, presence or definitive claim to Being” (Ibid., p. 284). The knowledge base that undergirds the developmental model already presumes a privileged position for whiteness, even as it hides that privilege in science and objectivity.

The psychological conception of the individual self that animates both technologies of self under consideration is necessarily raceless: Cartesian autonomous man, (abstract) mind over body, reason over passion, objectivity over interestedness, and universal (and outside of race). Clinical supervision and reflection might contribute to the production of good teaching as “a predictable, controllable act” (Taliaferro Baszile, 2008, p. 380); however, this image of good teaching is deracialized “as it relies again on a sense of Cartesian rationality, which flattens out the role one’s racial history plays in considering a rational line of thought” (Taliaferro Baszile, 2008, p. 381). This emphasis on psychology insinuates, at the core of teaching, the psychological subject—the modernist unitary rational
subject—who is also presumed to be white, and it makes this subject the ideal teacher. This ideal teacher, then, is rational, is reflective, and is raceless.

If we take seriously the performative function of language and that “speaking the truth about oneself also makes, constitutes, or constructs forms of one’s self” (Belsey, 2007, p. 65), then what subject is being produced through teacher education? If both clinical supervision and reflection are forms of self-constitution, what can it mean that the focus of this truth telling never includes the racial constitution of the subject? I have argued that naming the racial constitution of the subject does not make sense from the perspective of racelessness, the position authorized by dominant whiteness. It did not occur to the professors/architects of the new secondary program to consider the highly in/visible racial constitution of teachers as a factor in their training. To paraphrase Foucault—the architects of the secondary program knew what they were doing; they knew why they were doing it—they were unaware of exactly what they had accomplished (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983). The fact that those attributes of neutrality, objectivity, efficiency, and rational decision making were also constitutive of a White cultural register is not an accident.

The practices of clinical supervision and reflection do not question the ongoing constitution of race in the teaching and activities that are being supervised and reflected on, even while this supervision and reflection are reifying other elements in the teaching, reinstating them, and inscribing them with an official (and therefore normative) reading. In the midst of a highly organized and thoroughly planned curriculum, where nothing deemed important was left to chance, there was
no discussion of or reflection on race. There was no need to discuss these matters because the instruction was accomplishing exactly what it was designed to do. The intention was to produce skilled, competent White teacher subjects who were authorized to reproduce a very particular form of embodied whiteness in the classroom. In so far as whiteness is a construction, the process thoroughly produced the incoming candidates as White teachers, regardless of whether they were White skinned or not. The instruction was a thorough, necessary, and sufficient process for producing and legitimating the teachers as White.

Teaching becomes right performance of technique; this version becomes normative, even while whiteness is being produced and hidden in the same moment. The technical-rational (White) teacher—observing, planning, conferencing, reflecting, targeting effective competencies to develop in—is not only becoming a good teacher, but is also being distanced from race and produced as neutral. Seeing these technical practices work and having the desired effect on the classroom further entrenches this rationality; good pedagogy becomes deeply a part of how teachers can think of themselves and their work. Of course, this appearance of racelessness is essential to dominant White identity. Thus supervision and reflection powerfully insert a White racial identity, even though that whiteness cannot be stated or said aloud.

What cannot be easily said or named? Supervision and reflection that avoid or mask conversation outside the technical foreclose the possibility that students will notice, account for, or understand the social context for their teaching. But “reflection, even on technical matters, has a ‘racial texture’” (Taliaferro Baszile,
2008, p. 373) that already surrounds students and teaching. Thus, supervision and reflection are a “pseudo-reflection,” whereby student teachers reflect on some things but not others, notice some things but not others, for example, “how well they are demonstrating their competencies as opposed to perhaps the cultural literacy that informs such competencies” (Taliaferro Baszile, 2008, p. 377). That these things cannot be talked about or noticed does not mean they are not present; silence is also constituted in discourse, part of what is both authorized and not authorized to say\textsuperscript{15}. These silences are “an element that functions alongside the things said, with them and in relation to them within over-all strategies” (Foucault, 1981, p. 27).

In this way, some ways of seeing teacher education, learning to teach, and so forth, have already been authorized, have already been sanctioned and enabled by the discursive context of the technical-rational approach. At the same moment, other ways of seeing the classroom, other insights into the processes being engaged in are not authorized, not sanctioned and, therefore, not enabled to easily enter the conversation in legitimate ways. Britzman (1991) notes the significance of how, with few exceptions, the teachers and student teachers with whom she worked “did not speak of their own race, class, or gender” (p. 233). She explains that this silence was partly because of the largely racially segregated contexts that these teachers worked within, contexts where “as Caucasians, they were the norm, and consequently could not locate themselves as raced” (Britzman, 1991, p. 234). Both what is authorized to speak and what is not authorized constitute subjectivities.

\textsuperscript{15}Alongside these silences about White racialization, it is important to also add the silences about Aboriginal people, or about other overtly racialized people. Whiteness is accomplished partially through the silence about anything except dominant whiteness in the curriculum, just as it is reinforced by the silence about the fact of White racialization.
The effect, then, of this self-work is the production of dominant White identities. Clinical supervision and reflection, while powerfully intervening in the teaching practice of student teachers, also work to “persuade” (Britzman, 1991) subjectivities towards the raceless neutrality that dominant whiteness requires. In this way, the White institutional space of the Faculty of Education, while appearing to be merely normal, maintains and produces whiteness in deeply normative ways.

5.8 Conclusion

The factors we have considered in the last three chapters paint a picture of the effects of power. It is clear that teacher education in the new secondary program supported the development of dominant White subjectivities. Chapter 3 showed how discourses of race turned into discourses of culture, making available a neutral, raceless subjectivity for White teachers. Chapter 4 argued that technical-rational approaches to teacher preparation also enabled whiteness so that the good or effective or skilled teacher is also the White teacher. Chapter 5 showed how this discursive context was also inserted deeply into the teaching subject through technologies of the self, enabling the White teaching self to produce itself in narrow technical and raceless ways: Whiteness surrounds teacher education and student teachers in constitutive ways.
CHAPTER 6. PRODUCING (WHITE) TEACHERS DIFFERENTLY:
MARSHALLING RESISTANCE TO DOMINANT WHITENESS

Sherene Razack’s (2002) edited book, *Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*, begins with an introduction titled, “When Place Becomes Race.” As she notes, “the book explores how place becomes race through the law” (Razack, 2002, p. 1). The previous three chapters of this dissertation have explored how this place of the new secondary education program becomes race and how discourses of racelessness and culture, technologies of technical rationality, and techniques of the self constitute this program as White institutional space. In this concluding chapter, I engage a little more personally with the genealogical realities that I have worked in this dissertation. I began my introduction with some personal narratives and an admission of my complicity/positionality as a White teacher within the racialized/colonial realities of the province of Saskatchewan. To conclude the dissertation, I write myself into the narrative with more directness; this material is salient to me as a teacher.

This chapter focuses on an *(un)usual narrative* (Tupper & Cappello, 2008) centered on the 1995 murder of Pamela George, a Saulteaux woman, at the hands of one of my classmates, also a White male teacher education student. The narrative highlights and nuances some of the theoretical considerations that the dissertation has made available. Within the imaginative space that the counter story opens up, the dissertation concludes with some of the possibilities that this narrative offers for resisting the constitution of both teacher and students as dominant White subjects.
6.1 Reviewing the Terrain: Setting the Stage for an (Un)Usual Narrative

The very first challenge articulated in Dwayne Huebner’s famous “Challenges Bequeathed” essay invites educators to, “Surpass the technical foundations of education” (Huebner, 1999, p. 432). Huebner describes many ways in which the technical has taken hold of education and offers insight into the kinds of questions that educators must ask in order to get beyond this orientation. For Huebner, surpassing the technical, “requires historical awareness of where we once were, sensitivity to present problems, resistances and binds, and openness to future possibilities” (Ibid., p. 433). The work of this dissertation has followed the arc of Huebner’s challenge, however, it is now possible to add an even more significant reason to engage his challenge: educators must surpass the technical because of the way technical rationality is implicated in the production of dominant whiteness.

I can hear the critique now—from friends, mentors, and professors invested in the production/maintenance of the new secondary program who, in reading these chapters, would hear only criticism of the work that has been accomplished through the Faculty of Education at the University of Regina. Let me be clear: The new secondary program at the University of Regina was an outstanding teacher education program. What was happening, starting in the 1970s with the transformation of the elementary program and carrying into the new secondary program, was innovative and transformative, generating both national and international interest. The success of and desire for graduates of the program speaks volumes about the preparation for teaching that was accomplished in this place. The University of Regina produced very competent teachers with a variety of
skills, a range of competencies, the ability to make decisions, and an awareness of the professional mentality required of teachers. I am a product of what is perceived by many to be an excellent program of teacher education. I am considered a good teacher partly because of the careful training I received here in my teacher education.

This genealogy has given an historicized sense of this secondary teacher education program—Harootunian’s (2007) thickened present where “the ghosts of the past comingle daily with the living ... in a habitus of a haunted house” (p. 478). Through the careful attention to skills and technique, this excellent teacher education produces whiteness in students studying to be teachers. According to my research, this incredible, innovative program made it more possible for students to be supported and confirmed in the development of White subjectivity. This technical teacher education also produces whiteness.

This dissertation has clearly explicated the modes of the production of White subjectivity: The White subject is subjectified through knowledge and discourse around racelessness and culture; the White subject is subjected in technologies of power and technical rationality; and the White subject subjectifies him/herself through techniques of the self, producing his/her own whiteness through clinical supervision and in reflection. These modes capture something of the complexities and nuances of teacher education as White institutional space. In this space, whiteness marks/shapes the Faculty of Education, and whiteness is the product of the new secondary program. Teacher education in this space, then, is about the production of good (White) teachers and the normalization of that whiteness.
Willinsky’s (1998) call for educational accountability, for giving “an account of why education has not done more good in the world” (p. 16) resonates here. While there are many appropriate accounts to be given for the failures of education to live up to its high-sounding ethical/moral/educational vision, this dissertation offers one important answer to that challenge—education has not done more good, has not moved society very far beyond race, because teacher education is implicated in the production of dominant whiteness. It is not an accident that the new secondary education program in 1985 was so closely aligned with the cultural register of whiteness. It is also not an accident that the measures and commonsense around what constitutes a good teacher so naturally line up with dominant White subjectivity. Whiteness, both as a physical reality—seen in the ongoing dominant positioning of racialized Whites—and as the ideal mental/spiritual goal—toward which teacher education works—is dominant. The ongoing production of whiteness and its centrality to teacher education contribute to the unequal, racial/colonial social reality of schooling and of broader society; this genealogy enables us to trace the effects of how inequality is normalized. What is striking about this account is the ubiquity of race in the production of teachers and the absolute necessity and centrality of race and processes of racialization to the production of good teachers.

Genealogy, as a history of the present, enables an understanding of how the production of White racialization is accomplished through the practices of teacher education. Unfortunately, Foucault’s work in general has been criticized for being overly nihilistic. Even though the critique offered through the lenses that Foucault provides is rich, often there is no hope or direction for how we might move ahead.
While Foucault resists giving simplistic answers and techniques for undoing the effects of power (because “we cannot hope to escape power” [Prado, 2000, p. 170]), linking the research produced through genealogy with attempts to be politically active in the struggle against domination remains a viable way out of the dominations of the present. Before considering a narrative response to this struggle, two more concepts are needed to frame this (un)usual narrative. Briefly, I want it consider the ‘binds or resistances’ and the ‘possibilities’ offered through the idea of unknowability and the resignification of the self.

6.1.1 Unknowability
Kumashiro (2000) uses the notion of ‘unknowability’ to describe how, “Working against oppression ... should not be about advocating strategies that are always supposed to bring about the desired effect” (p. 45). No matter what pedagogic or systemic interventions might be designed/implemented, education is always partial. The anti-racist curriculum I design and utilize with students enables some possibilities to be considered and takes students some way towards thinking about the complexities of race and racism. However, it is not possible to chart/rationalize a curricular intervention that will exert the control that technical rationality demands. As Kumashiro (2001) articulates,

> We cannot fully know who our students are, we cannot control what they learn, we cannot know with certainty what it is they actually learn, and we cannot even be certain that what we want them to learn is what is in their best interest to learn. (p. 9)

Unknowability underlines the dangers of technical knowledge—the myth of control, of objective knowledge, of neutrality. This gets at the very heart of what many students think education should be about, around management and control of
student populations, around the certainty of the techniques being used and around
neutrality and the lack of implication in larger social systems of oppression.
Students resist unknowability and the partiality of knowledge.

Genealogy supports unknowability as a visceral image of the partiality of
knowledge, exploring what counts as knowledge and exposing those things that
were not deemed necessary in the constitution of dominant discourses. Genealogy
offers some of the raw materials to engage students with the partiality of
knowledge. Embracing the unknowability of teaching and the classroom
acknowledges the reality of the spaces of teaching and learning and relieves the
pressure of control and certainty identified within the cultural register of whiteness,
and creates spaces where other than dominant discourses can speak. It will be
important to consider the (un)usual narrative that follows through the lens of
unknowability, noticing what is made available to know through the story, but also
questioning what is not present.

6.1.2 Resignifying the Self

Subjectivity theorizes a self that is induced and encouraged to work on itself
in particular ways to be/become governable. However, “[P]ractices of the self can be
not only instruments in the pursuit of the political, social and economic goals but
also means of resistance to other forms of government” (Dean, 2010, p. 21).
Poststructural notions of subjectivity also hold out possibilities not to be that which
we have become; subjects can resignify who they are and choose to act slightly
differently. Resistance occurs as dominant subjects are often quite comfortable and
invested in the status quo. This resistance begins to explain why merely adding
more cultural emphases, or antiracist courses, or having conversations about race
does not fix the problem—it is possible to maintain dominant White identities in the
face of the mere addition of particular content. It is important it offer those ‘Other’
voices, especially in a curriculum largely silent about the
histories/experiences/critiques from marginalized groups. But it is also necessary
to recognize the limited extent to which dominant subjects can hear these voices. It
is possible to carefully construct learning environments that raise questions about
racism and provide opportunities for students to learn about privilege and
oppression and to have students resignify themselves again as dominant. The
attraction of dominant discourse is powerful. This is not, however, the last word.
Students can choose to resignify themselves in the direction of anti-oppression.

Genealogy provides “just fragments” (Foucault, 1980, p. 79) that potentially
offer local histories and local insights into the workings of power that might be
useful in this resignification. This more complex sense of the production of
whiteness through teacher education in Regina may allow the movement from “one
set of subjectivity-shaping practices to another” (Prado, 2000, p. 101). Tamboukou
(1999) notes that a history of the present is “more interested in the future” (p. 210).
Displacing the dominant subjectivities on offer opens up possibilities for new
subjectivities, ones not inscribed using the same tools, knowledge, or techniques. It
is this orientation towards change and the possibility of enacting different
subjectivities that provides hope. The workings of discourse and power and
techniques of the self that have shaped these dominant identities can also become
the “means of resistance” to those dominant subjectivities, enabling subjects to form
subjectivities that are other than dominant. This is not a way out; rather, it is a way into different possibilities. It will be important to consider the *(un)*usual narrative that follows with an eye towards resignification, noting the subject positions that the narrative makes possible and impossible.

6.2 *(Un)*Usual Narrative: Racism, Murder and the Racializing of Teachers

The reputation of technical teacher training at the University of Regina is almost commonsensical. The usual story suggests that it is known what technical teacher education here accomplishes: It produces good teachers. The storied history of the success of this place is almost unassailable; good teacher training (and a good teacher) is assumed to be the result of a University of Regina education degree. Interrupting these dominant understandings through story is a central feature of critical race theory (CRT). Tate (1997) suggests dominant groups justify their positions “with stock stories. These stock stories construct realities in ways that legitimize power and position” (p. 220). Stock stories, such as the story about the effectiveness of the secondary teacher education at the University of Regina, work to sediment the dominant narrative into the commonsense, reifying as normal, as unassailably true, the stories being repeated. I want to tell a different story. Using the idea of the *(un)*usual narrative (Tupper & Cappello, 2008), I want to tell a story about teacher education here that will underline the research of this dissertation and, more importantly, cast the dominant story in relief, making it less likely that it will be so easy to see the commonsense story as usual.
6.2.1 Steven and I

Pamela George, a Saulteaux woman, a mother of two, a devoted daughter, and a member of the Sakimay First Nation, was murdered on the outskirts of Regina on Easter weekend, April 17, 1995. At the time, she was working as a prostitute, something she did occasionally. Her story and the subsequent trial are important examples of the ongoing realities of colonialism and its effects and the continuing salience of race to shape the social fabric and subjectivities of people living in Regina, Saskatchewan. Two privileged White, university athletes murdered her. It happened just after the end of term, and I had already made my way back to Ontario for summer employment. Steven Kummerfield and his friend, Alex Turnowetsky, convinced Pamela George to get into their car, drove her to the outskirts of the city and, in a drunken rage, beat her to the point of death. They drove away and escaped scrutiny for almost a month. The police spent their time with the usual suspects, chasing down other men “of the street” (Razack, 2002, p. 146).

I did not hear (or pay attention) to the news. The murder of a First Nations woman did not register as really worth paying attention to. It was not until I returned to school in the fall of 1995 that I heard from a friend that one of my classmates was up on charges for murder. Even then, I remember being a little shocked, but the details of the case were either unavailable or not interesting to me at the time. It is important to note that in the subsequent 3 years of my program, not once did we take up, in class or out, the fact that an education student, one of our own classmates, had murdered an Aboriginal woman in our city. Somehow this did not register or seem important to anyone that I was paying attention to; there was no way for me to connect this
abstract racial violence with my sense of being in this place. The space between
Pamela George and Steven Kummerfield, the space between their racialized identities
and the gap that those identities ensured—she of the stroll and of the reserve, he of
Campbell Collegiate, Regina’s south end, the university—this space was also evident in
my own experience. White racial identification means not noticing these things. While
Razack notes that Kummerfield and Ternowetsky “had a very small chance of seeing
Pamela George as a human being” (Razack, 2002, p. 127), their inability is mirrored in
my own failure to take notice of these matters. I suggest that the same can be said
about the lack of response or treatment of these matters from the Faculty of
Education.

Steven and I were both taking classes in our first year of secondary education
at the University of Regina. Our Education Professional Studies 100 class was in room
ED 311. I remember the narrow hallway opening up to the classroom space. I
remember working on a project together, studying the developmental psychologists in
small groups and offering presentations to the class. Steven and I were in the same
group working on Piaget’s cognitive stages. I remember our presentation involved the
movement from the simple to the complex (and it ended with me doing some juggling).
I remember Steven Kummerfield’s hands, as they were big, much bigger than mine, and
thick. They were workmanlike. He was a great basketball player; I really enjoyed
playing basketball. I remember we were about the same height. In fact, there were lots
of similarities between us, largely because of our social location as White, middle-class
men. I often think about these similarities as I consider Steven and me.
In the present, in my teaching in the Faculty of Education, I urge my students to consider these similarities themselves. I use Sherene Razack’s (2002) article, “Gendered Racial Violence and Spatialized Justice: The Murder of Pamela George,” with my students to tell this very personal story. I invite my students into this reading and try to highlight the closeness of it by asking them to remember their own EPS 100 class, their own group presentations; by noting that we are (usually) across the hall from ED 311 where my EPS 100 class was; and by pointing out that we can almost see Campbell Collegiate (Steven’s high school, and the school where his dad was a teacher) from windows on the Education Building’s third floor. I tell them that in many ways Steven Kummerfield was one of us. I am careful to stress that I don’t believe that the students in my class are potential murderers. However, if we get past the limiting notion that racism is only an egregious individual act, seeing ourselves as closely related to this story might be able to tell us something about the ongoing reality of race formation in and through schools and about the potential consequences of not attending to these matters in our education program.

Razack (2002) considers the notions of race, space, and the law and how these entities work within a particular location to continue to constitute colonial relations, marking the city of Regina in visible and discursive ways. According to her, it was history that was “missing from the trial” (Razack, 2002, p. 126) of the murderers of Pamela George. Her article could easily be rewritten as “Race, Space and Education” because the same critique can be leveled at the education of teachers in the secondary program. The colonial realities of Saskatchewan and the history of education in the province are not made available as part of the lens through which teaching can be
understood. The whiteness of the faculty, of the students, and of the program itself is a given, an unmarked and normative feature of the Faculty of Education. Therefore students continue to be unable to read both history and the present in ways that meaningfully reference the realities of colonialism and the ongoing production of racialized privilege. It is this lack of historical context that made it unlikely that I could see Pamela George as a human being. By not being able to fit her murder and the actions of these White men into a history of such actions, and a history of producing White dominance through such actions, I was unable to hear the news or to think of the event meaningfully.

What if Steven Kummerfield never committed the murder? Or, what if he was never implicated or caught? How difficult is it to fail out of the education program as an education student? I ask my students this question and they know the answer: very difficult. Once you’ve been selected, you have to try hard to be removed, work hard against all the support that is in place to ensure your success. It is very likely that Steven Kummerfield, if he wanted to, could have finished the program and could have earned a teaching certificate. Where in the program would his whiteness, his dominant masculinity and dominant identity have been confronted? What information would he have encountered or what process would he have undergone that would have called these things into question? Given that I was a student at the same time, I have the answer: none. There was nothing in my experience as an education student that would have shed light on any of these realities. The discourses were completely absent.

It is very important to note that my social location, my subjectivity is not that different from Steven’s. I am no murderer, but having grown up in similar sports
cultures, similar orientations to society through dominance, and so forth, I need to underline that he and I are not that different. In a society where the term “racist” is reserved for only obvious and individual acts, some might point out that Steven Kummerfield’s racism and his violent homicide are signs of the difference between him and me. The effect of focusing on these differences is to miss out on the commonalities that in fact reveal the commonsense realities of being White in this place. Steven and I operate from a similar base of stock stories. We have been shaped in similar ways by colonial history and pointed in similar directions by our White, middle-class upbringing. We share in so many privileges. That he acted in such outrageous ways should not be allowed to diminish the normalized ways in which other Whites practice/operate in order to maintain colonialism and race privilege.

6.3 Possibilities for Resisting Dominance

The cogency of the depiction of the racialized production of White teachers is a necessary condition for the effectiveness of this genealogy. The usefulness of this work in resisting dominance remains to be discussed. This (un)usual story represents a possible counter-narrative to the stock story of the simple success of technical teacher training. While I do not want to belabor its usefulness, I think this story represents possibilities for the interruption of dominance and invites the disruption of White subjectivity in Regina in potentially useful ways.

6.3.1 Unknowability and this (Un)Usual Narrative

As suggested earlier, one of the means of surpassing the technical orientation of teacher education is to embrace the unknowable dimension of teaching and learning. There are many spaces within the (un)usual story offered above where
unknowability and the partiality of knowledge are made available to students and
made present in the classroom. This story makes some knowledge available,
engaging students with the limits of what they think they know, and it also presents
some challenges by obscuring other knowledge.

Students engage the partiality of their own knowledge in this narrative
through the challenge of seeing their constitution as white students. Working with
this narrative allows my students access to a space that they already inhabit, but are
not usually honest about publicly. I have had many students, male and female, who
confess to being in the front and/or back of cars, driving the stroll, looking at the
prostitutes, throwing pennies at the prostitutes. Something in this story connects
with many of my students and they see themselves, especially in Razack’s (2002)
telling, and can make better sense of themselves as a result. Even when they resist
and struggle with this sense making, it seems worthwhile. This story demonstrates
viscerally the work of racialization, depicting racism in the courts and the broader
society. For many in my classes, it is the first time in their 4-year program that they
have had a sustained conversation about race and racism. Whereas the teacher
education described in this genealogy strived for objectivity and distance, telling
this story dissolves the pretense of neutrality and makes the constitution of my
students as white subjects a site for inquiry. This story enables students to name
whiteness, to see whiteness at work through the story, and to begin to consider how,
through the backdrop of racial otherness, that whiteness has constituted them. They
learn that the partiality of knowledge has been largely to their benefit.
Partial knowledge is also engaged in the narrative around Pamela George.

Telling this story makes Pamela George visible and it is a way to humanize her.

Telling this story introduces some of the historical context absent from the trial specifically and education more generally. My students begin to link her story to the long history of colonial violence, especially against women and its ongoing manifestation in their disappearances. Students wrestle with the continuing effects of colonialism and consider how Regina remains a space un/marked by that history.

This story is a starting point from which to offer students some of the history of the idea of race and a beginning understanding of how processes of racialization are normalized. In contrast to the raceless neutrality explored in this genealogy, telling this story represents a move in the opposite direction. This history and Pamela George’s personhood may have been absent in the trial, but they can be made visible in the classroom in order to underline for students the ways in which the knowledge that they have already is partial—both incomplete and invested in a particular vision of the world. Their knowledge works for them, just as it works against those students who are racialized and minoritized. By teaching and learning about identities, racialization, colonial history, these students are better able to engage in both hearing this material and seeing its relevance to education, than I was prepared to be in my first 2 years as a teacher education student. There are possibilities here to offer students a different way to think about themselves and about themselves as teachers. Making whiteness and processes of racialization visible changes the discourse, allowing for different conversations and potentially different subject formations.
It is necessary to consider also how students can hear these things, to ask what sense largely dominant students can make of how their dominance is constructed, or how otherness ends up being so central to their own self-understanding. In a class, or even in a few classes, how far along this journey is it possible to travel? Kumashiro (2001) suggests, “learning to overcome one’s desire for the comforting repetition of normative knowledges, identities, and experiences involves learning to desire the discomforting process of unlearning” (p. 8). But what happens when students do not desire this? Or they do not desire this at a deep level? These questions trouble the idea that what I am presenting here is the answer, or even an answer. The complexities of each situation, each student, and my own implications in teaching and learning are difficult to untangle and understand, let alone claim some kind of mastery over.

6.3.2 Resignification of the Self Through this (Un)Usual Narrative

Another pathway to surpassing education’s technical orientation, and especially it’s deep connection to White subject formation, is the potential for the resignification of subjects towards anti-oppression. This narrative makes some other than dominant subject positions available for students and it also presents opportunities for students to resist and remain dominant.

While working with this (un)usual narrative can be productive of a change in the discourse and can help interrogate the limitations of technical-rational teaching, the story is only a starting place in enabling the kind of self-work that might produce other than dominant White subjects. By offering up my own relationship to the secondary program, my own constitution in whiteness through the program, I point
them towards how subject formation is accomplished through the denial and use of otherness. I also model a subjectivity that acknowledges dominance and privilege, that draws attention to the advantages that are being offered, and by publicly working to subvert those advantages, I offer students a more complicated, unusual example of being teacher. Students also can begin to see the other work that their education program has been doing to them and for them. To begin to see these things is to de-center the place of the “objectivity” and “neutrality” of technique and provide the starting place for enacting different subjectivities.

Something such as the critical autobiographies that Schick and St. Denis (2005) articulate might offer students an alternative starting place to choose how they come to terms with this history and with their place in this history and in this space. A critical autobiography makes room for the social context of teaching and potentially de-centers the dominance of whiteness by asking students to account for their privilege. More than thinking carefully, students think differently about who they get to be as a result of their schooling, and who they imagine themselves being as a teacher. In the context of the difficult conversations around racialization, this invitation to think themselves in the future offers the potential to enact themselves as teachers (slightly) differently. They can not only see themselves as more than technical, but also as cultural and with an acknowledgement of the positioning that White culture has made available.

Unknowability suggests that this process of resignification can not be mandated or narrowly conceived. Certainly, many of my students resist both the critique of dominant knowledge and the invitation to take up less dominant
positions. Not only in my class, but also in other Faculty spaces, students are constantly presented with opportunities to resignifying themselves along the lines of dominance. I think of the way that students can see the social realities of schooling in and through their practica, and I think of the rich and important conversations that have resulted from talking through those realities. I also wonder about how continued emphasis on the technical aspects of teaching, to the exclusion of other topics, impinges on the kind of learning that might happen in these spaces. The work that may have gone on to make whiteness visible and to de-center the White cultural register needs to be continued to allow students to experiment with anti-oppressive and increasingly less dominant teaching subjectivities.

Another form of resistance might involve the kind of resignification that dominant subjects can opt into that looks like liberal goodness. Being a White person who can also talk about racism and its history means being a “good” White person. I can admit to racism, and even this admission can add to my privileged status as I perform a sensitive whiteness. The good White person is interested in these matters and, by placing these conversations in the foreground, it is possible to re-inscribe the normativity of the good White teacher. Even as I draw attention to the unequal advantages being offered to those racialized as White, participating in this conversation also confirms my students in their own goodness. For them, doing this work also looks good on a CV. There is more chance of being hired as a White student comfortable with the language of antiracism. It is these sorts of incongruities that must be acknowledged and wrestled with.
What about the non-dominant, racialized and minoritized student in my classroom? Who does s/he get to be? The Aboriginal student for example, who listens carefully to the story of Pamela George’s murder. Can s/he be other than victim? Can I support him/her in becoming towards anti-oppression? In what ways might the telling of this story make it harder for these students to resignify in anti-oppressive ways, even as the narrative invites dominant students to buy in?

Certainly, many more stories are required, ones that show Aboriginal people (and other racialized and minoritized people) in all the fullness of living and acting and creating. The murder of Pamela George is just one story among thousands that could and should be used to explore some of the complexities of living in a racialized and racializing world. The visceral reminder of this narrative from my own teacher education encourages me to consider very carefully what my own offerings to students make available/ensure, and what is foreclosed by these same efforts. Although this is a different starting place than my own teacher education, this time/place is not free from the history of this present where race and dominance are still so salient and so ubiquitous.

6.4 Conclusions AND Possibilities

Ultimately, teaching and working with this story enables different possibilities for subjectivity to be considered. Students feel implicated in this story in personal ways and attempt to account for themselves and their constitution. This (un)usual narrative reveals some of the ways in which we might disrupt the production of dominant identities. Through this story we can see something of the politics of knowledge, the politics of teaching, and the politics of being a particular
self in this location. There are other stories that could be told to a similar effect—
told to change the discourse, told to make whiteness visible, told to de-center
technical rationality and White cultural values, told to de-center White subjects.

It is in the range of practices around the telling of the story that we can see
multiple efforts to marshal resistance to dominant White subject formation. It is not
one thing. Rather, it requires an understanding of the “AND” (Brogden, 2009,
p. 138). There are no prescriptions, no neutral spaces outside of the dominant
discourses that invite, encourage and shape the processes of racialization. Any
‘answers’ must include the AND, the nod to what each practice and knowledge
accomplishes and forecloses. Teacher education must attend to the technical
components of learning to teach and attempt to disrupt the attendant whiteness
that, at least in the space of the new secondary education program at the University
of Regina, is reproduced in those technical discourses. Teacher education should
pursue the possibilities of imagining and acting in ways that are outside of dominant
subjectivities and recognize that those same practices will dissuade, dispossess and
diminish opportunities for some.

This genealogy has made it possible to see the processes of White
racialization that are central to secondary teacher education in Regina. Changing the
discourse or changing practices does not move us to some neutral space, it only
somewhat changes the local context. It becomes possible to say and be something
slightly different here. A meaningful goal, then, might be to either use increasingly
less racist practices in teacher education or to embody an increasingly less
dominant White subjectivity. Rather than mandating some changes, might this work
represent a call to collegial work, to work as allies towards some of these goals? To the extent that this research, in making visible the constitution of White subjectivity in/through teacher education, enables and supports these collegial alliances, that is the extent to which this work can be seen as legitimate and helpful.
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